# OIL SANDS BIRD CONTACT MONITORING PROGRAM

# **2014 ANNUAL REPORT**

Prepared for:

Alberta Energy Regulator and Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development

March 2015

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

1-1		1.0
2-1	CANADIAN NATURAL RESOURCES LIMITED (HORIZON)	2.0
3-1	IMPERIAL OIL RESOURCES	3.0
4-1	SHELL CANADA ENERGY	4.0
5-1	SUNCOR ENERGY INC.	5.0
6-1	SYNCRUDE CANADA LTD.	6.0
7-1	REGIONAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	7.0



## OIL SANDS BIRD CONTACT MONITORING PROGRAM 2014 ANNUAL REPORT

**1. INTRODUCTION** 

Prepared for:

Canadian Natural Resources Limited, Imperial Oil Canada Limited, Shell Canada Energy, Suncor Energy Inc., Syncrude Canada Limited

March 13, 2015

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

### PAGE

1.0	INTRC	DUCTION	1·	-1
	1.1	Context	1.	-1
	1.2	Objectives	1·	-3
	1.3	Protocol Overview	1·	-4
		1.3.1 Bird Contact Monito	ring1·	-4
		1.3.2 Mortality Searches .	1.	-4
		1.3.3 Incidental Observati	ons1·	-5
		1.3.4 Data Collection and	Management1	-5
	1.4	Weather	1·	-6
	1.5	Documents Cited	1·	-6

### LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1:	Process-affected and Freshwater Ponds at the Five Mine Sites included	
-	in the OSBCMP	.1-2



### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Context

The Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program (OSBCMP) was initiated in 2011, with the early objective of establishing a standardized protocol for monitoring of bird landings at process-affected ponds at the five oil sands mine operations in northeastern Alberta. In each subsequent year, the data were analysed and challenges experienced were evaluated, and the protocol amended to improve data quality and consistency in procedures across sites. Through the period of 2011 to early 2014, responsibility for the protocol and for the integration and analyses of data collected within the program rested with the University of Alberta's Research on Avian Protection Program (RAPP), led by Dr. Colleen Cassady St. Clair. The history of events leading to the establishment of the OSBCMP is described in detail in St. Clair (2014a).

Data and outcomes from each of the 2011, 2012 and 2013 programs are presented in St. Clair et al. (2012, 2013 and 2014b, respectively). Submission of the St. Clair reports to Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development (AESRD) in 2012 and 2013 (for the 2011 and 2012 programs, respectively) fulfilled the relevant environmental operating approval conditions for each operator. In early 2014, for the 2013 program year, each operator provided separate reports to regulatory agencies, as the final RAPP report was generated for a different purpose, the satisfaction of a court order (R v. Syncrude Canada Ltd. 2010) relating to the landing of waterfowl on Syncrude's Aurora Settling Pond in 2008.

In early 2014, the responsibility for management of the OSBCMP transferred to Owl Moon Environmental Inc. (OMEI); this responsibility includes protocol oversight, data management and reporting. In the latter regard, this report provides to the Alberta Energy Regulator and AESRD the submissions of each of the operators (Chapters 2 to 6), together with an integration of information and data in a regional synthesis (Chapter 7). Submission of this report to regulatory agencies is, therefore, intended to fulfill the approval requirements associated with the five mining operations – Canadian Natural Resources Ltd. (Canadian Natural), Imperial Oil Canada Limited, Shell Canada Limited, Syncrude Canada Ltd., and Suncor Energy Inc. (Figure 1.1).

The intent of the program is to quantify bird landings and mortalities at process-affected ponds at oil sands mining facilities and on the basis of these data, to provide site-specific guidance on bird deterrent strategies to reduce these landings and mortalities. It is important to note that, in these early stages of the program, meeting this intent requires that the protocol remain open for improvement as differences among sites challenge the ability to fully standardize the procedures within the protocol. While the OSBCMP remains in a nascent stage, improved standardization across sites within each year provides for a means of evaluating bird contacts and mortalities across the oil sands mining industry at a regional scale. Landings at process-affected ponds and mortalities due to bitumen contact over time remain difficult to quantify as a consequence of annual changes to the protocol. Discussion of trends has been deferred, pending a better understanding of the compatibility of data from year-to-year and across sites within each year.



Canadian Natural Resources Limited, Imperial Oil Canada Limited, Shell Canada Energy, Suncor Energy Inc., Syncrude Canada Limited Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program 2014 Annual Report



Figure 1.1: Process-affected and Freshwater Ponds at the Five Mine Sites included in the OSBCMP



### 1.2 Objectives

The OSBCMP arose out of the legal proceedings following the landing of a large number of waterfowl on a Syncrude tailings pond in 2008. The resulting court order specified four objectives to be addressed by the RAPP:

- 1. Collect information on bird use and deterrence practices in the oil sands region and review avian deterrents in this and other industries.
- 2. Conduct field studies and supporting analyses.
- 3. Integrate with and support the development of a standardized monitoring program.
- 4. Recommend best practices for bird protection by the mineable oil sands industry.

While the OSBCMP includes activities that contribute to achievement of these four objectives, the third has been a primary focus in the 2011 to 2014 period. Standardization of monitoring practices using an appropriate monitoring design is critical in quantifying bird landings and mortalities, and while significant steps have been made towards achieving standardization, the OSBCMP protocol is updated prior to each monitoring season. The monitoring activities in 2014 followed the procedures in the 2014 OSBCMP protocol (St. Clair et al. 2014b).

The five objectives of the OSBCMP are to:

- 1. Provide an estimate of bird contacts and mortalities on ponds containing processaffected waters.
- 2. Provide an estimate of bird contacts on ponds containing fresh water.
- 3. Develop a standardized monitoring program for all oil sands mine operations to provide comparable data across ponds, sites, seasons, and years.
- 4. Identify species at risk that have been affected through contact on ponds containing process-affected waters.
- 5. Provide direction on adaptive management for long-term monitoring and bird deterrent programs.

To date, the OSBCMP has focused on objectives 1 to 4, with the majority of effort dedicated to developing a standardized method of estimating the numbers of birds contacting process-affected ponds and the proportion of these birds dying as a consequence of contact with residual bitumen in the ponds.

Oil sands operators employ a variety of techniques to deter birds from landing. Deterrents typically emit auditory or visual stimuli, or a combination of the two. As part of their environmental approvals, oil sands operators are obliged to submit a Waterfowl Protection Plan (or Bird Protection Plan), which specifies how they will monitor the number of birds coming in contact with their tailings ponds and how they will endeavour to minimize those contacts. To the extent permitted by the data, guidance to operators to improve deterrent effectiveness has been provided, and this contributes to meeting the fifth objective.



### 1.3 **Protocol Overview**

The OSBCMP monitoring protocol has been developed to detect avian landings and mortalities related to oil sands process-affected ponds and to do so in a standardized manner. The protocol is designed primarily for species that are more likely to come in contact with process-affected ponds. This is formalized by designating target species, defined as those that dabble, dive, or wade as a primary means of foraging. In contrast, non-target guilds are those that forage primarily by pecking at the ground, gleaning fruit or insects from vegetation, are aerial insectivores, the raptor groups, and scavenging species. The program includes two survey components – bird contact monitoring and mortality searches, and incidental observations. These are described in detail in St. Clair et al. (2014b).

### 1.3.1 Bird Contact Monitoring

The unit of monitoring is the survey area, defined as the visible area of the pond within a 500-m radius to an altitude of 100 m, observed from a designated survey station. One survey location is required for small ponds (≤150 ha), and monitoring at a small pond occurs over a period of 10 minutes. Two or more survey locations are required at ponds larger than 150 ha, the number of locations being dependent on the size of the pond. Landed and flying birds within the survey area/altitude are counted and identified during a 30-minute observation period at survey locations on the largest ponds (>1,000 ha). Small ponds at which the risk of bird oiling is low are monitored once per week, while all other process-affected ponds in the program are monitored six times per week. Freshwater ponds are monitored for 10 minutes, twice weekly. Within the survey area, birds landed or flying over were counted and identified at a minimum to guild, and to species if possible.

At each site, bird contact monitoring occurred on six days per week, from April 16 to July 6 (spring season) and July 25 to October 31 (fall season) each year. The order of ponds was varied each day to the extent practical within site safety and operational constraints, and as constrained by weather conditions. Ponds missed during the 6-day period (weather or safety constraints) are monitored on the seventh day (the Comparison Day). Also on the Comparison Day, a series of Inter-observer Variation surveys were conducted, which were used to characterize variability among observers at a site.

### 1.3.2 Mortality Searches

Bitumen on feathers can impede flight, buoyancy, thermoregulation, and foraging, and can result in bird death. Once in each 2-week period through the season, a transect of a length equal to the circumference of each large pond was searched to for the presence of dead birds. Searches were conducted by boat, vehicle (truck, ARGO) or on foot. Search effort was quantified by time spent searching (hours), and by either distance (m) or area (ha) searched, depending on the pond and the operator.



Observations of an oiled bird by any person at any time resulted in efforts to capture the bird. Capture and euthanization procedures are site-specific, conducted under regulatory approval and permit requirements that are separate from the data collection procedures within the OSBCMP protocol. Captured, oiled birds were euthanized as instructed by AESRD personnel. Euthanized oiled birds were included as mortalities.

### 1.3.3 Incidental Observations

Birds observed outside of the formal bird contact monitoring program could be recorded in the database as incidental observations. Broadly interpreted, incidental observations could be recorded anywhere on the site at any time during the monitoring day. From the inception of the program through July 2014, observers were encouraged to record incidental observations with an emphasis on species of conservation concern and species that had not been previously recorded or had been recorded in low numbers through the season. However, the resulting incidental observations database was highly variable, reflecting the interests and priorities of observers rather than the product of a standardized procedure for recording bird observations.

Following a government-industry workshop in July 2014, the incidental observation procedure was clarified, focusing observers on recording of birds representing species of conservation concern that were at elevated risk of bitumen contact. This did not change the protocol, rather, it represented an enhancement in standardization across operating facilities and among observers, while retaining an emphasis on the species of conservation concern component of the OSBCMP.

### 1.3.4 Data Collection and Management

The majority of bird contact monitoring and incidental observation data were entered in real-time into electronic tablets using customized data entry forms. Upon submission of a completed survey, the data were automatically uploaded into the program database through a cellular network.

Similarly, a custom data entry form was available for use during mortality searches, and data acquired at some sites were entered into the database using this facility. However, because of restrictions associated with the use of electronic devices in industrial operating areas (a restriction for safety reasons) and the harsher conditions often experienced on a boat on water, mortality search data were recorded using paper forms and later entered into the program database.

Data were extracted from the database and returned to the operator for quality assurance/ quality control (QA/QC) on a 2-week cycle through the 2014 season. At the end of the season, OMEI personnel combined the corrected files into a single database (one each for bird survey, mortality search, and incidental observations) and conducted a full QA/QC review. Operators addressed questions arising from this QA/QC, resulting in a final set of data files for use by each operator in generating this report. The original, raw data submitted during the season has been retained in an unaltered form, available for future use should one or more modified files be found to be in error, or compromised (e.g., corrupted).



### 1.4 Weather

The landing events in 2008, 2010 and November 2014 illustrate the strong influence of weather conditions on the number of landings and mortalities that occur on process-affected ponds (St. Clair et al. 2011). In particular, strong and variable winds, precipitation, dense cloud cover, and darkness were identified as contributors to the bird landing event in October 2010. The April 2008 bird landing event occurred during a late winter storm following a period of unseasonably warm weather. Although not a specific requirement of the protocol, weather data have been acquired, and an attempt has been made to correlate bird observations and mortalities with periods of adverse weather during the 2014 monitoring season. This is discussed in a regional context (Section 7.0), based on Environment Canada weather station data (Fort McMurray) and the observations from the five monitoring sites. Each of the individual operator sections also includes a discussion of the November 2014 landing event, which occurred after the October 31, 2014 conclusion of the formal OSBCMP monitoring program.

### 1.5 Documents Cited

- R. v. Syncrude Canada Ltd. (2010) ABPC 229. Retrieved January 26, 2015 from http://www.canlii.org/en/ab/abpc/doc/2010/2010abpc229/2010abpc229.pdf
- St. Clair C.C., Habib T., Shore B. (2011) Spatial and temporal correlates of mass bird mortality in oil sands tailings ponds. Prepared for Alberta Environment. 61 pp.
- St. Clair C.C., Habib T., Loots S., Ball J., McCallum C. (2012) 2011 Annual Report of the Regional Bird Monitoring Program for the Oil Sands Region. Research on Avian Protection Project, Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton; 144 p.
- St. Clair C.C., Loots S., McCallum C., Thayer D., Fontaine T., Gilhooly P. (2013) 2012 Report of the Regional Bird Monitoring Program for the Oil Sands. Research on Avian Protection Project, Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton; 60 p.
- St. Clair C.C. (2014a) Final Report of the Research on Avian Protection Project (2010–2014). Research on Avian Protection Project, Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton; Prepared for Alberta Justice; 95 p.
- St. Clair C.C., Loots S., Ronconi R.A. (2014b) 2014 Protocol Oil sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program. Research on Avian Protection Project, Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton; 50 p.





## OIL SANDS BIRD CONTACT MONITORING PROGRAM HORIZON OIL SANDS – CANADIAN NATURAL RESOURCES LIMITED 2014 ANNUAL REPORT

Prepared for:

**Canadian Natural Resources Limited** 

March 13, 2015



March 15, 2015

Alberta Energy Regulator 11th Floor Oxbridge Place 9820-106 Street Edmonton, AB T5K 2J6

Karen McCallion, P.Eng. Industrial Engineer, Mining Authorizations

#### Via email EPEA.Reports@aer.ca

Subject: Horizon Oil Sands Processing Plant and Mine EPEA Approval No. 149968-00-04 Regional Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program Annual Report

As required in Section 4.9 of the above mentioned approval, Canadian Natural Resources Limited (Canadian Natural) hereby submits the 2014 Regional Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program.

The following is the annual report requirements as described in Section 4.9.2(b).

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (780) 824-2076.

Sincerely,

### CANADIAN NATURAL RESOURCES LIMITED

Joanne Hogg

Joanne Hogg Lead, Research (Wetlands & Aquatics) Horizon Oil Sands

Cc Kenneth Yap, AER Marie Nietfeld, AER Richard Wiacek, Environment Canada Joann Skilnick, AESRD Andrea Mc Gregor, AESRD

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

### PAGE

2.0	CANA		FURAL RESOURCES LIMITED (HORIZON)	2-1
	2.1	Summary	/	2-1
		2.1.1	Bird Landings and Mortalities at Process-affected Ponds	2-1
		2.1.2	Bird Landings at a Freshwater Lake	2-2
		2.1.3	Standardized Monitoring	2-3
		2.1.4	Species of Conservation Concern	2-3
		2.1.5	Adaptive Management	2-4
	2.2	Introducti	on	2-4
		2.2.1	Site	2-4
		2.2.2	Personnel	2-4
		2.2.3	Management of Avian Attractants and Control of Hazards	2-6
		2.2.4	Avian Deterrents	2-6
		2.2.5	Hazing Procedures	2-10
	2.3	Methods.		2-10
		2.3.1	Pond Characteristics	2-11
		2.3.2	Bird Surveys	2-11
		2.3.3	Inter-observer Variability (IOV)	2-12
		2.3.4	Mortality Searches	2-13
		2.3.5	Incidental Observations and Reporting	2-14
	2.4	Results		2-14
		2.4.1	Pond Characteristics	2-14
		2.4.2	Bird Observations	2-17
		2.4.3	Inter-observer Variability (IOV)	2-26
		2.4.4	Mortalities	2-27
		2.4.5	Species of Conservation Concern	2-29
	2.5	Discussic	on	2-36
		2.5.1	Bird Contacts	2-36
		2.5.2	Mortalities and Oiling	2-37
		2.5.3	Monitoring Protocol	2-38
	2.6	Documer	nts Cited	2-39
	2.7	Appendic	es 2.A to 2.F	2-40



### TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

### PAGE

### LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1:	Monitoring Effort at Process-affected Ponds at Horizon in 2014	2-1
Table 2.2:	Bird Observations at Process-affected Ponds at Horizon in 2014	2-2
Table 2.3:	Monitoring Effort at a Freshwater Lake at Horizon in 2014	2-2
Table 2.4:	Bird Observations at a Freshwater Lake at Horizon in 2014	2-2
Table 2.5:	Number of Observations of Birds of Conservation Concern at Process-	
	affected Ponds at Horizon in 2014	2-3
Table 2.6:	Avian Deterrents Deployed at Horizon (as of Fall 2014)	2-7
Table 2.7:	Number of Avian Radars and Deterrents at Process-affected Ponds at	
	Horizon (as of Fall 2014)	2-8
Table 2.8:	Characteristics of Survey Stations Monitored at Horizon in 2014	2-15
Table 2.9:	Characteristics of Ponds Monitored at Horizon in 2014	2-16
Table 2.10:	Bird Survey Effort by Station at Horizon in 2014	2-18
Table 2.11:	Bird Survey Effort by Pond at Horizon in 2014	2-19
Table 2.12:	Number of Bird Observations by Pond and Guild at Horizon in 2014 <sup>1</sup>	2-21
Table 2.13:	Mean Number of Landed Birds per Survey at Horizon in 2014	2-22
Table 2.14:	Mean Number of Oiled Birds per Survey at Horizon in 2014	2-23
Table 2.15:	Brood Observations by Species at Process-affected Ponds at Horizon in	
	2014	2-26
Table 2.16:	Inter-observer Variability in Terms of Relative Percent Difference at	
	Horizon in 2014, for Surveys during which at least One Bird was	
	Observed as Landed or Flying Over	2-27
Table 2.17:	Mortality Search Effort at Horizon in 2014 <sup>1</sup>	2-28
Table 2.18:	Number of Mortalities by Pond at Horizon in 2014	2-30
Table 2.19:	Number of Observations of Oiling and Mortalities, by Species, at Horizon	
	in 2014	2-31
Table 2.20:	Summary of Bird Survey, Mortality and Incidental Results by Pond at	
	Horizon in 2014	2-35

### LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1:	Eighteen Process-affected Ponds and a Compensation Lake at Horizon Oil Sands (2014)	2-5
Figure 2.2:	Mean Number of Landed Waterbirds per Survey at Horizon in 2014	2-24
Figure 2.3:	Mean Number of Oiled Birds per Survey at Horizon in 2014	2-25
Figure 2.4:	Relationship Between Pond Size (area over water), Mortality Search	
	Effort, and Mortality Search Results (no mortalities were found during	
	mortality searches)	2-29
Figure 2.5:	Proportion of each Guild for Birds that Flew Over or Landed at Process-	
	affected Ponds, Contacted Bitumen, or Died at Horizon in 2014	2-32
Figure 2.6:	Timing of Bird Landings, Oiling, and Mortalities in Spring (top) and Fall	
·	(bottom) 2014 at Horizon.	2-33
Figure 2.7:	Location of 31 Pond-related Mortalities Found Incidentally at Horizon in	
-	April-October 2014	2-34



### 2.0 CANADIAN NATURAL RESOURCES LIMITED (HORIZON)

### 2.1 Summary

In accordance with the Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program (OSBCMP) regional protocol, 18 process-affected ponds and one freshwater lake were monitored at Canadian Natural Resources Limited's (Canadian Natural) Horizon Oil Sands Mine, during the spring (April 16 to July 6) and fall (July 25 to October 31) periods.

### 2.1.1 Bird Landings and Mortalities at Process-affected Ponds

At process-affected ponds, there was a total 6,411 observations of landed waterbirds (dabblers, divers, waders, and gulls) of 50 species, across 2,177 surveys (Tables 2.1 and 2.2). Surveys covered 90 to 100% (0.1 to 25.8 ha) of each pond, except at the Tailings pond, where four survey stations covered in total 10% (100.2 ha) of the pond. There was a mean of 2.2 landed waterbirds per survey across ponds, ranging from zero at seven of the ponds, to 7.2 at Dyke 10 Runoff pond and 26.8 at Basal Water Storage pond. The most common species were Mallards, Greater Scaup, Eared Grebe, and Ring-necked Ducks.

No mortalities were found during 84.5 h of standardized searching across the 18 ponds. However, 31 mortalities were found incidentally, 27 of which occurred at the Tailings pond. Mortalities included 13 species, notably Eared Grebe (7 birds), Franklin's Gulls (5 birds) and American Coots (4 birds).

Bird Surveys								
# Ponds Surveyed		18	5					
# 10-min Surveys Conducted		1,59	98					
# 30-min Surveys Conducted		579						
Mortality Searches								
# Ponds Searched	18							
# Searches	244	(17 focused and 22	27 transect searche	es)				
Search Method	Boat	Walk	Truck	Total				
Total Time Searched	9.8 h	69.8 h	4.9 h	84.5 h				
Distance/Area Searched <sup>1</sup>	101 km	137 km 13 ha	21 km	259 km 13 ha				

Fable 2.1: Monitoring Eff	ort at Process-affected	Ponds at Horizon in 2014
---------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------

Note:

<sup>1</sup> For each search, either distance or area counted towards effort.



	Waterbirds							Non-target Guilds						
			Contacted Bitumen		Contacted Bitumen		Mort	ality			Conta Bitu	acted men	Mort	ality
	Landed	Flew Over	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental	Landed	Flew over	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental		
# Birds <sup>1</sup>	6,411	1,969	127	11	0	31	534	4,208	0	0	0	0		
# Species	50	24	14	5	0	13	26	30	0	0	0	0		

### Table 2.2: Bird Observations at Process-affected Ponds at Horizon in 2014

#### Note:

<sup>1</sup> Individual live birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times.

### 2.1.2 Bird Landings at a Freshwater Lake

A total of 981 landed waterbirds (31 species) were observed during 52 surveys (Table 2.3) at Compensation Lake (mean = 18.9 birds per survey). Surveys covered 26% (20 ha) of the lake. Three birds that must have contacted bitumen at another location were observed at Compensation Lake in early August: two Franklin's Gull (20 to 30% oiled) and a California Gull (30% oiled) (Table 2.4).

### Table 2.3: Monitoring Effort at a Freshwater Lake at Horizon in 2014

Bird Surveys							
# Ponds Surveyed	1						
# 10-min Surveys Conducted	52						
# 30-min Surveys Conducted	0						

### Table 2.4: Bird Observations at a Freshwater Lake at Horizon in 2014

		۷	Vaterbird	s		Non-target Guilds				
			Con Bite	tacted umen				Conta Bitu	acted men	
	Landed	Flew Over	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality (Incidental)	Landed	Flew over	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality (Incidental)
# Birds <sup>1</sup>	981	175	3	0	0	39	125	0	0	0
# Species	31	10	2	0	0	8	12	0	0	0

#### Note:

<sup>1</sup> Individual live birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times.



### 2.1.3 Standardized Monitoring

Bird surveys were conducted as per the protocol, aside from the following details. Surveys were usually conducted earlier in the day in the mining areas (including the Tailings pond) due to afternoon access restrictions, than were surveys in areas around the extraction and upgrader areas. The timing of surveys at individual survey locations was randomized within these constraints, and survey timing was not correlated with the number of birds observed. The Tailings pond's southwest station could not be accessed in wet conditions due to impassable road conditions, and no alternative stations could be established, resulting in 21% missed surveys at that station. The missed surveys were interspersed throughout the monitoring period, increasing the confidence interval around the mean numbers of birds observed at this station compared to other stations. Mortality searches were conducted in accordance with the regional protocol.

### 2.1.4 Species of Conservation Concern

During surveys, six waterbird species of conservation concern were observed landed at five of the 18 process-affected ponds (Table 2.5): Basal Water Storage (mean = 1.61 birds per survey), Dyke 10 Runoff (0.53), Coke Runoff (0.10), Tailings (0.09), and Recycle Water (0.02). Four species of conservation concern were found incidentally as mortalities: two Green-winged Teal, a Lesser Scaup, a Horned Grebe, and a White-winged Scoter.

	Lan	ded <sup>1</sup>	Flew Over <sup>1</sup>		Contacted Bitumen <sup>1</sup>		ality
Species	Bird Survey	Incidental	Bird Survey	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental
	V	<b>Vaterbirds</b>					
Green-winged Teal	236	35	71				2
Northern Pintail	91	4	25				
Lesser Scaup	51						1
American White Pelican	10						
Horned Grebe	8						1
Pied-billed Grebe	1						
White-winged Scoter							1
Sandhill Crane		14	12				
Sora		1					
Great Blue Heron			1				
Osprey			1				
	Non	-target Gui	lds				
Barn Swallow	35		1,161				
American Kestrel	7		29				
Sharp-tailed Grouse	2		17				
Northern Harrier	1		27				
Bank Swallow			36				
Peregrine Falcon			1				

## Table 2.5: Number of Observations of Birds of ConservationConcern at Process-affected Ponds at Horizon in 2014

#### Note:

<sup>1</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times.



### 2.1.5 Adaptive Management

As in 2013, hazing activities were conducted as needed throughout the 2014 season. New deterrents in 2014 included two falcon kites and six radar-activated floating deterrent units (FDUs) that combine three different audio deterrents and a robotic falcon, all deployed at the Tailings pond. Five habitat protection booms were deployed in the spring or summer on the west side of the Tailings pond, and a year-round containment boom was added to Storm Water pond in June 2014. In August 2014, herbicide was applied on the west side of the Tailings pond and around Recycle Water pond, and in September vegetation was mechanically removed around Dyke 10 Runoff pond. As in 2013, hazing activities were conducted as needed throughout the 2014 season.

Survey stations that became inaccessible during the season due to construction (PMP1, PMP3 and TMP1) were replaced with stations established nearby (PMP5, PMP6 and TMP2, respectively).

### 2.2 Introduction

### 2.2.1 Site

The Canadian Natural Horizon Oil Sands Mine is located approximately 70 km north of Fort McMurray. Conditions 4.9.1 to 4.9.4 in the EPEA Approval for the Horizon Mine (149968-00-01) require that Canadian Natural develop and implement a Waterbird Protection Plan. Canadian Natural's participation in the OSBCMP fulfils these requirements, and this Chapter of the report is submitted in fulfilment of Condition 4.9.4.

In 2014, 18 process-affected ponds covering a total of 1,086 ha were monitored as part of the OSBCMP. The same 18 ponds have been monitored since the initiation of the program in 2011. They consist of a Tailings pond with fluids covering 1,013 ha, Basal Water Storage pond (28 ha), which contains saline water, Recycle Water pond (18 ha), and 15 smaller process-affected ponds (Figure 2.1). A freshwater lake, Compensation Lake (77 ha), was also monitored as part of the program.

### 2.2.2 Personnel

A Canadian Natural Horizon Mine Wetlands & Aquatics Lead and Bird Deterrent Coordinator oversee the implementation and coordination of the OSBCMP program at Horizon Oil Sands. Avian biologists conducted bird surveys and data verification, and occasionally hazed landed birds. Personnel qualifications included at minimum enrollment in or completion of a biology or ecology-related degree, or multiple years of field experience in waterfowl identification. New hires were trained and oriented on site for at least one week, including site-specific safety certifications, mine driving, bird survey protocol, bird identification, use of electronic tablets for data collection, and use of hazing pistols. Canadian Natural summer students assisted in completing the comparison surveys for the inter-observer variability (IOV) study.





Figure 2.1: Eighteen Process-affected Ponds and a Compensation Lake at Horizon Oil Sands (2014)



A specialized team maintained deterrents, conducted mortality searches, hazed landed birds, and captured oiled birds. New crew members typically spent at least two shifts (a total of 28 days on site) before they were responsible for leading a crew and conducting mortality searches on their own.

At Canadian Natural, the interval between the fall and spring migrations (July 7 to 24) was used as an investigative period aimed at evaluating and improving bird deterrence practices.

### 2.2.3 Management of Avian Attractants and Control of Hazards

In August 2014, 710 ha of land along the west shore of the Tailings pond was sprayed aerially with a mixture of Navius, Vision Max, OnSite, and Hasten. A mixture of Navius, Vision Max and OnSite was also applied to 2.2 ha of vegetation surrounding the Recycle Water pond in August 2014. Between September 3 and 16, vegetation was removed from approximately 7 ha along the shore of Dyke 10 Runoff pond, using a Caterpillar D6 bulldozer. The area will be sprayed with herbicide in spring 2015 to prevent regrowth.

Year-round containment booms surround discharge points at Dyke 10 Runoff and Recycle Water ponds. Another boom was deployed at Storm Water pond on June 11, 2014 and will also remain in place year round. At the Tailings pond, a 4-km boom intended to contain bitumen from the tailings discharge lines was in place from May 5 to November 3. In addition, five short habitat booms were deployed along the west shore of the Tailings pond between May 6 and July 26 and decommissioned between October 21 and 30. These habitat booms were used to add protection to areas where waterfowl family groups were observed and areas with habitat attractants.

### 2.2.4 Avian Deterrents

A total of 162 audio-only deterrents, 150 visual-only deterrents, and 18 combined units of audio and visual deterrents were deployed at process-affected ponds in 2014 (Tables 2.6 and 2.7; Appendix 2.A). The combined deterrents were activated by a radar detection system (Merlin Detect and Deter<sup>™</sup>) customized for the Horizon Oil Sands site. Three surveillance radars, each capable of detecting birds to a maximum distance of 2.8 km (DeTect 2014), triggered deterrents located in the corresponding guard zone through wireless signal when the software identified moving objects as targets (birds). A horizontal radar provided coverage of Basal Water Storage pond and the north part of the Tailings pond, a horizontal radar was also located on the south shore of the Tailings pond, and a radar with horizontal and vertical capability was located on the east shore of the Tailings pond. On two occasions the bird deterrent system reverted to random activation as a backup process during failure of the on-demand radar activation system. During the night of September 28, the north radar defaulted to battery power; the radar antenna stopped rotating and the linked deterrent units switched to random activation until maintenance the following morning. On October 2, the south radar went offline due to a system failure, and all linked units switched to random activation. The east radar was reconfigured on October 7 to provide coverage of the south part of the Tailings pond while the south radar was not functional.



Deterrent Name	Description	Stimuli	Sound Intensity at 1 m	Activation Control	Placement	Location [Number]
AHD-Laser Unit	Combines three to six acoustic hailing devices (long range acoustic devices 100x or Hyperspike HS-18) facing different directions, and two eye-safe (Class 3) green lasers for night deterrence	Audio and Visual	152 to 156 dB	Radar	Land	Tailings Pond [10] Basal Water Storage [1]
FDU (Floating Deterrent Unit)	Combines a Robop robotic falcon effigy with internal speaker, Bird Guard Super Pro Amp, and Zon EL08 Electronic Propane Cannon. A 12-volt battery system is recharged via solar panel and wind generator. In the event of wireless disruption, all systems switch to random activation	Audio and Visual	90 to 120 dB	Radar	Floating	Tailings Pond [7]
Cannon	Zon LP propane bird scare cannons	Audio	120 dB	Random	Land	All ponds except Froth Dump [159 in total]
<i>Merlin Harrier</i> System	Uses thermal surveillance cameras to detect birds near the pond surface, and triggers the closest of the 10 linked cannons	Audio	120 dB	Motion sensor	Land	Recycle Water
Bird Guard	Distress call generator	Audio	110 dB	Random	Land	Dyke 10 Runoff R2 Basal Dump Storm Water
Human Effigy	Human effigies dressed as workers	Visual	-	-	Land	All ponds except Sulphur Runoff [135 in total]
Eagle Effigy	Plastic eagle	Visual	-	-	Land	Basal Water Storage Dyke 10 Runoff Mine Dump Pond
Falcon Kite	Falcon kite attached by cable to a pole; emulates the flight of a falcon	Visual	-	-	Land	Dyke 10 Runoff Tailings Pond
Mylar Tape	Crackling reflective tape, attached to a string in strips of 30 to 60 cm in length	Visual	-	-	Over beaches	Dyke 10 Runoff R2 Basal Dump Storm Water

### Table 2.6: Avian Deterrents Deployed at Horizon (as of Fall 2014)



		s	Co	mbined Visual D	Audio a eterrent	nd	Au	idio-only	/ Deterre	ent	Vis	sual-only	/ Deterre	ent	То	tal
	ha)	Radar	Link Ra	ed to dar	Not L	inked	Linko Ra	ed to dar	Not L	inked	Link Ra	ed to dar	Not L	inked		
Pond Name	Pond Area (over water	Number of	Floating <sup>a</sup>	On Land <sup>b</sup>	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land⁰	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land <sup>d</sup>	Units	Density (units/ha)
Basal Water Storage	27.99	1		1						7				8	16	0.6
Coke Runoff	2.69									7				11	18	6.7
Dyke 10 Runoff	8.99									13				10	23	2.6
Emergency Dump Pond 1	0.12									1				1	2	16.7
Emergency Dump Pond 2	0.13									1				1	2	15.4
Emergency Dump Pond 3	0.10									2				2	4	40.0
Extraction Dump	1.67									2				5	7	4.2
Froth Dump	0.95													4	4	4.2
Mine Dump	1.19									2				7	9	7.6
Mine Sump	0.38									2				1	3	7.9
R1 Distributor	0.10									1				1	2	20.0
R1 Emergency Dump	0.17									1				1	2	11.8
R2 Basal Dump	1.26									5				3	8	6.3
R2 Emergency Dump	0.12									2				2	4	33.3
Recycle Water	18.22									10				10	20	1.1
Storm Water	8.27									9				7	16	1.9
Sulphur Runoff	0.57									2					2	3.5
Tailings Pond	1,013.40	3	7	10						95				76	188	0.2
Total	1,086.32	3*	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	162	0	0	0	150	330	0.3

### Table 2.7: Number of Avian Radars and Deterrents at Process-affected Ponds at Horizon (as of Fall 2014)

#### Notes:

Deterrent types: **a** = FDUs; **b** = AHD-laser Units; **c** = Cannons, Bird Guards; **d** = Human Effigies, Eagle Effigies, Falcon Kites, Mylar Tape.

\* One radar provided coverage of both Basal Water Storage and the Tailings Pond.



Combined deterrents consisted of acoustic hailing devices (AHD) paired with lasers for night deterrence, and FDU. The AHD-laser combinations were mounted as 11 separate units (10 at the Tailings pond and one at Basal Water Storage pond), comprising in total 42 long range acoustic devices, 18 Hyperspike speakers, and 22 lasers. AHD files included 255 sound tracks: 85 warning sounds (e.g., dogs barking), 85 scare sounds (e.g., bird distress calls), and 85 significant hazing sounds (e.g., gunshots). When a target (bird) was detected within a guard zone, sounds projected from the acoustic deterrents were selected from the library of recordings with lowest threat level played first, escalating to those in the intermediate threat level category, and then to the highest threat level if the bird(s) remained in the area. The recording played within each threat level was randomly selected by computer algorithm. To minimize habituation, the escalating sequence restarted and continued looping through the randomly selected sounds and ended when the target was no longer detected. The 11 AHD-laser units were deployed on March 25 and decommissioned between November 11 and 13. Some units were moved occasionally through the season to gain line of sight and improve connection with the radar, or were moved temporarily while building up the dyke along the edge of the Tailings pond.

FDUs included a robotic falcon with a rotating head and flapping wings, emitting Peregrine Falcon calls, a bird distress call generator with an omni-directional speaker, and a scare cannon. The seven units were deployed at the Tailings pond on May 16 and decommissioned on November 1, except for one unit that flipped and became submerged during a storm on July 30 and remained out of service.

At the Tailings pond, 100 cannons were deployed between March 28 and April 11. Five were removed due to damage or construction, 12 were removed between October 12 and 25 due to high water levels, 82 were removed between November 2 and 15 for winter storage, and the status of one cannon was unknown. At the other process-affected ponds, a total of 54 cannons were deployed between March 26 and 28 and removed between November 10 and 23. Ten additional cannons are in place year-round at Recycle Water pond; they are linked to an on-demand system (*Merlin Harrier;* DeTect) that detects movement (birds) above the pond surface using infrared cameras with motion sensors, and triggers the appropriate cannon. Each camera covers a different area of the pond, and masks on the sensors eliminate detection of movement in areas subject to human activity (roads) or wind-blown vegetation, preventing unnecessary cannon firing.

Bird Guards (at Dyke 10 Runoff, Storm Water, and R2 Basal ponds) and eagle effigies (at Dyke 10 Runoff, Basal Water Storage, and Mine Dump ponds) were deployed between March 24 and April 15, and remained in place until November 10-15. The 135 human effigies are in place year-round. A falcon kite was deployed on the west shore of the Tailings pond and another at Dyke 10 Runoff pond between September 10 and October 21. Strings of Mylar tape were placed over beaches at Dyke 10 Runoff, R2 Basal Dump, and Storm Water ponds between June 15 and October 18. The Mylar Tape at R2 Basal Dump is still in place because the posts were frozen in the ground and could not be removed.



### 2.2.5 Hazing Procedures

Hazing activities were conducted at process-affected ponds as needed, from April to November. Crews responsible for hazing and maintaining deterrents visited the Tailings pond daily and checked Dyke 10 Runoff, Storm Water, Recycle Water, Coke Runoff, R2 Basal Dump ponds, and R2 Emergency Dump ponds every second day. The remaining process-affected ponds on site were visited at least once per week. While at ponds, the crew scanned surrounding areas for birds while performing routine maintenance of the deterrents. Observers responsible for the live bird surveys occasionally hazed birds after the completion of a survey, depending on accessibility by foot or truck, work permit and time restrictions, and safety considerations. Observers systematically communicated the location of landed birds to the nearest hazing crew for additional hazing effort where required. This approach aimed to haze birds more promptly in order to prevent birds from habituating to the area, prevent them from attracting more birds, and minimize oiling risk.

Each team carried two short-range hazing pistols that fired pyrotechnic scare cartridges (bangers, screamers and whistlers) and a 300-m range CAPA® launcher that fired 18-mm cartridges producing a loud detonation. Hazing activities were conducted by airboat, outboard boat, amphibious all-terrain vehicle (Argo), or on foot, depending on location and weather. The airboat was the most effective hazing device on the Tailings pond, as expected from previous studies (Marsh et al. 1991). On stormy days and other days when airboats could not be used on the Tailings pond, ground-based hazing effort was focused on areas where higher bird activity was observed, including areas along the west shore of the Tailings pond.

Crews selected a hazing strategy on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the relative risk posed to birds at different ponds and potential for pushing fatigued birds into more hazardous areas. Moulting birds unable to fly were not hazed, nor were family groups with flightless broods. Family groups may be relocated, as was attempted at the Tailings pond in 2013, but these birds are difficult to capture, and relocation is not always successful.

Hazing efforts were directed primarily at waterfowl, as shorebirds tend to run along or continuously circle back to the shore instead of leaving the area. Hazing methods were most effective on dabblers. Divers, in particular grebe species, often escape the perceived threat by diving. The most effective hazing method currently employed at Horizon for diving birds is to briefly harass birds to encourage them to leave the area, and then cease hazing for a period of one to two hours. When hazing personnel returns to the area the birds have typically left the area but if they remain another hazing attempt is made. This cycle is repeated until the bird leaves, continuing will compromise the bird health (e.g., fatigue), or it becomes unsafe for personnel. Diving birds, if healthy, are expected to leave within two hazing cycles.

### 2.3 Methods

Monitoring was conducted in accordance with the 2014 regional protocol (St. Clair et al. 2014), from April 16 to July 6 (82 days; spring), and July 25 to October 31 (99 days; fall). Any deviations or adaptations to the methods are detailed in sections below. Mortalities, oiled birds, species of conservation concern, and incidental observations were documented and reported as



per protocol and governmental regulations. The period between the end of the spring monitoring period and the beginning of the fall monitoring period (July 7 to 24) was used to investigate potential improvements to the deterrent systems and monitoring program.

### 2.3.1 Pond Characteristics

A geospatial analyst delineated pond characteristics in a Geographic Information System, using a satellite image taken on May 1, 2014. Ground-truthing information provided by field personnel helped with accurately identifying and categorizing features visible on the image. Pond and island areas were measured, as well as vegetated and total shoreline length. Emergent vegetation could not be identified from the image and was included as a qualitative characteristic only. The presence of vegetated areas adjacent to ponds, sinuous shorelines, and mudflats or gradual sandy or pebbly beaches was also qualitatively assessed. Floating bitumen was estimated in two ways: from the spring satellite image and in the field throughout the monitoring season as part of the bird survey protocol.

### 2.3.2 Bird Surveys

Eight of the 18 process-affected ponds were considered of lower monitoring priority because of their small size (0.1 to 1.3 ha), low amount or absence of avian attractants such as vegetation, beaches, islands, or sinuous shorelines, regular human activity nearby, and because no landed waterbirds or mortalities were observed in 2013. Although there is potential for floating bitumen on these ponds, the potential for bird oiling or mortality is low due to the low probability of birds landing. As per the protocol, bird surveys were conducted once per week at these low priority ponds, six days per week at other process-affected ponds, and twice per week at Compensation Lake.

On occasion, some stations could not be monitored due to deteriorated roads, blocked access by berms or heavy machinery, or time constraints. Mondays were chosen as the "Comparison Day" (per protocol definition) and used to conduct bird surveys at these missed stations. Other tasks completed on the Comparison Day included data verification, additional orientation and training as necessary, maintenance, communication, coordination, administrative tasks, comparison surveys for the IOV study, and testing deterrent sound files.

Bird surveys were conducted between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. (2 to 12 hours after sunrise) in April to June, and between 6 a.m. and 5 p.m. (0 to 11 hours after sunrise) in July to October. In the spring, the daily work permits could not be obtained earlier in the morning; however, changes in the permitting schedule and procedure in early July enabled crews to start monitoring earlier. Throughout the year, each station was surveyed in at least seven different 1-hour periods of the day (in terms of hours after sunrise) and most stations were surveyed in at least 10 different periods of the day. However, the timing of surveys were biased for some stations in order to prioritize morning surveys on the west side of the site, where most birds occurred and ensure that crews were off the mining roads and back to the plant site before sunset, a mandatory safety procedure. Thus, the Tailings, Basal Water Storage, R2 Basal Dump, Dyke 10 Runoff,



and R2 Emergency Dump ponds were most often surveyed 0 to 6 hours after sunrise, whereas Recycle Water, Sulphur Runoff, Storm Water, Extraction Dump, and Coke Runoff ponds were usually surveyed 6 to 12 hours after sunrise. For the eight ponds surveyed once per week and Compensation Lake, the time of day of surveys was randomized to a greater degree.

Each monitored pond had one station surveyed for 10 minutes, except the large Tailings pond, which had four stations surveyed for 30 minutes each (Appendix 2.A). At the start of the fall monitoring period, on July 25, PMP1 was replaced due to sand build-up on the pond within the survey area and road access issues; the replacement station (PMP5) was established to the west. Similarly, TMP1 was replaced with TMP2, established nearby, because the original access road became a heavy hauler road. On October 11, PMP3 was replaced due to the siphon line being moved; although the station was only moved 35 m, the vantage point changed and the new station was named PMP6.

During a survey, birds observed landed on the pond surface, islands and shores within 500 m of the survey station, or flew within 100 m above the survey area were identified and counted. Shores consisted of areas along shorelines that could be reached by effluent or changing fluid levels. Birds were identified as oiled if 5 to 100% of the body surface was oiled, usually when some feathers on the underside, the breast, or the bill were matted or speckled with a black sticky substance.

Bird surveys were conducted by a team of two. In April and early May, some of the small ponds that typically have few or no birds were monitored by single observers to improve efficiency of the daily schedule; however, starting on May 8 site safety personnel required that all surveys be conducted in pairs due to safety concerns regarding possible wildlife interactions. One person conducted the survey using a waterproof Leica Apo-Televid 65 spotting scope on a tripod and 10x50 binoculars, and the other person recorded data on an electronic tablet (iPad) using electronic forms built by the University of Alberta using the Device Magic application. After each survey, the completed data forms were immediately uploaded (via 3G cellphone network) into the regional database, through a cloud-based server.

### 2.3.3 Inter-observer Variability (IOV)

IOV comparison surveys were conducted simultaneously by two teams at the same survey station, ensuring that teams covered the same survey area but could not hear or react to the other team's observations. Each team was formed by a regular observer, conducting the survey following the regular bird survey protocol, and a Canadian Natural summer student who entered the data into the electronic form. After each survey, teams compared results and discussed potential causes of variability. Five regular observers each participated in at least four surveys and up to 17 surveys, in three different combinations of observer pairs (dictated by the shift schedule). According to the regional protocol, comparison surveys were to be conducted at large ponds (ponds with at least two survey stations). Only the Tailings pond met the size criterion; however, the second largest pond, Basal Water Storage, was also included because



the regular presence of birds on the pond offered a good opportunity for observer comparison. In total, 22 comparison surveys were conducted. Five comparison surveys had no bird observations (neither flying nor landed, by any observer) and were excluded from the analysis to avoid biasing the results towards zero variability.

For each comparison survey, the relative percent difference (RPD) of the number of birds and number of species observed was calculated for landed birds and birds that flew over, using the following formula:

$$\mathsf{RPD}_{\#observations} = \frac{|x_1 - x_2|}{\bar{x}} *100$$

where

 $x_1$  is the number of observations from Observer 1,  $x_2$  is the number of observations from Observer 2, and  $\bar{x}$  is the mean of the number of observations from both observers. The mean number of observations provides the reference value against which the two sets of observations are compared, assuming that the real number is likely between Observer 1 and Observer 2's results.

From each pair of surveys, the survey conducted by the team lead was retained for inclusion in the formal bird survey dataset.

### 2.3.4 Mortality Searches

Mortality searches were conducted at all monitored process-affected ponds at two-week intervals, between 6 a.m. and 11 p.m., and usually between 7 a.m. and 4 p.m. Search effort was measured in terms of area at Sulphur Runoff pond, and in terms of distance for all other ponds. All searches were route-based (transects), except at the Tailings pond where focused searches were also conducted in areas with vegetation, bays, bitumen, or where mortalities were previously found.

Mortality searches were completed once for each pond during a crew's two-week shift. The transects for all of the ponds excluding the Tailings pond followed the shoreline around the entire pond except at locations where infrastructure made a portion of the shoreline inaccessible or it was unsafe for survey personnel. On the smaller ponds, the mortality searches were conducted by one member of the crew by walking the shoreline and scanning the surface of the water from various locations, while the other crew member conducted deterrent maintenance. As a safety precaution, both crew members conducted mortality searches on the larger ponds together. The Sulphur Runoff pond was observed from one location because the pond has a large berm and fence around it making the pond not visible around much of the perimeter.

Three transects running north-south on the Tailings Pond were designated using mapping software to ensure they were equally spaced and covered the majority of the pond. Transects were loaded on to the crew's GPS units for them to follow while performing the search. Transects were followed the majority of the time and were only deviated from when the area could not be traversed by boat due to floating bitumen mats or the boom (only an issue when airboats were unavailable and outboards were being used). For the focused area searches, three areas were selected at the beginning of the year based on experience from 2013 of where



the problem areas were on the Tailings pond. These areas were searched every two weeks as well, primarily by boat. The shoreline was walked in areas where it was safe to do so and time allowed. Areas were added, removed or changed as the habitat on the Tailings pond changed over the course of the season, location of floating bitumen mats, and where bird activity was being observed. These changes ensured that surveys were conducted in areas where there was a higher probability that birds had become oiled or had died.

Two boats are required on the tailings pond at all times for the bird deterrent program with one boat acting as the work boat and the other following behind and acting as a safety boat. Observations from both boat operators were included in the search data.

### 2.3.5 Incidental Observations and Reporting

Incidental observations included birds detected between April and October outside of formal bird surveys or mortality searches. Birds counted were: 1) oiled, dead, or euthanized; or 2) species of conservation concern in contact with a process-affected pond.

Observers reported landed birds, whether observed incidentally or during surveys, immediately to hazing crews for hazing or capturing of oiled birds. Oiled birds were immediately reported to the Horizon Regulatory and Environment on-call personnel who then contacted AESRD for their recommendation; typically permission to euthanize was granted. Observers also reported oiled birds and landed species of conservation concern as part of a daily email update sent to the Horizon Waterbird Protection Program contact list, including details about the location, species, number of birds, and percent of the body surface oiled.

Workers on site are required to report sightings of birds on process-affected ponds and other wildlife at the project site to the on-call Horizon Regulatory & Environmental cellphone number.

### 2.4 Results

### 2.4.1 Pond Characteristics

Geospatial analysis guided by ground-truthing information enabled measurement of pond area over water and islands. However, characteristics such as vegetation, narrow beaches or mudflats, and floating bitumen can be difficult to identify or quantify from satellite imagery, especially for small ponds, and the results will depend on the date of the image. Hence, for some characteristics qualitative estimates from field observations are more informative, even though visibility of the entire area for large ponds may be limited. Quantitative and qualitative pond characteristics are summarized in Tables 2.8 and 2.9.



Dand Nama	Summer Station ID	Survey Area		Emergent	Shorel	ine (m)
Pond Name	Survey Station ID	(over water; ha)	isiand (na)	Vegetation	Vegetated	Total
	TMP1*	20.2	0	Y	247	1,240
Basal Water Storage	TMP2	25.8	0	Y	619	1,793
	Station Total	25.8	0	Y	619	1,793
Coke Runoff	FMP1	2.7	0	Y	305	1,422
Dyke 10 Runoff	NMP1	9.0	0	N	1,225	1,851
Extraction Dump	IMP1	1.7	0	N	0	634
R2 Basal Dump	SMP1	1.3	0	N	0	576
R2 Emergency Dump	MMP1	0.1	0	N	0	171
Recycle Water	AMP1	16.4	0	N	0	2,089
Storm Water	EMP1	8.3	0	N	0	1,263
Sulphur Runoff	CMP1	0.6	0	N	0	305
	PMP1*	32.4	0	N	0	1,564
	PMP5	41.7	0	Y	1,025	1,304
	PMP2	0	0	N	0	0
Tailings Pond	PMP3	24.8	0	N	0	1,055
	PMP6*	23.0	0	N	0	1,030
	PMP4	33.7	0.55	Y	1,966	1,966
	Stations Total	100.2	0.55	Y	2,991	4,325
Emergency Dump Pond 1	JMP1	0.1	0	N	0	137
Emergency Dump Pond 2	LMP1	0.1	0	N	0	158
Emergency Dump Pond 3	QMP1	0.1	0	N	0	166
Froth Dump	OMP1	1.0	0	N	0	459
Mine Dump	KMP1	1.3	0	N	0	472
Mine Sump	RMP1	0.4	0	N	0	233
R1 Distributor	HMP1	0.1	0	N	0	129
R1 Emergency Dump	GMP1	0.2	0	N	0	201
Compensation Lake	ZMP1	20.0	0.01	Y	1,179	1,179

### Table 2.8: Characteristics of Survey Stations Monitored at Horizon in 2014

#### Notes:

Grey shading: pond of lower monitoring priority; Blue shading: freshwater lake. \* Not included in total (the station from each original/replacement pair that had the most surveys was used for deriving totals).



		Bitumen Cove				Shore	ine (m)	
Pond Name (Year of Origin)	Pond Content <sup>1</sup>	% of Water Surface <sup>2</sup> Mode [Range]	ha <sup>3</sup>	Pond Area <sup>3</sup> (over water; ha)	lsland (ha)³	Emergent Vegetation <sup>2</sup>	Veg.	Total
Basal Water Storage (2011)	SW	0	0	28.0	0.04	Y	1,493	2,850
Coke Runoff (2008)	PA	0 [0 to 1-5]	0	2.7	0	Y	305	1,422
Dyke 10 Runoff (2008)	PA	0 [0 to 1-5]	0	9.0	0	N	1,215	1,851
Extraction Dump (2008)	PA	1-5 [0 to 16-25]	0	1.7	0	N	0	634
R2 Basal Dump (2010)	PA	0 [0 to 1-5]	0	1.3	0	N	0	576
R2 Emergency Dump (2008)	PA	0 [0 to 16-25]	0	0.1	0	N	0	171
Recycle Water (2008)	PA	1-5 [0 to 1-25]	0	18.2	0	N	0	2,483
Storm Water (2008)	PA	0 [0 to 6-15]	0	8.3	0	N	0	1,263
Sulphur Runoff (2008)	PA	0 [0 to 1-5]	0	0.6	0	N	0	305
Tailings Pond (2008)	PA	1-5 [1-5 to 16-25]	8.83	1,013.4	2.89	Y	17,729	29,115
Emergency Dump Pond 1 (2008)	PA	76-100 [0 to 76-100]	0	0.1	0	N	0	137
Emergency Dump Pond 2 (2008)	PA	1-5 [1-5 to 76-100]	0	0.1	0	N	0	158
Emergency Dump Pond 3 (2011)	PA	6-15 [0 to 76-100]	0	0.1	0	N	0	166
Froth Dump (2008)	PA	1-25 [0 to 26-50]	0	1.0	0	N	0	459
Mine Dump (2008)	PA	1-5 [0 to 26-50]	0.05	1.3	0	N	0	472
Mine Sump (2010)	PA	0 [0 to 16-25]	0	0.4	0	N	0	233
R1 Distributor (2008)	PA	0 [0 to 6-15]	0	0.1	0	N	0	129
R1 Emergency Dump (2008)	PA	1-5 [1-5 to 76-100]	0	0.2	0	N	0	201
Compensation Lake	FW	0	0	77.5	0.28	Y	5,637	5,637

#### Notes:

Grey shading: pond of lower monitoring priority; Blue shading: freshwater lake.
SW: saline water; PA: process-affected; FW: freshwater.
Observed on site in April-Oct.
Estimated from a satellite image taken on May 1, 2014.



Of the process-affected ponds, the Tailings and Basal Water Storage ponds were the largest and had the most diverse and abundant avian habitat attractants, including sinuous shorelines along their west shores and the presence of vegetation, islands, and beaches or mudflats. The eight ponds of lower monitoring priority were small (0.1 to 1.3 ha) and had no habitat attractive to birds, except at Mine Dump pond where a small sandy area occurred on the south side and grassy vegetation covered the adjacent slopes on the north and east sides of the pond. Ponds of lower monitoring priority were also closer to human activity, such as machinery and operations, compared to other process-affected ponds.

All of the monitored process-affected ponds had the potential to contain bitumen, except Basal Water Storage, Coke Runoff pond, and R2 Basal Dump pond. Floating bitumen was consistently observed at the Tailings pond (100% of days surveyed), R1 Emergency Dump and Emergency Dump ponds 1, 2 and 3 (92 to 100%), and Mine Dump (88%), Extraction Dump (72%), Froth Dump (58%), Recycle Water (57%), Mine Sump (36%), and Storm Water (35%) ponds. At the four remaining ponds, floating bitumen was observed less often (between 1 and 14% of days surveyed, depending on the pond).

### 2.4.2 Bird Observations

### 2.4.2.1 Survey Effort

All stations were surveyed as per the protocol from April to October, except for PMP4 on the southwest shore of the Tailings pond, where 33 surveys (21% of scheduled surveys at that station) were missed due to unusable roads (Tables 2.10 and 2.11); neither PMP4 nor any other alternative location could be reached because the access road along the west shore of the Tailings pond was rendered unusable by precipitation and runoff. Access was generally attempted by the crew and failed (48% of missed surveys), or was denied by the permitting office (38% of missed surveys) when roads were deemed unsafe. The other missed surveys were due to delays preventing the crew from completing all surveys within 12 hours (9% of missed surveys), or access being blocked by a berm, heavy machinery, or road closure (5% of missed surveys).

Survey areas encompassed the entire water surface of ponds, except at the Tailings pond, where the four regular stations covered 10% of the water surface, Recycle Water (90%), Basal Water Storage (92%), and Compensation Lake (26%).

Within the above access and safety constraints, stations where birds were more likely to occur were generally surveyed earlier in the day (see Methods, Section 2.3.2). There was no evident trend between time of day and number of waterbirds landed (Appendix 2.B).



Pond Name	Survey Duration (min)	Survey Station ID	Survey Area (over water; ha)	# Surveys Conducted in 2014
Rasal Water Storage	10	TMP1*	20.2	69
Dasal Water Storage	10	TMP2	25.8	84
Coke Runoff	10	FMP1	2.7	154
Dyke 10 Runoff	10	NMP1	9.0	156
Extraction Dump	10	IMP1	1.7	155
R2 Basal Dump	10	SMP1	1.3	157
R2 Emergency Dump	10	MMP1	0.1	154
Recycle Water	10	AMP1	16.4	154
Storm Water	10	EMP1	8.3	155
Sulphur Runoff	10	CMP1	0.6	154
		PMP1*	32.4	71
		PMP5	41.7	82
Tailinga Dand	20	PMP2	0	148
Tailings Fond		PMP3	24.8	132
		PMP6*	23.0	18
		PMP4	33.7	122
Emergency Dump Pond 1	10	JMP1	0.1	26
Emergency Dump Pond 2	10	LMP1	0.1	25
Emergency Dump Pond 3	10	QMP1	0.1	26
Froth Dump	10	OMP1	1.0	26
Mine Dump	10	KMP1	1.3	26
Mine Sump	10	RMP1	0.4	25
R1 Distributor	10	HMP1	0.1	26
R1 Emergency Dump	10	GMP1	0.2	26
Compensation Lake	10	ZMP1	20.0	52

#### Notes:

Grey shading: pond of lower monitoring priority; Blue shading: freshwater lake. \* Station from each original/replacement pair that had the least surveys.



### Table 2.11: Bird Survey Effort by Pond at Horizon in 2014

Pond Name	# Survey Stations	Survey Area (over water; ha)	Survey Area as % of Pond Area (over water; ha)	Duration of Surveys (min)	Scheduled Monitoring Frequency (days/week)	# Surveys Conducted in 2014	% Days with all scheduled surveys conducted
Basal Water Storage	1	25.8	92	10	6	153	99
Coke Runoff	1	2.7	100	10	6	154	99
Dyke 10 Runoff	1	9.0	100	10	6	156	100
Extraction Dump	1	1.7	100	10	6	155	100
R2 Basal Dump	1	1.3	100	10	6	157	100
R2 Emergency Dump	1	0.1	100	10	6	154	99
Recycle Water	1	16.4	90	10	6	154	99
Storm Water	1	8.3	100	10	6	155	100
Sulphur Runoff	1	0.6	100	10	6	154	99
Tailings Pond	4	100.2	10	30	6	573	77
Emergency Dump Pond 1	1	0.1	100	10	1	26	100
Emergency Dump Pond 2	1	0.1	100	10	1	25	96
Emergency Dump Pond 3	1	0.1	100	10	1	26	100
Froth Dump	1	1.0	100	10	1	26	100
Mine Dump	1	1.3	100	10	1	26	100
Mine Sump	1	0.4	100	10	1	25	96
R1 Distributor	1	0.1	100	10	1	26	100
R1 Emergency Dump	1	0.2	100	10	1	26	100
Compensation Lake	1	20.0	26	10	2	52	100

#### Note:

Grey shading: pond of lower monitoring priority; Blue shading: freshwater lake.



### 2.4.2.2 Survey Results

At process-affected ponds, there was a total of 6,945 observations of landed birds, 92% of which were waterbirds, and 6,177 observations of birds flying within the survey area, 31% of which were waterbirds (Table 2.12). The most common landed guild were divers (Greater Scaup, Eared Grebe, Ring-necked Duck), followed by dabblers (Mallard, Canada Goose, Northern Shoveler), waders (Red-necked Phalarope, Lesser Yellowlegs, Spotted Sandpiper), non-target (Common Raven, Snow Bunting, American Pipit), and gulls (Franklin's Gull, Herring Gull, Bonaparte's Gull) (Appendix 2.C).

Basal Water Storage pond had by far the highest number of landed waterbirds per survey (26.8), followed by Compensation Lake (18.8), Dyke 10 Runoff pond (7.2), and the Tailings pond's southwest station PMP4 (2.6) (Table 2.13, Figure 2.2). Waders were also regularly observed at the PMP2 station and at Storm Water and Coke Runoff ponds. None of the ponds of lower monitoring priority had landed birds except Mine Dump, where two Greater Yellowlegs were observed on September 8.

There were 127 observations of birds that had contacted bitumen (2% of all observations of landed waterbirds), including 21 species (Table 2.19). Most were shorebirds and gulls that were 5 to 10% oiled, usually on their underside (Table 2.14, Appendix 2.D). Fifteen birds were 40 to 80% oiled: 12 gulls, 2 ducks and one sandpiper. All oiled birds were reported for hazing or capture. However, birds could be difficult to find, capture, or haze successfully; thus some birds were likely observed in more than one survey. Observations of oiled birds during surveys occurred primarily at Basal Water Storage pond, PMP4, PMP2, Storm Water pond, R2 Basal Dump pond, and Compensation Lake (Table 2.13, Figure 2.3). Thirty-six percent of oiled birds observed during surveys were at ponds that did not have floating bitumen, indicating that some birds contacted bitumen elsewhere and then flew to the pond, or walked from a pond nearby. For example, an 80% oiled unknown duck observed at Basal Water Storage on October 1 likely walked from the nearby Tailings pond, where floating bitumen occurred.

Broods were observed on 39 occasions between June and August at process-affected ponds: Dyke 10 Runoff pond (27 observations), Storm Water pond (6), Basal Water Storage pond (4), Coke Runoff pond (1), and at the PMP4 station at the Tailings pond (1) (Table 2.15). Three observations also occurred at Compensation Lake: Canada goose (2) and Red-breasted Merganser (1).



	Dabb	olers	Div	ers	Wad	lers	Gu	lls	Non-t	arget	Tot	al <sup>2</sup>
Pond Name	Landed	Flew Over										
Basal Water Storage	1,415	88	1,958	2	531	163	100	20	23	146	4,122	489
Coke Runoff	75	49	99	3	102	6			18	96	297	204
Dyke 10 Runoff	282	3	491	2	324	22		3	36	611	1,164	641
Extraction Dump					1				4	83	5	83
R2 Basal Dump		8			26	2	2	1	4	203	32	216
R2 Emergency Dump				1	35	6			52	513	87	521
Recycle Water	5	3	21		41	2	2	3	20	94	89	102
Storm Water	28	2	43	1	104	1		3	10	290	185	297
Sulphur Runoff		1			4	2			7	100	11	103
Tailings Pond	154	805	21	16	394	431	21	30	360	2,027	951	3,474
Emergency Dump Pond 1										4		4
Emergency Dump Pond 2												
Emergency Dump Pond 3		1								1		2
Froth Dump										12		12
Mine Dump		1			2					10	2	11
Mine Sump										3		3
R1 Distributor										9		9
R1 Emergency Dump										6		6
Total (Process-affected Ponds)	1,959	961	2,633	25	1,564	635	125	60	534	4,208	6,945	6,177
Compensation Lake	266	140	575	9	33	2	98	16	39	125	1,020	300

### Table 2.12: Number of Bird Observations by Pond and Guild at Horizon in 2014<sup>1</sup>

#### Notes:

Grey shading: pond of lower monitoring priority; Blue shading: freshwater lake.
<sup>1</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times.
<sup>2</sup> Includes unknown duck species (which may be dabblers or divers).



### Table 2.13: Mean Number of Landed Birds per Survey at Horizon in 2014

Pond Name	Survey Station ID	Dabblers	Divers	Waders	Gulls	Non-target Guilds	All Guilds <sup>1</sup>
	TMP1	9.23	25.87	0.62	0.29	0.07	37.36
Basal Water Storage	TMP2	9.26	2.06	5.81	0.95	0.21	18.38
	Mean across surveys	9.25	12.80	3.47	0.65	0.15	26.94
Coke Runoff	FMP1	0.49	0.64	0.66	0	0.12	1.93
Dyke 10 Runoff	NMP1	1.81	3.15	2.08	0	0.23	7.46
Extraction Dump	IMP1	0	0	0.01	0	0.03	0.03
R2 Basal Dump	SMP1	0	0	0.17	0.01	0.03	0.20
R2 Emergency Dump	MMP1	0	0	0.23	0	0.34	0.56
Recycle Water	AMP1	0.03	0.14	0.27	0.01	0.13	0.58
Storm Water	EMP1	0.18	0.28	0.67	0	0.06	1.19
Sulphur Runoff	CMP1	0	0	0.03	0	0.05	0.07
	PMP1	0.14	0.18	0.15	0	1.17	1.65
	PMP5	0.16	0	0.11	0.01	0.57	0.85
	PMP2	0	0	1.24	0.09	0.58	1.91
Tailings Pond	PMP3	0.08	0.05	0	0.05	0.05	0.21
	PMP6	0	0	0	0	0	0
	PMP4	0.99	0.02	1.57	0	1.13	3.71
	Mean across surveys	0.27	0.04	0.69	0.04	0.63	1.66
Emergency Dump Pond 1	JMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emergency Dump Pond 2	LMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emergency Dump Pond 3	QMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Froth Dump	OMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mine Dump	KMP1	0	0	0.08	0	0	0.08
Mine Sump	RMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
R1 Distributor	HMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
R1 Emergency Dump	GMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Process-affected Ponds	Mean across ponds	0.67	0.95	0.46	0.04	0.10	2.26
Compensation Lake	ZMP1	5.12	11.06	0.63	1.88	0.75	19.62

#### Notes:

Grey shading: pond of lower monitoring priority; Blue shading: freshwater lake. <sup>1</sup> Includes unknown duck species (which may be dabblers or divers).


Pond Name	Survey Station ID	Dabblers	Divers	Waders	Gulls	Non-target Guilds	All Guilds <sup>1</sup>
	TMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Basal Water Storage	TMP2	0	0.012	0.083	0.26	0	0.357
	Mean across surveys	0	0.007	0.046	0.14	0	0.196
Coke Runoff	FMP1	0	0	0.013	0	0	0.013
Dyke 10 Runoff	NMP1	0	0	0.019	0	0	0.019
Extraction Dump	IMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
R2 Basal Dump	SMP1	0	0	0.051	0.01	0	0.064
R2 Emergency Dump	MMP1	0	0	0.013	0	0	0.013
Recycle Water	AMP1	0	0.013	0.039	0	0	0.052
Storm Water	EMP1	0	0	0.071	0	0	0.071
Sulphur Runoff	CMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	PMP1	0.042	0	0	0	0	0.042
	PMP5	0.024	0	0	0.01	0	0.037
	PMP2	0	0	0.115	0.02	0	0.135
Tailings Pond	PMP3	0	0	0	0.04	0	0.038
	PMP6	0	0	0	0	0	0
	PMP4	0	0	0.246	0	0	0.246
	Mean across surveys	0.009	0	0.082	0.02	0	0.101
Emergency Dump Pond 1	JMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emergency Dump Pond 2	LMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emergency Dump Pond 3	QMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Froth Dump	OMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mine Dump	KMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mine Sump	RMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
R1 Distributor	HMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
R1 Emergency Dump	GMP1	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Process-affected Ponds	Mean across ponds	<0.001	0.001	0.019	0.010	0	0.030
Compensation Lake	ZMP1	0	0	0	0.058	0	0.058

#### Notes:

Grey shading: pond of lower monitoring priority; Blue shading: freshwater lake. <sup>1</sup> Includes unknown duck species (which may be dabblers or divers).





\* Freshwater Lake. Bars = 95% Confidence Interval.

Figure 2.2: Mean Number of Landed Waterbirds per Survey at Horizon in 2014





\* Freshwater Lake. Bars = 95% Confidence Intervals.

Figure 2.3: Mean Number of Oiled Birds per Survey at Horizon in 2014



# Table 2.15: Brood Observations by Species at Process-affectedPonds at Horizon in 2014

Species/Species Group	# Brood Observations <sup>1</sup>
Mallard	13 (Dyke 10 Runoff, Basal Water Storage)
Ring-necked Duck	12 (Dyke 10 Runoff, Strom Water)
Green-winged Teal	4 (Dyke 10 Runoff, Basal Water Storage, PMP4)
UNK Dabbler Duck	3 (Dyke 10 Runoff)
UNK Scaup	2 (Dyke 10 Runoff)
American Wigeon	1 (Dyke 10 Runoff)
Canada Goose	1 (Basal Water Storage)
Canvasback	1 (Storm Water)
Spotted Sandpiper	1 (Coke Runoff)
UNK Duck	1 (Dyke 10 Runoff)

#### Notes:

Pink shading: Species of Conservation Concern.

<sup>1</sup> Each brood may contain one to multiple chicks; broods may be observed repeatedly across surveys and thus be counted multiple times.

### 2.4.3 Inter-observer Variability (IOV)

Observations during IOV surveys ranged from 0 to 20 birds (0 to 6 species) for landed birds, and 0 to 63 birds (0 to 4 species) for birds that flew over. The RPD between observers varied from 0 to 200% (Table 2.16). Although a 200% difference seems high, in all cases, this difference represented ≤3 observations but led to a high RPD due to the small number of birds present.

Observers attempted to identify causes of variability after the completion of each comparison survey. They included systematic causes, such as differences in distance estimates for delineating the survey area (which covers a 500-m radius and 100-m altitude), and more stochastic causes such as some birds being visible only briefly or intermittently (e.g., birds moving in or out of vegetation), combined with different scanning approaches (e.g., starting right to left versus starting left to right). Other potential causes included, in a few cases, differences in survey equipment (make and model of binoculars or scope), slightly different vantage points or fields of vision between the two teams, or some students requiring more assistance with data entry.



# Table 2.16: Inter-observer Variability in Terms of Relative Percent Differenceat Horizon in 2014, for Surveys during which at leastOne Bird was Observed as Landed or Flying Over

		Lan	ded	Flew	Over
Survey Station	Comparison Survey ID	RPD (%) in Number of Individual Birds	Ied         Flew Over           RPD (%) in Number of Avian Species         RPD (%) in Number of Individual Birds         RI Number of Avian Avian           -         0         0           -         0         0           -         67         0           -         0         0           -         0         0           -         0         0           0         21         0           -         200         0           0         200         0           0         200         0           0         67         0           0         67         0           0         67         0           0         67         0           0         167         0           0         167         0           0         38         86           200         38         18	RPD (%) in Number of Avian Species	
	2	-	-	0	0
	6	-	-	67	67
	11	0	0	0	0
PMP5	14	-	-	0	0
	17	Landed           RPD (%) in Number of Individual Birds         RPD (%) Number of Avian Spector           -         -           0         -           100         0           -         -           100         0           120         0           120         0           111         0           200         200           100         0           200         200           200         200           200         200           200         200           200         200           200         200           200         200           200         200           200         200           200         200           200         200           200         200           200         200           200         200           200         200           200         200           200         200	0	21	40
	7	-	-	200	200
	9	9	0	0	0
PMP2	12	111	0	200	200
	15	-	-	0	0
PMP3	3	-	-	67	0
	1	0	0	67	67
	4	200	200	-	-
PMP4	10	0	0	0	0
	13	40	0	167	120
	16	200	Lanced         Flew Over           (%) in ber of ual Birds         RPD (%) in Number of Avian Species         RPD (%) in Number of Individual Birds         Avian Avian Species           -         -         0         Avian D	29	
	5	29	86	200	200
	8	11	'D (%) in imber of idual Birds         RPD (%) in Number of Avian Species         RPD (%) in Number of Individual Birds         R Avian	-	

#### Note:

Dash = no birds were observed by either observer.

Skill levels in species identification did not appear to be a major source of variability, as differences were primarily in the number of birds seen rather than in species identification. The option to select species groups in the entry forms enables observers to be conservative in case of uncertainty. Assuming that the observers were looking at the same landed bird, the species identification differences were: Greater vs. Lesser Yellowlegs, unknown dabbling duck vs. unknown duck, Lesser Yellowlegs vs. unknown Yellowlegs, and Green-winged Teal vs. unknown dabbling duck; and for flying birds: Barn Swallow vs. unknown Swallow, and unknown Yellowlegs vs. unknown shorebird.

### 2.4.4 Mortalities

Mortality search effort is detailed in Table 2.17 and Figure 2.4. The Tailings pond was searched over much greater distances, but search duration was of the same order as other ponds, because searches were conducted on boats instead of on foot (average of 5.4 km and 34 min per day searched).



Dond Name	# Days	Boat			Walk			Truck			Total		
Pond Name	Searched	h	km	ha	h	km	ha	h	km	ha	h	km	ha
Basal Water Storage	13				8.4	17					8.4	17	0
Coke Runoff	12				6.7	16					6.7	16	0
Dyke 10 Runoff	15				15.7	27					15.7	27	0
Extraction Dump	12	0.2	1		2.7	8					2.9	9	0
R2 Basal Dump	12				4.0	6					4.0	6	0
R2 Emergency Dump	12				1.5	3					1.5	3	0
Recycle Water	14				4.8	15		3.8	20		8.6	35	0
Storm Water	14				8.8	18		1.1	1		9.9	19	0
Sulphur Runoff	13				1.4		13				1.4	0	13
Tailings Pond	19	9.6	101		1.1	1					10.7	102	0
Emergency Dump Pond 1	12				1.1	1					1.1	1	0
Emergency Dump Pond 2	12				1.6	1					1.6	1	0
Emergency Dump Pond 3	13				1.9	1					1.9	1	0
Froth Dump	9				1.6	5					1.6	5	0
Mine Dump	13				3.0	8					3.0	8	0
Mine Sump	12				2.2	4					2.2	4	0
R1 Distributor	13				1.3	3					1.3	3	0
R1 Emergency Dump	15				1.9	4					1.9	4	0
Total		9.8	101	0	69.8	137	13	4.9	21	0	84.5	260	13

# Table 2.17: Mortality Search Effort at Horizon in 2014<sup>1</sup>

#### Note:

<sup>1</sup> Includes route-based and focused transects; for each search, either distance or area counted towards effort.





Figure 2.4: Relationship Between Pond Size (area over water), Mortality Search Effort, and Mortality Search Results (no mortalities were found during mortality searches)

No mortalities were found during mortality searches. However, 31 mortalities were found incidentally between April and October, mainly during hazing activities (Table 2.18). Fourteen mortalities occurred in the spring (between May 7 and 31), 13 in the fall (between August 1 and October 8), and one each on July 26 and 27 during the interval between the spring and fall monitoring periods. Mortalities consisted of 21 divers, 5 dabblers, and 5 gulls (Table 2.19, Figures 2.5 and 2.6). Mortalities were 5 to 100% oiled (average 75%); 21 were captured alive and euthanized, five could not be captured or were unrecovered, four were found dead, and one died during the capture attempt (Appendix 2.D). Most mortalities were found at the Tailings pond, in areas where floating bitumen tended to accumulate: along the west shoreline, along the boom, and in the southeast corner (Figure 2.7). One unknown diving duck (100% oiled) was found at Mine Dump pond on September 11.

### 2.4.5 Species of Conservation Concern

Bird surveys and incidental observations at process-affected ponds included nine landed waterbird species of conservation concern: Green-winged Teal (271 landed and two mortalities), Northern Pintail (95 landed), Lesser Scaup (51 landed and one mortality), Sandhill Crane (14 landed), American White Pelican (10 landed), Horned Grebe (eight landed and one mortality), White-winged Scoter (one mortality), Pied-billed Grebe (one landed), and Sora (one landed) (Table 2.20, Appendix 2.C). Four species of conservation concern from non-target guilds also landed, none of which were oiled or mortalities: Barn Swallow (35), American Kestrel (7), Sharp-tailed Grouse (2), and Northern Harrier (1).



Pond Name	Mortality Search	Incidental	Total
Basal Water Storage	0	1	1
Coke Runoff	0	0	0
Dyke 10 Runoff	0	1	1
Extraction Dump	0	0	0
R2 Basal Dump	0	0	0
R2 Emergency Dump	0	0	0
Recycle Water	0	1	1
Storm Water	0	0	0
Sulphur Runoff	0	0	0
Tailings Pond	0	27	27
Emergency Dump Pond 1	0	0	0
Emergency Dump Pond 2	0	0	0
Emergency Dump Pond 3	0	0	0
Froth Dump	0	0	0
Mine Dump	0	1	1
Mine Sump	0	0	0
R1 Distributor	0	0	0
R1 Emergency Dump	0	0	0
Total (Process-affected Ponds)	0	31	31
Compensation Lake	N/A	0	0

# Table 2.18: Number of Mortalities by Pond at Horizon in 2014

#### Notes:

Grey shading: pond of lower monitoring priority; Blue shading: freshwater lake. Does not include November 2014 landing event (Appendix 2.E).



Table 2.19: Number of Observations of Oiling and Morta	lities,
by Species, at Horizon in 2014	

Species/Species Crows <sup>2</sup>	Contacted	Bitumen <sup>1</sup>	Morta	ality
Species/Species Group-	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental
	Wate	erbirds		
Lesser Yellowlegs	34	1		
Franklin's Gull	23	1		5
Baird's Sandpiper	23			
Spotted Sandpiper	10			
Semipalmated Sandpiper	6	1		
Canada Goose	3	2		1
Greater Yellowlegs	3			
Semipalmated Plover	3			
Unknown Black-headed Gull	3			
Unknown White-headed Gull	3			
Unknown Calidris Sandpiper	2	2		
Herring Gull	2			
Mallard	2			
Sanderling	2			
Unknown Gull	2			
Unknown Duck	1			1
Ring-necked Duck	1			1
Unknown Scaup	1			1
Killdeer	1			
Red-necked Phalarope	1			
Unknown Dowitcher	1			
Eared Grebe				7
American Coot				4
Common Goldeneye				2
Green-winged Teal				2
Northern Shoveler		4		1
Horned Grebe				1
Lesser Scaup				1
Long-tailed Duck				1
Ruddy Duck				1
White-winged Scoter				1
Unknown Diving Duck				1
	Non-tar	get Guilds		
(none)				
Total	127	11	0	31

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days or also observed as mortalities, and thus be counted multiple times. <sup>2</sup> Pink shading: Species of Conservation Concern.





Figure 2.5: Proportion of each Guild for Birds that Flew Over or Landed at Process-affected Ponds, Contacted Bitumen, or Died at Horizon in 2014





\* Individual birds may be observed repeatedly during consecutive days.

Figure 2.6: Timing of Bird Landings, Oiling, and Mortalities in Spring (top) and Fall (bottom) 2014 at Horizon





Figure 2.7: Location of 31 Pond-related Mortalities Found Incidentally at Horizon in April-October 2014



			% Dave	Mean # Landed Waterbirds per Survey				# Sp Lan	ecies ded	# Obse vations Oiled Bi	er- of rds	# Mortalities	
Pond Name	Pond Area (over water; ha)	Potential Attractants <sup>1,2</sup>	vith Floating Bitumen Present <sup>1</sup>	Dabblers	Divers	Waders	Gulls	Total <sup>3</sup>	Conservation Concern <sup>4</sup>	Per Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental
Tailings Pond	1,013.40	I, V, A, B, S	100	0.27	0.04	0.69	0.04	45	7	0.106	6	0	27
Basal Water Storage	27.99	I, V, A, B, S	0	9.25	12.80	3.47	0.65	46	5	0.196	4	0	1
Recycle Water	18.22	A, B	57	0.03	0.14	0.27	0.01	15	2	0.052	0	0	1
Dyke 10 Runoff	8.99	A, V, B, S	10	1.81	3.15	2.08	0	32	3	0.019	0	0	1
Storm Water	8.27	A, B	35	0.18	0.28	0.67	0	24	1	0.071	0	0	0
Coke Runoff	2.69	V, B	0	0.49	0.64	0.66	0	20	1	0.013	0	0	0
Extraction Dump	1.67		72	0	0	0.01	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
R2 Basal Dump	1.26	В	0	0	0	0.17	0.01	10	0	0.064	0	0	0
Mine Dump	1.19	A, B	88	0	0	0.08	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Froth Dump	0.95		58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sulphur Runoff	0.57	А	7	0	0	0.03	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Mine Sump	0.38		36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R1 Emergency Dump	0.17		100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emergency Dump Pond 2	0.13		100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R2 Emergency Dump	0.12		14	0	0	0.23	0	13	2	0.013	0	0	0
Emergency Dump Pond 1	0.12		92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R1 Distributor	0.10		8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emergency Dump Pond 3	0.10		96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Process-affected Ponds				0.67	0.95	0.46	0.04	76	10	0.030	11	0	31
Compensation Lake	77.48	I, V, A, B, S	0	5.12	11.06	0.63	1.88	39	6	0.058	0	N/A	0

#### Table 2.20: Summary of Bird Survey, Mortality and Incidental Results by Pond at Horizon in 2014

#### Notes:

Grey shading: pond of lower monitoring priority; Blue shading: freshwater lake.
<sup>1</sup> Observed on site in April-Oct.
<sup>2</sup> I: islands; V: emergent or shoreline vegetation; A: vegetated area adjacent to the pond; B: mudflat or gradual sandy or pebbly beach, S: sinuous shoreline.
<sup>3</sup> During bird surveys.
<sup>4</sup> Includes incidental observations.



#### 2.5 Discussion

#### 2.5.1 Bird Contacts

Of the 6,411 observations of waterbirds landed at process-affected ponds at the Horizon Oil Sands site in 2014, 41% were divers, 31% dabblers, 24% waders, 2% gulls, and 2% unknown duck species (which could be divers or dabblers). While the survey effort and total number of observations was very similar in 2013, the species composition has shifted. In 2013, 22% of landed waterbirds were divers, 24% dabblers, 47% waders, 5% gulls, and <1% unknown duck species.

Survey effort (frequency, timing and surface area) in 2013 was comparable to 2014. Excluding gulls (because they were not categorized as waterbirds in 2013), the mean number of landed waterbirds per survey at process-affected ponds was similar in 2013 and 2014 (2.5 compared to 2.1), whereas at Compensation Lake the mean increased from 11.6 to 17.0 birds per survey.

The mean number of landed waterbirds at Basal Water Storage pond increased substantially, from 14.1 to 26.1, especially for dabblers and divers. Basal Water Storage pond continues to have the highest number of landed birds per survey across all ponds at Horizon. There is no risk of oiling at this pond, as it does not contain bitumen. The relatively high numbers are due to a combination of habitat attractants, including deep water for diving birds, emergent vegetation and shallow areas for dabblers, and some mudflat areas for waders. Another factor contributing to the high numbers of bird landings is that hazing was not conducted at Basal Water Storage pond, because hazed birds would potentially move to the nearby Tailings pond where floating bitumen may occur, and the potential presence of hydrogen sulfide compromises the safety of personnel.

The mean number of landed birds also increased at Dyke 10 Runoff pond, from 2.5 in 2013 to 7.2 in 2014, for every guild and in particular divers. Similarly to 2013, most observations of waterfowl broods in 2014 occurred at Dyke 10 Runoff pond. The removal of vegetation in September 2014 and proposed control of regrowth for 2015 is expected to decrease the attractiveness of the Dyke 10 Runoff pond to waterfowl.

At the Tailings pond, the mean number of landed birds decreased from 4.5 in 2013 to 1.0 birds per survey in 2014. It is important to note that the mean number of landed birds at the Tailings pond varied across stations in both years. The mean at PMP2, on the east side of the Tailings pond, increased from 0.1 in 2013 to 1.2 in 2014 due to an increase in the number of waders. Although the AHD-laser unit was still in place near that station, the amount of operational activities in the area decreased during the season, likely increasing the attractiveness of the beach area to shorebirds. At the northwest station (PMP1), the mean number of landed birds decreased from 11.4 birds per survey in 2013 to 0.5 in spring 2014, and then to 0.3 in fall 2014 at the replacement station (PMP5). The mean number of landed birds also decreased at the southwest station (PMP4), from 6.0 to 2.6. The southeast station, PMP3, and its replacement since October 2014, PMP6, remained the stations with the fewest birds at the Tailings pond (0.1 at PMP3 in 2013 and 2014 and 0 at PMP6), although mortalities were found in this area.



As in 2013, gulls were the least common of the water-associated guilds; they were more often observed at the Compensation Lake station, followed by Basal Water Storage pond. Compensation Lake also attracts diving birds, but provides minimal habitat for shorebirds.

The Tailings pond had the highest number of species of conservation concern: seven species, compared to five species at Basal Water Storage pond and three species at Dyke 10 Runoff pond, and also had the most mortalities (four species compared to one at Basal water Storage pond), but numbers of landed birds of conservation concern were highest at Basal Water Storage pond (1.61 birds of conservation concern per survey), followed by Dyke 10 Runoff pond (0.53), Coke Runoff pond (0.10), Tailings pond (0.09), and Recycle Water pond (0.02). Greenwinged Teal (listed as Sensitive in Alberta) were widespread, with broods observed at Dyke 10 Runoff, Basal Water Storage, and the Tailings ponds. Northern Pintail (Sensitive) occurred most often at Basal Water Storage pond, and Lesser Scaup (Sensitive) at Dyke 10 Runoff pond. Six species of conservation concern were observed at Compensation Lake, but this cumulative total should not be compared to process-affected ponds, which were surveyed three times more often, increasing the likelihood of detecting species.

Breeding habitat potentially occurred at or near ponds where broods were observed during bird surveys: Dyke 10 Runoff, Storm Water, Basal Water Storage, and the Tailings ponds for waterfowl (Mallard, Ring-necked Duck, Green-winged Teal, American Widgeon, Canada Goose, Canvasback), and Coke Runoff for shorebirds (Spotted Sandpiper). Ponds at Horizon were searched between the spring and fall monitoring periods. Young were then observed at the Tailings pond (Northern Shoveler, Mallard), Coke Runoff pond (Common Goldeneye), Dyke 10 Runoff pond (Mallard), and Basal Water Storage pond (Mallard). The presence of family groups suggests that some birds resided on site during the summer and were likely recorded during multiple surveys, especially between June and August. Summer resident birds within the survey areas may be counted during multiple surveys. Thus, the numbers of bird observations reported may be elevated due to multiple counts of the same birds (Appendix 2.F). Vegetation control on the west side of the Tailing pond and at Dyke 10 Runoff pond should contribute to minimize resident birds and family groups in those areas in 2015.

# 2.5.2 Mortalities and Oiling

Mortality and oiling of birds in 2014 were generally consistent with those reported annually since the initiation of the program in 2011, with the Tailings pond representing the most problematic area for waterbirds due to its large size, presence of habitat attractants, and occurrence of floating bitumen. Twenty-five and 31 pond-related mortalities were found incidentally in 2013 and 2014, respectively. During formal searches, one mortality was found in 2013, and none in 2014. During standardized bird surveys in 2013 and 2014, respectively 3% and 2% of observations of landed waterbirds had contacted bitumen.

No mortalities were found at any of the process-affected ponds during 85 h of standardized searching over a distance of 260 km, mostly by foot and by boat. The number of incidental mortalities found likely resulted from the consistent presence of deterrent maintenance crews on ponds and particularly the presence of hazing personnel in boats. Most mortalities (27 of 31) were found at the Tailings pond in areas where floating bitumen and, in many cases, habitat



attractants were present. The locations on the Tailings pond where mortalities occurred potentially represent areas where birds encountered bitumen or where oiled waterfowl attempted to take refuge, rather than areas where dead birds drifted, as most birds were found alive and severely oiled, limiting their mobility. Most (68%) of mortalities were diving birds, which was also the guild most commonly observed as landed during bird surveys. Although gulls represented only 2% of landed waterbirds during surveys, they represented 16% of mortalities.

As in 2013, oiled birds observed most frequently during bird surveys were shorebirds (86 observations) and gulls (36 observations) and most had small patches of bitumen on their underside. Gulls were disproportionately likely to be observed oiled, with 29% of landed gulls identified as oiled, compared to 5% of landed shorebirds. During a survey at the Tailings pond (PMP3) on August 1, four Franklin's Gulls were seen landing on a floating mat of bitumen and became 85 to 95% oiled, indicating that these birds were unable to identify the floating bitumen as hazardous. The birds were immediately reported and the same day, two were captured and euthanized and two had already died. The number of oiled birds observed during surveys appeared to be correlated with the total number of birds observed rather than the proximity of floating bitumen. Many of the observations of oiled birds occurred at ponds without floating bitumen, as most were able to fly. The ability to identify bitumen on lightly oiled birds may be station-dependent, depending on the proximity of the observers to the birds and opportunities to view the birds' underside, for example when birds were on shores or islands, or preening.

# 2.5.3 Monitoring Protocol

At seven of the eight ponds of lower monitoring priority, no landed waterbirds, oiled birds or mortalities were observed, even though the presence of workers near the ponds increased the likelihood of birds being found and reported. The eighth pond, Mine Dump, is the largest of these low priority ponds, and a small beach on the south side and grassy vegetation on the north and east sides could potentially act as attractants. Two Greater Yellowlegs were observed during a survey on September 8. Removal of the small beach area would likely prevent future landings of shorebirds. In addition, a 100% oiled unknown diving duck was found incidentally on September 11. The bird was likely injured or disoriented before landing, as the area within which this pond is located has high human activity and is unlikely to normally attract waterfowl. The bird was noticed by a worker in the area and reported to capture personnel.

Survey effort was consistent across survey stations, except at PMP4 where 33 surveys (21% of scheduled surveys at that station) were missed due unusable roads. Access to the west side of the Tailings pond by truck is limited due to the primitive roads degrading with precipitation and runoff. Establishing an alternative survey location along the west side of the pond was therefore not possible, as no alternative access was available. Survey areas covered the entire process-affected pond surfaces over water, except at Basal Water Storage pond (92%), Recycle Water pond (90%) and the Tailings pond (10%), where ponds were too large to be entirely encompassed within the 500-m radius of the survey area. The survey area at Basal Water Storage pond may slightly underestimate numbers of birds, as all of the excluded area is along the sinuous vegetated shoreline on the west side. However, given that only 8% of the area is excluded, the bias is not expected to be substantial. The survey area at Recycle Water pond is likely representative of the entire pond, or could slightly overestimate bird numbers since the



excluded area, near the effluent and boom, is visible to observers and birds were rarely or never seen there. The location of the survey station is appropriate, as moving the station westward would exclude a small portion on the east side of the pond from the survey area. Few birds were observed at Recycle Water pond (0.4 landed waterbirds per survey), and numbers would likely be almost identical if the entire pond was included within the survey area. The survey areas at the Tailings pond have the greatest potential for having low representativeness. For example, survey areas underrepresent the open water in the center of the pond. The total survey area (all regular stations combined) includes 17% of the total pond vegetated shoreline (15% of the total pond shoreline), and 8% of the total pond beach area, and there is no certainty that these areas are representative of similar habitats outside of the survey areas. In addition, the pond is large and each section likely has a different set of factors influencing bird numbers. These factors may change from day to day, for example heavy machinery operating at the east side of the pond may dictate where shorebird activity occurs at different periods of the season. Survey areas may not capture these influences. Representativeness of the survey area at Compensation Lake (which covers 26% of the pond) is difficult to assess without better knowledge of the entire lake; different areas of the lake could provide habitat for different species or attract birds in different numbers.

Results from the IOV study indicated that systematic error could occur during data collection due to differences between observers. Comparison surveys should be used as training sessions at the beginning of monitoring periods to identify and minimize sources of systematic error.

The implementation of one flexible day per week, the "Comparison Day", was greatly beneficial to conducting the program at Horizon. It enables personnel to conduct bird surveys at stations that were missed during the previous week if any, data verification, additional orientation and training as necessary, maintenance of vehicles and material, communication, coordination, administrative tasks, and comparison surveys for the IOV study.

# 2.6 Documents Cited

- DeTect (2014) MERLIN *Detect and Deter*<sup>™</sup>, Horizon Oil Sands Project, Data Report for 2013. Prepared for Canadian Natural Resources Limited. DeTect Inc., Panama City, Florida, USA. February 2013, 44 pp. [Confidential report made available by Canadian Natural Resources Limited for use in this project only].
- Marsh R.E., Erickson W.A., Salmon T.P. (1991) Bird hazing and frightening methods and techniques (with emphasis on containment ponds). Other Publications in Wildlife Management. Paper 51.
- St. Clair C.C., Loots S., Ronconi R.A. (2014) 2014 Protocol Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program. Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta. Prepared for Oil Sands Operators and Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development. April 2014, 50 pp.



2.7 Appendices 2.A to 2.F



#### Appendix 2.A: Location of Deterrents, Booms, Survey Stations, and Survey Areas at Horizon Ponds in 2014

<u>Note</u>: Pond labels show the number of mortalities (all found incidentally) during April-October 2014. The survey station labels show the mean number of landed waterbirds per survey.





































# Appendix 2.B: Relationship Between the Mean Number of Landed Waterbirds per Survey and Hour after Sunrise at Horizon in 2014

<u>Note</u>: No landed waterbirds were observed during surveys at 7 of the 18 process-affected ponds (Emergency Dump 1, Emergency Dump 2, Emergency Dump 3, Froth Dump, Mine Sump, R1 Distributor, and R1 Emergency Dump), and at one of the Tailings pond's alternative survey station (PMP6). Stations are presented in descending order of landed waterbird abundance. Bars = 95% Confidence Interval.

























	Lan	ded <sup>2</sup>	Flew Over <sup>2</sup>	Cont Bitu	acted men <sup>2</sup>	Mortality		
Species/Species Group <sup>1</sup>	Bird Survey	Incidental <sup>3</sup>	Bird Survey	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental	
	V	VATERBIRD	6					
Mallard	826		379	2				
Greater Scaup	676		1					
Eared Grebe	425						7	
Ring-necked Duck	386		6	1			1	
Unknown Scaup	358		6	1			1	
Canada Goose	304		388	3	2		1	
Red-necked Phalarope	301			1				
Lesser Yellowlegs	291		26	34	1			
Common Goldeneye	281		6				2	
Northern Shoveler	244		54		4		1	
Green-winged Teal	236	35	71				2	
Spotted Sandpiper	217		8	10				
Canvasback	178		4					
Baird's Sandpiper	157			23				
Unknown Duck	131		288	1			2	
Unknown Dabbling Duck	127		23					
American Wigeon	111		7					
Killdeer	96		24	1				
Semipalmated Sandpiper	93			6	1			
Northern Pintail	91	4	25					
Unknown Calidris Sandpiper	85		261	2	2			
Unknown Shorebird	85		183					
Unknown Yellowlegs	54		25					
Wilson's Phalarope	52							
Lesser Scaup	51						1	
Ruddy Duck	50						1	
Bufflehead	43							
Franklin's Gull	39		5	23	1		5	
Unknown Diving Duck	39							
Herring Gull	37		10	2				
Greater Yellowlegs	32			3				
Surf Scoter	30							
Redhead	26							
Unknown Sandpiper	24		15					
American Avocet	17							
Least Sandpiper	17							
Bonaparte's Gull	16							
Red-necked Grebe	15							
Blue-winged Teal	14							
Common Loon	14							

## Appendix 2.C: Number of Bird Observations by Species at Horizon Process-affected Ponds in 2014



	Lan	ded <sup>2</sup>	Flew Over <sup>2</sup>	Cont Bitu	acted men <sup>2</sup>	Mort	ality
Species/Species Group <sup>1</sup>	Bird Survey	Incidental <sup>3</sup>	Bird Survey	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental
Long-tailed Duck	13						1
Unknown White-headed Gull	12		30	3			
American Coot	12						4
California Gull	12		5				
Unknown Diver	10		1				
American White Pelican	10						
Sanderling	9			2			
Unknown Dowitcher	8		70	1			
Horned Grebe	8						1
Unknown Black-headed Gull	6		6	3			
Pectoral Sandpiper	5						
Unknown Phalarope	5						
Unknown Grebe	4						
Semipalmated Plover	3			3			
Unknown Gull	3		4	2			
Snow Goose	3		4				
Gadwall	3		3				
Ruddy Turnstone	3						
Unknown Plover	2		9				
Black-bellied Plover	2						
Red-breasted Merganser	2						
Short-billed Dowitcher	2						
White-rumped Sandpiper	2						
Wilson's Snipe	1		1				
Pied-billed Grebe	1						
Stilt Sandpiper	1						
Sandhill Crane		14	12				
Tundra Swan			6				
Great Blue Heron			1				
Greater White-fronted Goose			1				
Osprey			1				
Sora		1					
White-winged Scoter							1
	Non-	TARGET GL	JILDS				
Common Raven	127		982				
Snow Bunting	86		225				
American Pipit	44		345				
Red-winged Blackbird	39		10				
Barn Swallow	35		1161				
Yellow-headed Blackbird	32		5				
Lapland Longspur	30		67				
Savannah Sparrow	28		71				
Song Sparrow	17		7				
Brewer's Blackbird	13		60				



	Land	ded <sup>2</sup>	Flew Over <sup>2</sup>	Conta Bitur	acted nen²	Mortality	
Species/Species Group <sup>1</sup>	Bird Survey	Incidental <sup>3</sup>	Bird Survey	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental
Unknown Blackbird	12		193				
Unknown Sparrow	9		38				
Unknown Passerine	8		545				
Clay-colored Sparrow	8		1				
American Kestrel	7		29				
American Robin	6		9				
Tree Swallow	5		184				
Horned Lark	5		5				
Unknown Swallow	4		141				
Black-billed Magpie	4		13				
Chipping Sparrow	3		1				
Sharp-tailed Grouse	2		17				
Brown-headed Cowbird	2		6				
Harris's Sparrow	2						
Northern Harrier	1		27				
Common Grackle	1		3				
Sharp-shinned Hawk	1		1				
Vesper Sparrow	1		1				
Alder Flycatcher	1						
Yellow Warbler	1						
Bank Swallow			36				
Cliff Swallow			15				
Merlin			4				
American Crow			1				
Hairy Woodpecker			1				
Northern Flicker			1				
Peregrine Falcon			1				
Unknown Raptor			1				
Unknown Woodpecker			1				

#### Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Pink shading: Species of Conservation Concern.
 <sup>2</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times.
 <sup>3</sup> Only for Species of Conservation Concern.


#### Appendix 2.D: Bird Oiling and Mortality Events at Horizon in April–October 2014

Note: Birds were reported as required depending on the situation: to hazing crews, in the observers' daily email update to the Waterfowl Protection contact list, and to AESRD.

Date	Species/ Species Group	Pond (Survey Station)	Location Description	# Birds <sup>1</sup>	% Oiled	Outcome	Context of Detection	Method of Detection	Potential Reason for Mortality/Oiling
Apr-29	Canada Goose	Tailings Pond (PMP1)		1	20	Reported, bird flew but landed again	ew but Incidental by Us in observers		
Apr-30	Canada Goose	Tailings Pond (PMP1)	Vegetation on shore	2	25 (breast, belly)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the birds
Apr-30	Canada Goose	Tailings Pond (PMP1)	Water	1	20 (breast)	Reported, bird flew	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Bird landed in bitumen mat near shore
May-7	Eared Grebe	Dyke 10 Runoff	NE quadrant	1	> 0	Bird unable to fly, not recovered	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
May-8	Long-tailed Duck	Tailings Pond	East side	1	95	Euthanized	While hazing		
May-12	Eared Grebe	Tailings Pond		1	90	Died during capture attempt	While hazing	Airboat	
May-12	Eared Grebe	Tailings Pond		1	40	Euthanized	While hazing		
May-12	Eared Grebe	Tailings Pond		1	55	Euthanized	While hazing		
May-12	Eared Grebe	Tailings Pond	Shoreline	1	90	Euthanized	While hazing		
May-12	Common Goldeneye	Tailings Pond		1	90-100	Not recovered, likely sank	While hazing		
May-13	American Coot	Tailings Pond		1	90	Euthanized	While inspecting cannons		
May-14	Eared Grebe	Tailings Pond		1	5	Euthanized	While hazing		
May-14	Eared Grebe	Tailings Pond		1	95	Euthanized	While hazing		
May-17	Ring-necked Duck	Tailings Pond		1	100	Euthanized	While hazing		
May-19	Common Goldeneye	Tailings Pond		1	100	Euthanized	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
May-26	Unk. Duck	Tailings Pond		1	100	Found dead	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
May-31	Green-winged Teal	Tailings Pond		1	40	Euthanized	While hazing		
Jul-9	Canada Goose	Basal Water Storage (TMP1)	SE corner	1	30 (breast)	Reported, bird flew	Reported, bird flew Incidental by observers		
Jul-11	Semipalmated Sandpiper	Tailings Pond		1	30 (right flank/belly)	Reported	Incidental by observers	Using optics, from shore	



Date	Species/ Species Group	Pond (Survey Station)	Location Description	# Birds <sup>1</sup>	% Oiled	Outcome	Context of Detection	Method of Detection	Potential Reason for Mortality/Oiling
Jul-17	Unk. Calidris Sandpiper	Basal Water Storage		2	5-30 (belly, vent, legs, bill)	Reported, birds flew	Incidental by observers	Using optics, from shore	
Jul-21	Northern Shoveler	Tailings Pond (PMP4)		4	5-30 (belly, face, bill)	Reported	Incidental by observers	Using optics, from shore	
Jul-21	Northern Shoveler	Tailings Pond	West shore	1	5	Found dead	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
Jul-21	Green-winged Teal	Tailings Pond		1	80-90	Not recovered, likely sank	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
Jul-26	Unk. Gull	Tailings Pond (PMP3)	Water	1	30 (all of underside)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the bird
Jul-26	Horned Grebe	be Tailings Pond		1	100	Euthanized	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		Floating bitumen present
Jul-27	Unk. Gull	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Water	1	30 (all of underside)	Reported, bird flew	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Jul-27	Franklin's Gull	Tailings Pond		1	40	Euthanized	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
Jul-29	Franklin's Gull	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Shore	1	60 (body, head, vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Jul-30	Franklin's Gull	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Water	3	5-20 (belly, vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Jul-31	Franklin's Gull	Tailings Pond (PMP2)	Shore	1	10 (breast, vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen present (1-5 % of pond)
Jul-31	Franklin's Gull	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Shore	2	10-50 (belly, vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-1	Franklin's Gull	Tailings Pond (PMP3)	Water	4	85-95	Reported, captured	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the birds
Aug-1	Unk. White-headed Gull	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)		1	15 (belly, bill)	Reported	Incidental by observers	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-1	Franklin's Gull	Tailings Pond		1	85	Euthanized	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
Aug-1	Franklin's Gull	Tailings Pond		1	85	Euthanized	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		



Date	Species/ Species Group	Pond (Survey Station)	Location Description	# Birds <sup>1</sup>	% Oiled	Outcome	Context of Detection	Method of Detection	Potential Reason for Mortality/Oiling
Aug-1	Franklin's Gull	Tailings Pond		1	95	Found dead	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
Aug-1	Franklin's Gull	Tailings Pond		1	85-90	Found dead	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
Aug-2	Semipalmated Sandpiper	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Shore	1	10 (vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-2	Franklin's Gull	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Shore	1	30-40 (belly, breast, vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-3	Spotted Sandpiper	Recycle Water (AMP1)	Shore	1	5 (vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the birds
Aug-3	Unk. White-headed Gull	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Shore	1	50 (breast, belly, vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-3	Greater Yellowlegs	Tailings Pond (PMP4)	Vegetation on water	1	5-10 (vent)	Reported, bird flew	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the birds
Aug-3	Lesser Yellowlegs	Tailings Pond (PMP4)	Vegetation on water	1	5-10 (vent)	Reported, bird flew	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the birds
Aug-4	Semipalmated Sandpiper	Tailings Pond (PMP2)	Shore	1	5-10 (vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen present (6-15 % of pond)
Aug-4	Semipalmated Plover	Tailings Pond (PMP2)	Shore	2	5-15 (belly, vent, wingtips)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen present (6-15 % of pond)
Aug-5	Lesser Yellowlegs	Tailings Pond (PMP4)	Vegetation on water	2	10-15 (vent)	Reported, birds flew	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the bird
Aug-5	Semipalmated Sandpiper	Tailings Pond (PMP2)	Shore	1	5-10 (vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen present (1-5 % of pond)
Aug-6	California Gull	Compensation Lake (ZMP1)	Shore	1	30	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-6	Lesser Yellowlegs	Tailings Pond (PMP4)	Vegetation on water	5	15-20 (belly, vent, legs)	Reported, birds flew	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the birds
Aug-6	Red-necked Phalarope	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Shore	1	15 (breast)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-6	Franklin's Gull	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Shore	2	30 (belly)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-6	Herring Gull	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Shore	1	60 (breast, breast, neck, legs)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-6	Lesser Yellowlegs	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Shore	2	10 (belly)	Reported, birds flew	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	



Date	Species/ Species Group	Pond (Survey Station)	Location Description	# Birds <sup>1</sup>	% Oiled	Outcome	Context of Detection	Method of Detection	Potential Reason for Mortality/Oiling
Aug-7	Semipalmated Plover	Tailings Pond (PMP2)	Shore	1	10 (belly, vent)	Reported During bird survey		Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen present (1-5 % of pond)
Aug-7	Semipalmated Sandpiper	Tailings Pond (PMP2)	Shore	1	10 (flanks)	Reported	Reported During bird survey		Floating bitumen present (1-5 % of pond)
Aug-7	Lesser Yellowlegs	Tailings Pond (PMP4)	Vegetation on shore	2	10-20 (belly, vent)	Reported	eported During bird survey		Floating bitumen within 25 m of the birds
Aug-8	Franklin's Gull	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Shore	1	> 0	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-8	Franklin's Gull	Tailings Pond (PMP5)		[1]	30 (breast, belly, vent)	Bird flying, circling	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-8	Franklin's Gull	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Shore	1	10 (flanks, vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-8	Franklin's Gull	Tailings Pond (PMP2)	Shore	1	25 (belly, vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen present (1-5 % of pond)
Aug-8	Franklin's Gull	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Water	1	30 (breast, belly, vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-11	Franklin's Gull	Compensation Lake (ZMP1)	Water	1 [1]	20-30 (belly, flanks, vent)	Reported, one bird flying, circling	eported, one bird flying, circling During bird survey		
Aug-11	Franklin's Gull	Basal Water Storage (TMP1)		1	20 (vent, flanks)	Reported, bird flew	Incidental by observers	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-11	Canada Goose	Road near Tailings Pond		1	95	Euthanized	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
Aug-12	Unk. Black-headed Gull	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)		[3]	20-30 (belly, vent)	Birds flying, circling	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-12	Herring Gull	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Shore	1	40-50 (belly, flanks, vent, head)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-13	Baird's Sandpiper	Tailings Pond (PMP2)	Shore	2	5 (vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen present (1-5 % of pond)
Aug-13	Greater Yellowlegs	Dyke 10 Runoff (NMP1)	Shore	1	10-15 (vent, legs)	Reported	Reported During bird survey		
Aug-13	Greater Yellowlegs	Tailings Pond (PMP4)	Vegetation on water	1	5 (vent, legs)	Reported During bird survey		Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the birds
Aug-14	Franklin's Gull	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Shore	2	5-15 (breast, belly)	Reported	Reported During bird survey		
Aug-14	Baird's Sandpiper	R2 Basal Dump (SMP1)	Shore	1	5 (vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	



Date	Species/ Species Group	Pond (Survey Station)	Location Description	# Birds <sup>1</sup>	% Oiled	Outcome	Context of Detection	Method of Detection	Potential Reason for Mortality/Oiling
Aug-14	Lesser Yellowlegs	Tailings Pond (PMP4)	Vegetation on water	4	5-15 (belly, vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the birds
Aug-14	Unk. Dowitcher	Tailings Pond (PMP4)	Vegetation on water	1	25 (breast, belly, vent)	Reported During bird survey		Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the birds
Aug-14	Baird's Sandpiper	Tailings Pond (PMP2)	Shore	2	5 (vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen present (1-5 % of pond)
Aug-15	Lesser Yellowlegs	Storm Water (EMP1)	Shore	1	10 (vent, legs)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-15	Baird's Sandpiper	R2 Basal Dump (SMP1)	Shore	5	5-10 (belly, vent)	Reported, 3 birds flew	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-16	Unk. Calidris Sandpiper	Tailings Pond (PMP2)	Shore	1	30 (breast, belly, vent, head)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen present (1-5 % of pond)
Aug-16	Lesser Yellowlegs	Tailings Pond (PMP2)	Shore	2	5 (vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen present (1-5 % of pond)
Aug-16	Spotted Sandpiper	Recycle Water (AMP1)	Shore	3	10 (belly, vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen present (1-5 % of pond)
Aug-17	Lesser Yellowlegs	Coke Runoff (FMP1)	Shore	1	10 (vent, legs)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-17	Spotted Sandpiper	Coke Runoff (FMP1)	Shore	1	5 (flanks)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-17	Franklin's Gull	R2 Basal Dump (SMP1)	Shore	2	5-40 (underside, neck, head)	Reported, birds flew	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-18	Unk. White-headed Gull	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Shore	1	45 (underside, flanks, head, bill)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-19	Baird's Sandpiper	Tailings Pond (PMP2)	Shore	2	5-50 (underside, neck, head)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen present (1-5 % of pond)
Aug-19	Baird's Sandpiper	R2 Basal Dump (SMP1)	Shore	2	10 (breast, belly, vent)	Reported, birds flew	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-19	Lesser Yellowlegs	Storm Water (EMP1)	Shore	1	5 (vent, legs)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-19	Unk. White-headed Gull	Tailings Pond (PMP2)	Shore	1	30 (underside, wings)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen present (1-5 % of pond)
Aug-20	Baird's Sandpiper	Storm Water (EMP1)	Shore	4	5-15 (belly, vent, flanks)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-20	Lesser Yellowlegs	Tailings Pond (PMP4)	Shore	5	5-20 (breast, belly, flanks)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the birds
Aug-20	Lesser Yellowlegs	Storm Water (EMP1)	Shore	3	10 (belly, flanks)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	



Date	Species/ Species Group	Pond (Survey Station)	Location Description	# Birds <sup>1</sup>	% Oiled	Outcome	Context of Detection	Method of Detection	Potential Reason for Mortality/Oiling
Aug-20	Baird's Sandpiper	Tailings Pond (PMP4)	Shore	2	5-10 (belly, vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the birds
Aug-20	Semipalmated Sandpiper	R2 Emergency Dump (MMP1)	Shore	1	30 (breast, belly, head)	Reported, bird flew	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-21	Lesser Yellowlegs	Storm Water (EMP1)	Shore	2	10 (flanks, vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-21	Spotted Sandpiper	Tailings Pond (PMP4)	Shore	1	20 (underside)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the birds
Aug-21	Spotted Sandpiper	R2 Emergency Dump (MMP1)	Shore	1	5 (right flank, vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-22	Killdeer	Recycle Water (AMP1)	Shore	1	10 (belly, right flank)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-22	Lesser Yellowlegs	Tailings Pond (PMP4)	Shore	1	10 (vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the birds
Aug-23	Baird's Sandpiper	Tailings Pond (PMP2)	Shore	1	10 (belly, flanks)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the bird
Aug-23	Spotted Sandpiper	Dyke 10 Runoff (NMP1)	Shore	1	30 (breast, belly)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-23	Lesser Yellowlegs	Tailings Pond (PMP4)	Shore	1	5 (flanks)	Reported, bird flew	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the bird
Aug-23	Spotted Sandpiper	Tailings Pond (PMP4)	Shore	1	10 (breast, belly)	Reported, bird flew	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the bird
Aug-24	Lesser Yellowlegs	Light Duty Truck pond		1	10	Reported	Incidental by observers	Using optics, from shore	
Aug-26	Spotted Sandpiper	Tailings Pond (PMP4)	Shore	1	10 (vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the bird
Aug-26	Lesser Yellowlegs	Tailings Pond (PMP4)	Shore	1	15 (belly, vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the birds
Aug-31	Baird's Sandpiper	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Shore	1	10 (belly, vent)	Bird flew	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Sep-2	Unk. Calidris Sandpiper	Recycle Water (AMP1)		[1]	5 (vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen present (1-5 % of pond)
Sep-4	Semipalmated Sandpiper	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Shore	1	5 (vent)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Sep-6	Sanderling	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Shore	1	10 (left flank)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Sep-6	Baird's Sandpiper	Tailings Pond (PMP2)	Shore	1	5 (vent)	Reported, bird flew	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen present (1-5 % of pond)



Date	Species/ Species Group	Pond (Survey Station)	Location Description	# Birds <sup>1</sup>	% Oiled	Outcome	Context of Detection	Method of Detection	Potential Reason for Mortality/Oiling
Sep-11	Unk. Diving Duck	Mine Dump		1	100	Euthanized	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
Sep-18	Sanderling	Dyke 10 Runoff (NMP1)	Shore	1	10 (flanks)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Sep-21	Ruddy Duck	Tailings Pond		1	90	Euthanized	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
Sep-25	Lesser Scaup	Tailings Pond		1	90	Euthanized	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
Sep-30	American Coot	Tailings Pond		1	95	Euthanized	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
Oct-1	Unk. Duck	Basal Water Storage (TPM2)	Water	1	80	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	
Oct-1	American Coot	Tailings Pond	Near the boom	1	75	Euthanized	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
Oct-3	Ring-necked Duck	Recycle Water (AMP1)	Water	1	20 (breast, head)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen present (1-5 % of pond)
Oct-5	American Coot	Tailings Pond	Near the boom	1	60	Euthanized	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
Oct-6	White-winged Scoter	Basal Water Storage		1	80	Not recovered, signs of predation	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
Oct-7	Unk. Scaup	Recycle Water (AMP1)	Water	1	80 (all of body except head)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen present (1-5 % of pond)
Oct-7	Unk. Scaup	Recycle Water		1	80	Not recovered, could not be captured	Incidental by hazing/deterrent maintenance crew		
Oct-14	Mallard	Tailings Pond (PMP5)	Water	2	5 (head)	Reported	During bird survey	Using optics, from shore	Floating bitumen within 25 m of the birds

Notes:

Purple shading: mortality. <sup>1</sup> [Brackets indicate bird flying].



#### Appendix 2.E: Incidental Bird Mortalities at Horizon during a Weather-related Landing Event in November 2014

During the early morning hours of November 4, 2014, an unforeseen weather event of extreme fog conditions resulted in migratory waterfowl to land on the tailings pond at Horizon despite the full operation of the waterfowl deterrent system. The event was reported to Alberta Environment and Sustainable Development and the Alberta Energy Regulator on November 4th. Multiple factors contributed to the waterfowl landings that included the severe weather event, the timing of the waterfowl migration late in the season, and poor visibility. Waterfowl deterrents, including radar units, long range acoustic devices along with propane cannons and effigies, were functional and effective. There were 111 waterfowl fatalities. Canadian Natural's system has been operational since 2009 and this is the first event of this kind at Horizon Oil Sands.



Note: All observations occurred at the Tailings Pond, by boat.



## Appendix 2.E (cont'd)

Date	# Birds	Species/Species Group	% Oiled	Outcome
Nov-4	19	American Coot	> 25	Euthanized
Nov-4	1	Bufflehead	> 25	Euthanized
Nov-4	1	Gadwall	> 25	Euthanized
Nov-4	7	Lesser Scaup	> 25	Euthanized
Nov-4	1	Northern Shoveler	> 25	Euthanized
Nov-4	1	Unk. Scaup	> 25	Euthanized
Nov-5	1	American Coot	30	Euthanized
Nov-5	7	American Coot	50	Euthanized
Nov-5	1	American Coot	60	Euthanized
Nov-5	2	American Coot	80	Euthanized
Nov-5	4	American Coot	100	Euthanized
Nov-5	1	American Coot	> 0	Scavenged by ravens
Nov-5	2	Bufflehead	75	Euthanized
Nov-5	1	Green-winged Teal	60	Euthanized
Nov-5	1	Northern Shoveler	50	Euthanized
Nov-5	1	Pied-billed Grebe	50	Euthanized
Nov-5	13	Unk. Scaup	50	Euthanized
Nov-5	2	Unk. Scaup	60	Euthanized
Nov-5	2	Unk. Scaup	70	Euthanized
Nov-5	4	Unk. Scaup	75	Euthanized
Nov-5	8	Unk. Scaup	80	Euthanized
Nov-5	5	Unk. Scaup	90	Euthanized
Nov-5	2	Unk. Scaup	100	Euthanized
Nov-5	7	Unk. Scaup	80-100	Euthanized
Nov-6	1	American Coot	60	Euthanized
Nov-6	1	American Coot	80	Euthanized
Nov-6	1	Northern Shoveler	50	Euthanized
Nov-6	1	Unk. bird	unknown	On beach, scavenged by ravens
Nov-6	1	Unk. Scaup	10	Euthanized
Nov-6	1	Unk. Scaup	50	Euthanized
Nov-6	1	Unk. Scaup	75	Euthanized
Nov-6	4	Unk. Scaup	80	Euthanized
Nov-6	1	Unk. Scaup	85	Euthanized
Nov-6	2	Unk. Scaup	90	Euthanized
Nov-6	1	Unk. Scaup	> 0	Scavenged by ravens
Nov-7	1	Unk. bird	> 0	Scavenged by ravens and magpies
Nov-7	1	Unk. Scaup	60	Euthanized



#### Appendix 2.F: Summer Resident Birds

During the three-week interval between the spring and fall monitoring periods, Canadian Natural estimated the number of summer resident birds present within each survey area at Horizon Oil Sands, and evaluated the potential effect of multiple observations of these birds on the total through the 2014 season. A total of 48 dabblers (Canada Goose, Green-winged Teal, Mallard, Northern Shoveler) were considered to reside at Horizon ponds in the summer of 2014, of which 28 occurred at process-affected ponds (see table below). Assuming birds were resident from June 1 through to August 15 (at which date the young were presumed to be flight-capable), these birds could have been included in up to 50 surveys. While the actual impact of multiple counts of the 28 birds on each of 50 days (a theoretical maximum of 1,400 observations) cannot be calculated, repeated observations of these resident dabblers could represent up to 36% of the total number of observations of dabblers at Horizon's process-affected ponds in 2014, given that there were 694 observations of dabblers at process-affected ponds between June 1 and August 15, out of a total of 1,959 observation of dabblers at process-affected ponds during 2014. Similarly, every dabbler observed at Compensation Lake between June 1 and August 15 had the potential for being a resident bird and nesting in the area.

Species (in taxonomic order; AOU 2014)	Guild	Process-affected Ponds	Compensation Lake (Freshwater)
Canada Goose	Dabbles	2	14
Mallard	Dabbles	18	6
Northern Shoveler	Dabbles	6	
Green-winged Teal	Dabbles	2	
Common Goldeneye	Dives	6	
Red-breasted Merganser	Diver	0	6
Common Loon	Dives	0	2
Killdeer	Wades	1	
Spotted Sandpiper	Wades	4	
Lesser Yellowlegs	Wades	2	
Common Raven	Non-target	2	
Tree Swallow	Non-target	8	
Bank Swallow	Non-target	4	
Cliff Swallow	Non-target	2	
Barn Swallow	Non-target	15	
American Robin	Non-target	2	
Clay-colored Sparrow	Non-target	1	
Savannah Sparrow	Non-target	3	
Song Sparrow	Non-target	2	
Brewer's Blackbird	Non-target	2	

#### Estimates of Summer Residents within Bird Survey Areas at Horizon

#### Note:

Rose shading indicates species of concern. Blue indicates freshwater pond.



While summer residents are not likely to be visible during every survey, and this example overestimates their contribution to the seasonal totals, it serves to show that consideration of a numerical method to account for multiple counting of summer resident birds would be appropriate to consider in updating the 2015 OSBCMP protocol.

Because of the relatively longer exposure of summer resident birds to process-affected ponds, and the bitumen that many contain, the risk of oiling or mortality is higher for birds nesting on these ponds. It is likely that at least some oiled bird and mortality observations were of these summer residents. Eight percent of observation of oiled birds and 17% of mortalities in 2014 occurred between June 1 and August 15.

The presence of summer resident birds on process-affected ponds reflects the presence of suitable habitat for nesting and breeding at these ponds. In some cases, attempts to remove attractive habitat were made (e.g., herbicide applications to vegetation on the western side of the Horizon Tailings pond), in compliance with restrictions from the *Migratory Bird Convention Act* and Alberta's *Wildlife Act*. This use of OSBCMP data and supplementary observations in support of site management practices geared to the reduction of bird contact with process-affected ponds is supportive of achievement of the fifth program objective. Removal of habitat in and around process-affected ponds will likely reduce substantially the number of bird contact observations, observations of oiled birds, and bird mortalities (Hennan & Munson 1979<sup>1</sup>, Yonge 1979<sup>2</sup>), and is considered to be a best management practice. This would likely enhance the effectiveness of deterrent systems as well, as birds would no longer be attracted to suitable habitats to the extent that they would break through the deterrent arrays.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Yonge K.S. (1979) Development of a bird protection strategy for tar sands tailings ponds. Proceedings of the 8th Bird Control Seminar, Bowling Green, Ohio.



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Hennan E., Munson B. (1979) Species Distribution and Habitat Relationships of Waterfowl in Northeastern Alberta. Canadian Wildlife Service, for Alberta Oil Sand Environmental Research Program, Project LS 22.1.2, 115 p.



OIL SANDS BIRD CONTACT MONITORING PROGRAM

# 2014 Annual Report – Imperial Oil Resources

Prepared by Imperial Oil Resources March 2015



Sandy J. Campbell P.Biol Environment & Regulatory Supervisor (587) 476-4393 sandy.j.campbell@esso.ca

11 March 2015

Albert Liu Industrial Engineer, Mining Authorizations Alberta Energy Regulator 111 Twin Atria Building 4999 – 98 Avenue Edmonton, Alberta, T6B 2X3

#### RE: Kearl Oil Sands Project Bird Contact Monitoring Program Submission of 2014 Annual Bird Monitoring Report Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act (EPEA) Approval 46586-00-00 as amended, Clauses 6.1.77 (b) and 6.1.78

Dear Mr.Liu,

Please find the Imperial Oil section enclosed as part of the regional 2014 Annual Bird Monitoring Report, in accordance with the requirements of the Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Plan for 2014 (required by AESRD in fulfillment of clauses 6.1.77 (b) and 6.1.78 of Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act (EPEA) Approval 46586-00-00).

Kearl production continued in 2014 and both the fresh water and process affected ponds were monitored regularly during 2014. Bird deterrents and monitoring continued at process affected ponds throughout the bird monitoring season.

If you have any questions, please contact Rhiannon Davies at (587) 476-4274.

Sincerely,

y Coff

Sandy J. Campbell P.Biol

cc: Kearl Document Control (Imperial) Rhiannon Davies (Imperial) Marie Nietfeld (AER) Kenneth Yap (AER) Joann Skilnick (AESRD) Andrea McGregor (AESRD) Richard Wiacek (Environment Canada)

<u>3.</u>	IMPE		IL CANADA LIMITED (KEARL)	3-1					
	3.1	SUMM	ARY	3-1					
		3.1.1	BIRD LANDINGS AND MORTALITIES AT PROCESS-AFFECTED PONDS	3-1					
		3.1.2	BIRD LANDINGS AT FRESHWATER PONDS	3-2					
		3.1.3	STANDARDIZED MONITORING	3-2					
		3.1.4	SPECIES OF CONSERVATION CONCERN	3-3					
		3.1.5	ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT	3-4					
	3.2	INTRO	DUCTION	3-5					
		3.2.1	SITE	3-5					
		3.2.2	Personnel	3-7					
		3.2.3	MANAGEMENT OF AVIAN ATTRACTANTS AND CONTROL OF HAZARDS	3-7					
		3.2.4	DETERRENTS	3-8					
		3.2.5	HAZING PROCEDURES	3-12					
	3.3	Метно	DDS	3-12					
		3.3.1	POND CHARACTERISTICS	3-12					
		3.3.2	BIRD SURVEYS	3-12					
		3.3.3	INTER-OBSERVER VARIABILITY (IOV)	3-13					
		3.3.4	Mortality Searches	3-13					
		3.3.5	INCIDENTAL OBSERVATIONS AND REPORTING	3-13					
	3.4	RESUL	TS	3-14					
		3.4.1	POND CHARACTERISTICS	3-14					
		3.4.2	BIRD OBSERVATIONS	3-17					
		3.4.3	INTER-OBSERVER VARIABILITY	3-26					
		3.4.4	Mortalities	3-26					
		3.4.5	SPECIES OF CONSERVATION CONCERN	3-34					
	3.5	Discus	SION						
	3.6	Docu	MENTS CITED	3-38					
	3.7	PERSO	NAL COMMUNICATIONS	3-39					
	3.8		IDICES	3-40					

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

#### 3. IMPERIAL OIL CANADA LIMITED (KEARL)

#### 3.1 Summary

#### 3.1.1 Bird Landings and Mortalities at Process-affected Ponds

Bird survey and mortality search efforts are summarized in Table 3.1. Over 2,000 bird surveys were conducted at Kearl in 2014.

	Bird Surveys											
# Ponds Surveyed	14											
# 10-min Surveys Conducted		1,5	14									
# 30-min Surveys Conducted		64	8									
	Mortality Searches											
# Ponds Searched		14	1									
# Searches	176 (2 f	ocused and 17	'4 transect sea	arches)								
Search Method	Boat	Walk	Truck	Total								
Total Time Searched	12.4 h 13.7 h 12.8 h 38.8											
Distance Searched	105.2 km	25.4 km	49.6 km	180.2 km								

#### Table 3.1: Monitoring effort at process-affected ponds at Kearl in 2014

Table 3.2 summarizes bird observations and mortalities at process-affected (PA) ponds in 2014. Thirty-nine (39) waterbirds were observed as mortalities at PA ponds, 35 of which were detected incidentally.

		V	Vaterb	irds			No	n-targe	et Guil	ds		
			Contacted Bitumen		Mortality				Contacted Bitumen		Mortality	
	Landed	Flew Over	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental	Landed	Flew over	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental
# Birds <sup>1</sup>	1,481	3,144	146	1	4	35	586	2,380	5	0	0	4
# Species	39	24	17	1	1	11	16	25	1	0	0	4

Table 3.2: Bird obse	ervations at proces	s-affected ponds	at Kearl in 2014
----------------------	---------------------	------------------	------------------

<sup>1</sup> Individual live birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times

#### 3.1.2 Bird Landings at Freshwater Ponds

Table 3.3 summarizes monitoring effort at three freshwater ponds at the Kearl site in 2014. Over 300 surveys were conducted throughout the duration of the program, while 14 mortality searches were completed at the Raw Water Pond. Table 3.4 summarizes bird observations at Kearl's freshwater ponds.

Bird Surveys											
# Ponds Surveyed 3											
# 10-min Surveys Conducted	157										
# 30-min Surveys Conducted <sup>1</sup>	onducted <sup>1</sup> 169										
Mortality Searches											
# Ponds Searched		1									
# Searches		14 (transect	t searches)								
Search Method	Boat	Walk	Truck	Total							
Total Time Searched	0 h	0.3 h	1 h	1.3 h							
Distance Searched	0 km	1.2 km	5.1 km	6.3 km							

Table 3.3: Monitoring effort at freshwater ponds at Kearl in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Includes 52 surveys at Muskeg Lake (48 surveys of 30 min and four surveys of 10 min, shorter surveys due to human error)

		Waterbirds							Non-target Guilds			
			Contacted Bitumen <sup>2</sup>		Mortality				Conta Bitur	acted men <sup>2</sup>	Mortality	
	Landed	Flew Over	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental	Landed	Flew over	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental
# Birds¹	1,223	464	2	0	0	1	538	728	0	0	0	0
# Species	38	21	1	0	0	1	13	16	0	0	0	0

Table 3.4: Bird observations at freshwater ponds at Kearl in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Individual live birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times

<sup>2</sup> Denotes birds that had come into contact with bitumen elsewhere and become oiled, but were observed at freshwater ponds

#### 3.1.3 Standardized Monitoring

Bird contact monitoring at the Imperial Oil Resources Ventures Ltd.'s (Imperial's) Kearl Oil Sands (Kearl) site was conducted according to the methods outlined in the 2014 Protocol for the Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program (OSBCMP; St Clair *et al.* 2014). The 2014 protocol was available for consultation by bird monitors at all times. On occasion, however, changing conditions encountered at site required modifications to the monitoring.

The West External Tailing Area (ETA) pond is in an area that regularly features cell and dyke construction, beaching (tailings discharge and sand deposition), and similar work by heavy equipment. As such, access to the monitoring stations at this pond (ETA Main, ETA NW, ETA NE, ETA SW, ETA 1) was often restricted. Observation points varied through the year, and while GPS coordinates were recorded at these locations, observation points would occasionally change on a daily basis; however, locations met the intent of the monitoring protocol. Apart from the changes in location, the methodology of monitoring sessions at the West ETA was the same as those at other ponds at Kearl.

Bird monitors were directed by Imperial to alter the frequency of visits to some ponds covered in the 2014 monitoring plan. The protocol dictated that all PA ponds were to be visited six times per week, but four of these ponds (Hydrotransport Ponds 1 and 2, OPP1 Crusher Sump, and OPP1 Emergency Dump Pond) were visited once weekly due to a lack of bird activity observed during the 2013 season. In addition, the protocol required that freshwater ponds were visited once per week, but Imperial directed monitors to visit the Raw Water Pond on a daily basis due to its large size and proximity to the plant (Adamek, C., pers. comm., 2014).

The inter-observer variability (IOV) surveys that were conducted by monitors at the Imperial Kearl site in 2014 did not result in statistical comparison opportunities, but were instead utilized as a means to assess and resolve differences between observations made by bird monitors.

Mortality searches followed the methods set forth in the 2014 OSBCMP protocol. At some areas on site, however, electronic devices are not safe due to their potential for sparking an explosion. When conducting work in these areas, tablets and GPS devices could not be used because posted barcodes could not be scanned, nor could distances to water be measured or mortality tracks recorded.

#### 3.1.4 Species of Conservation Concern

•	Landed <sup>1</sup>		Flew Over <sup>1</sup>	Contacted Bitumen <sup>1</sup>		Mortality		
Species	Bird Survey	Incidental	Bird Survey	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental	
	W	aterbird	S					
Sandhill Crane	64	3	11	18			1	
Green-winged Teal	14	5	9					
Northern Pintail	7		1	1				
Lesser Scaup	6		1					

Table 3.5: Number of observations of birds of conservationconcern at process-affected ponds at Kearl in 2014

	Lan	Landed <sup>1</sup>		Contacted Bitumen <sup>1</sup>		Mortality	
Species	Bird Survey	Incidental	Bird Survey	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental
Horned Grebe	2						
Pied-billed Grebe	1						2
Great Blue Heron			1				
	Non-t	arget G	uilds			•	
Bank Swallow	26		80				
Rusty Blackbird	2		10				
Eastern Phoebe	1						
Northern Harrier			3				
Bald Eagle			2				
Broad-winged Hawk			1				
Sharp-tailed Grouse		4	1				1

<sup>1</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times

#### 3.1.5 Adaptive Management

At the West ETA pond, small muskeg mats were destroyed and removed at the beginning and end of the summer. None of these mats exhibited nesting habitat for migratory birds prior to their removal but posed a risk as potential nesting habitat in future breeding seasons. Furthermore, vegetation along the northern and eastern shores of the West ETA pond was removed over the course of the summer. In response to approximately 300 migratory birds landing on the Raw Water Pond overnight on November 4<sup>th</sup>, Imperial directed that additional propane cannons be deployed along the tailings solvent recovery unit (TSRU) line and debris dyke at the West ETA pond. In addition, the radar and long-range acoustic devices (LRADs) were kept active at the West ETA until it was determined that the progress of the autumn migration had made a mass landing unlikely.

Imperial is evaluating potential future improvements to site management and bird deterrence in order to minimize bird contact with PA ponds. Vegetation management is regarded as a priority, and the possible use of herbicides to reduce the potential for nesting habitats near PA ponds, particularly the West ETA is currently under investigation. The East ETA pond, while not currently housing PA water, will also be addressed to highlight vegetation management practices.

The potential for improved placement of the LRADs at the West ETA pond is also being examined. If the LRADs are placed on the pond and oriented to radiate from the center of the pond, birds flying overhead may encounter deterring sounds before they reach the pond. The current orientation, which features the LRADs at the perimeter of the pond

facing towards its center, may not prevent deterrence until birds are flying over the tailings pond.

Imperial will continue to collaborate with other industry operators, academic institutions, and regulatory bodies to evaluate potential methods of reducing bird mortalities and contact with PA ponds at Kearl.

#### 3.2 Introduction

#### 3.2.1 **Site**

The northern extent of the oil sands lies 150 km south of the Peace – Athabasca Delta, the one of the world's largest deltas and a particularly important breeding site for waterfowl (Hennan & Munson 1979). The oil sands region is also at the confluence of all four continental flyways, and this leads to considerable migratory bird traffic near or directly above oil sands developments. This puts a large number of migrating birds in close proximity with water bodies on oil sands leases, including tailings and other ponds that contain the by-products of oil extraction, including bitumen or PA water (Golder 2000). Weather conditions can quickly deteriorate during periods of migration, forcing large numbers of waterfowl to seek refuge wherever available. Without adequate detection and deterrent systems in place, the risk of birds visiting a PA pond including mass landings, may be heightened during adverse weather conditions. To implement a more effective bird detection and deterrent system (BDDS), data on the presence and behavior of birds have been collected at PA ponds, as well as freshwater ponds on or near Kearl since 2011.

The Imperial Kearl site is located in the oil sands region, roughly 75 km north of Fort McMurray, Alberta. There are 14 ponds at Kearl that contain PA water. The combined total surface area of these ponds is almost 364 hectares, with the West ETA tailings pond alone accounting for 348 hectares. Two freshwater ponds were monitored throughout the 2014 season and had a combined total surface area of 31.8 hectares. Bird monitors began observation sessions at a third freshwater pond, the East ETA pond, partway through the 2014 season.

This report was completed as a requirement for Imperial to participate in regional monitoring programs, as outlined in Imperial's Waterfowl Protection Plan (WPP). The WPP in turn is a requirement of Imperial's EPEA Approval Conditions (EPEA Approval No. 46586-00-00; clauses 6.1.76, 6.1.77, and 6.1.78).



Figure 3.1: Process-affected and freshwater ponds at Kearl in 2014. Muskeg Lake, which lies approximately 14 kilometers southwest of the other ponds, is not pictured (July 29, 2014).

	R6	
		797
IMPE	RIAL	795
KEARL POND AN OVERVI	MINING ID DITCH EW MAP	
10.044		REV
000	074-0050-305-000-850.01	0

#### 3.2.2 Personnel

Imperial personnel coordinated OSBCMP activities at the Kearl site, with bird monitoring and mortality search activities being conducted by qualified contractors and specialists. Two crews of three employees, each working a ten-day rotation, were responsible for bird monitoring and mortality searches. New-to-site employees complete a full rotation of on-site and in-classroom training with a mentor. In this period, the employee is familiarized with both the OSBCMP protocol and the locations of all ponds at the Kearl site, as well as all necessary site safety programs. Over the next two rotations, while obtaining mine driving experience, this employee works as a junior bird monitor and is coached by a more senior employee. After these first three rotations, assuming an appropriate degree of competence has been demonstrated; the employee may begin working alone as a bird monitor.

#### 3.2.3 Management of Avian Attractants and Control of Hazards

Booms were deployed on the West ETA pond in order to minimize the spread of bitumen over the pond's surface. The booms were deployed as the pond surface was cleared of ice in the spring (March/April), and decommissioned in November following the effective end of the autumn migration.

Vegetation along the northern and eastern shores of the West ETA was completely removed in August to minimize the potential for its use as forage habitat for cranes and geese or breeding habitat for sandpipers. Vegetation was removed using heavy equipment and work was completed over the course of approximately two weeks. Herbicides were not used in this process but are being considered as a potential tool for future vegetation removal efforts.

Imperial employees and contractors were regularly reminded to reduce food waste as much as possible in order to prevent attracting wildlife into hazardous areas. All workers on site were also instructed to report on-site bird sightings, particularly when these birds were observed above, near, or on ponds containing PA water.

Decoys and deterrents were not deployed at Muskeg Lake or the Raw Water Pond, both of which are freshwater ponds. Muskeg Lake is roughly 10 km from the plant site, and this distance is likely enough to prevent this pond from attracting waterfowl to the Kearl site itself. The Raw Water Pond, while adjacent to the Kearl plant, is roughly 2 km from the West ETA pond, which is the largest site of floating bitumen at Kearl. The Raw Water Pond does not represent a direct threat to waterfowl. On the morning of November 4<sup>th</sup>, roughly 300 waterfowl were observed resting on the Raw Water Pond, following a night of heavy fog. Aside from an additional six waterfowl on the West ETA, no other birds were observed onsite on the 4<sup>th</sup>. Imperial is engaged in a discussion with the OSBCMP on whether the absence of auditory bird deterrents or decoys at the Raw Water Pond may have made this site more attractive to descending waterfowl than the much larger West ETA tailings pond, which still featured an active deterrent system at the time.

Allowing birds to land at the Raw Water Pond may prevent mortalities, as they will avoid ponds that carry a risk of oiling.

Bird deterrents were installed in August, 2014 in the East ETA, which did not contain PA water but featured small pockets of freshwater and associated vegetation. These deterrents were installed for two reasons. First, the East ETA will contain PA water in the coming years, and pre-emptive deterrence of birds may reduce the number of nests initiated in the area, which in turn may reduce the number of birds returning to breed in the East ETA when bitumen is present. Second, the East ETA is less than a kilometer from the West ETA tailings pond, which has exhibited floating bitumen and poses a potential risk to migratory birds. Deterring birds from the East ETA in 2014 may have helped reduce the number of birds observed at the nearby West ETA pond.

#### 3.2.4 Deterrents

The bird deterrent and detection system (BDDS) at the Kearl site utilizes both radarlinked and random-fire components. Deployment of the BDDS in 2014 began on March 1<sup>st</sup>, and the system remained deployed until November 20<sup>th</sup>following signoff through the seasonal decommissioning approval process. Maps included in Appendix 3.A summarize the locations of bird deterrents deployed at Kearl. Deterrents remained in approximately the same location throughout the 2014 season (+/- 200m in order to accommodate dyke construction), although additional propane cannons were deployed at the West ETA in November in response to heightened bird activity in the region.

The West ETA, as the largest PA pond at the Kearl site in 2014, featured the most comprehensive BDDS. A DeTect MERLIN Avian Radar unit was linked to four landbased long range acoustic devices (LRADs). These LRADs were stationed on the West ETA's northwest, northeast, southwest and southeast shores. Following the detection of an incoming object by the radar unit, the nearest LRAD would activate and emit noises designed to deter any birds approaching the pond. These noises increase in intensity and biological significance (e.g., bird distress calls) if the detected bird continued a path over the ETA. This radar-linked approach is designed to reduce the likelihood that incoming birds would become habituated to deterring noises; if a noise is not clearly associated with danger, birds may cease to be deterred by it. The West ETA also featured floating effigies, radar-linked propane cannons and lasers, as well as land-based random-fire air cannons and falcon kites. DeTect Inc. and monitoring personnel were responsible for the set-up and decommissioning of the radar system, and daily maintenance of the radar system and downloading of captured radar images.

The large size of the West ETA facilitated the use of watercraft as mobile deterrents. Two motorized 4.5 meter boats and an air boat allowed personnel to approach and deter birds that had landed on the water throughout the 2014 season. The rapid speed, loud noise, and considerable air disturbance generated by the air boat made it a considerably more effective deterrent than the other boats. A second radar station and set of four LRADs was installed and operated at the East ETA in 2014, and will be utilized to deter birds from the area in 2015.

Bird deterrents on the majority of PA water ponds, excluding the West ETA and East ETA described above, were exclusively random-fire propane cannons and land-based visual deterrents (i.e., falcon kites and land effigies; Table 3.7). The OPP1 Crusher Sump Pond (0.03 ha surface area) and the OPP1 Emergency Dump Pond (0.06 ha surface area) were the only PA ponds that did not have any deployed deterrents.

One falcon kite was erected at the Raw Water Pond in order to discourage bird landings there; following common practice for the region, no auditory deterrents were installed despite the pond's relatively large size.

To further deter birds from landing at PA ponds, vegetation was removed from the shoreline wherever possible. With the exception of the West ETA, PA ponds were devoid of potential foraging or breeding habitat. At the West ETA, a few small muskeg mats rose to the surface of the pond over the course of the year but were removed before they could be utilized as breeding habitats by birds.

The migratory patterns of birds were taken into consideration when decommissioning bird deterrents. The majority of waterfowl and shorebirds migrate primarily at night and may land abruptly during inclement weather. Beginning in mid-October, overnight radar scans over the West ETA pond were analyzed for signs of migratory activity and were used to dictate when deterrents would be dismantled and removed from the area. Daytime observations of on-site bird activities were also assessed as indicators of the autumn migration's progress, as were prevailing weather conditions. Using this technique, the migration season concluded in mid-November, with deterrents being removed the following week. No deterrents were intentionally left on PA ponds over the winter.

Deterrent Name	Description	Stimuli	Sound Intensity	Activation	Placement	Number and
Deterrent Name	Description	Stinun	at 1 m (dB)	Control	Flacement	Location
Merlin DeTect	Land-based radar	None,	N/A	N/A, controls	On land	2; one at
Radar System	detection system	but		activation of other		West ETA,
	utilized to detect	linked		deterrents		and one at
	birds flying overhead	to audio				East ETA (as
		stimuli				of September)
Secondary	Radar-linked, noise-	Audio	100 - 130	Radar	On land	See Table 3.7
Deterrent Unit	emitting propane					
	cannon; lasers					
Long Range	Radar-linked sound-	Audio	149	Radar	On land	See Table 3.7
Acoustic Device	emitting speakers					
Lasers	Light emitted from	Visual	N/A	Radar	On land	See Table 3.7
	LRAD stations					
Cannon	Random-firing,	Audio	100 - 130	Random	On land	See Table 3.7
	noise-emitting				and on	
	propane cannon				water	
Human Effigy	Wire frame, high-	Visual	N/A	N/A	On land	See Table 3.7
	visibility coat, hard				and on	
	hat				water	
Barrel Effigy	Barrel raised above	Visual	N/A	N/A	On water	See Table 3.7
	a platform					
Eagle Effigy	Kite resembling a	Visual	N/A	N/A	On land	See Table 3.7
	bird-of-prey					

# Table 3.6: Avian deterrents deployed at Kearl (as of Fall 2014)

		<b>()</b>	Combined Audio &				Audio	o-only		Visual-only				Total		
	<u>ب</u>	ar(s	Vis	ual De	terren	nts²		Deter	rents			Deter	rents			7.01
	ove	adâ	Linke	ed to	N	ot	Linke	ed to	N	ot	Linke	ed to	N	ot		
Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	o) e	fR	Ra	dar	Linl	ked	Ra	dar	Lin	ked	Ra	dar	Lin	ked		
r ond Name	Pond Area water; ha)	Number o	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Units	Density (units/ha)
Basal Water Treatment Pond	0.61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.9
Emergency Extraction Dump Pond	0.32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3.1
Froth Run-off Pond	0.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	7.5
Hydrotransport Pond #1	0.03	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	33.3
Hydrotransport Pond #2	0.09	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	11.1
MSF Run-off Pond	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.7
NODA Runoff Pond	3.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	6	2
OPP1 Crusher Sump	0.03	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OPP1 Drainage Pond	3.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	5	1.6
OPP1 Emergency Dump Pond	0.06	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recycle Water Pond	4.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	5	1.1
West External Tailings Area	348	1	4	0	0	0	0	3	20	32	0	4	30	1	96	0.28
West ETA Drainage Pond 1A	0.39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	7.7
West ETA Drainage Pond 2	1.63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	2.5
East External Tailings Area	75.13	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4	0	0	20	0.26
Muskeg Lake	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Raw Water Pond	1.83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.3

#### Table 3.7: Number of avian radars and deterrents at process-affected ponds at Kearl (as of Fall 2014)

<sup>1</sup>Blue shading: freshwater ponds <sup>2</sup> Combined deterrents count as one unit; individual components are described in Table 3.6

## 3.2.5 Hazing Procedures

Hazing activities were conducted on a case-by-case basis. Bird monitoring crews continued monitoring sessions while hazing activities were taking place. When birds were observed on PA ponds during a monitoring session and hazing was possible, bird monitors contacted nearby operators or bird monitoring and mortality search personnel. This occurred most frequently at the West ETA pond, where monitoring sessions were 30 minutes long. If hazing had not taken place by the time the observation period had ended, or if operators could not arrive to haze the birds before the observation period finished, the bird monitors would proceed with hazing the birds after their monitoring period had ended. Hazing was also conducted on land and water when birds were reported by Contract Supervisors, IOL Tailings Operators and/or contractors.

Hazing at the West ETA pond was generally undertaken by the boat crew under direction of their shore watch, the bird monitor team, or their supervisor. Hazing was most typically undertaken using the airboat. When necessary, the boat crew would slowly position themselves between the targeted bird and floating bitumen, so as to direct the bird away from potential danger. Diving birds in particular were approached with caution when floating bitumen was nearby. The speed and noise of the airboat made it very effective at hazing birds.

Hazing at smaller PA ponds was conducted by monitors wielding air horns or, occasionally, handheld lasers. Approaching the birds was often enough to cause them to leave the area. Hazing typically took place within an hour of the birds being reported, but response times could vary depending on site access and the immediate availability of personnel.

#### 3.3 Methods

The methods utilized for bird monitoring and mortality searches at the Imperial Kearl site in 2014 followed the 2014 OSBCMP protocol (St Clair *et al.* 2014). Any deviations from the protocol are described in this section.

#### 3.3.1 Pond Characteristics

Imperial established the surface area, shoreline composition, and presence of emergent vegetation or islands at the ponds included in the 2014 OSBCMP using satellite imagery and ground truthing. Tables 3.8 and 3.9 summarize the characteristics of Kearl's ponds; definitions of these characteristics are available in the Glossary.

#### 3.3.2 Bird Surveys

The bird monitoring program commenced on April 16<sup>th</sup>, although monitors had been visiting and surveying the onsite ponds since April 1<sup>st</sup>. All 14 PA ponds were visited six times each week, per the 2014 protocol, except the following four: Hydrotransport Ponds 1 and 2, OPP1 Crusher Sump, and OPP1 Emergency Dump Pond. Imperial directed

that these ponds be visited once per week, as very little bird activity had been observed in 2013 (Adamek, C., pers. comm., 2014). Muskeg Lake and the East ETA, both freshwater ponds, were each visited twice per week. The East ETA was under construction for the first part of the 2014 season, and monitoring there did not commence until September. The bird monitors were directed by Imperial to visit a third freshwater pond, the Raw Water Pond, six times per week (Adamek, C., pers. comm., 2014). Appendix 3.A outlines the locations of ponds and survey sites on the Imperial Kearl site.

Three observers worked together during surveys early in the season, but as new workers became familiar with site safety regulations and the monitoring program itself, crews split into two groups in order to survey ponds earlier in the morning. Bird monitoring crews adhered to the daily start times outlined in the 2014 protocol and continued monitoring through the scheduled mid-summer break (July 7<sup>th</sup> to July 24<sup>th</sup>).

Aside from the changes in scheduling outlined above, the only significant deviation from the 2014 protocol was a series of changes in survey locations in the West ETA. Cell construction and beaching in the West ETA throughout 2014 at times rendered established survey sites inaccessible. Bird monitors recorded the GPS coordinates of new survey locations as they were visited, and informed the Program Manager of these changes.

## 3.3.3 Inter-observer Variability (IOV)

Observers at the Kearl site are equipped with the required supplies and training in order to reduce variability between observers. Inter-observer variability (IOV) surveys were used as a training exercise at the Kearl site in 2014. The bird monitoring IOV teams consisted of three people instead of two because two would conduct the survey while the third monitored for wildlife hazards (i.e. bear presence at Muskeg Lake). The two bird monitors making observations would compare notes following the monitoring session and discuss the differences in their results. The outcomes of these discussions would be used to refine all subsequent monitoring sessions. Further clarity and training on the IOV program and its execution will occur in the spring of 2015 with the addition of assistance and expertise provided by biologists that work on the Kearl site.

## 3.3.4 Mortality Searches

Mortality searches at the Kearl site adhered to the recommendations set forth in the 2014 protocol. Two monitors conducted mortality searches together. In addition, Imperial decided to conduct mortality searches at the Raw Water Pond, despite it being a freshwater pond. Searches could be conducted on foot at most locations, but an amphibious all-terrain vehicle (AATV - Argo) was required at the West ETA.

# 3.3.5 Incidental Observations and Reporting

Incidental mortalities are reported directly to the on-site Environment and Regulatory Advisor.

#### 3.4 Results

#### 3.4.1 **Pond Characteristics**

The areas covered at each survey station are shown in Table 3.8 and Appendix 3.A. The only PA pond which was not completely covered by the surrounding survey stations was the West ETA; the center of the pond is too distant to be adequately surveyed from the shore.

Five PA ponds consistently contained floating bitumen in 2014, summarized in Table 3.9. The OPP1 Emergency Dump Pond had the most extensive cover (75-100%), but the small total surface area of the pond; however, the actual area covered by bitumen was roughly 0.05 ha. Hydrotransport Pond #1, Hydrotransport Pond #2, and the Emergency Extraction Dump Pond each had less than 25% bitumen cover and a bitumen surface area of less than 0.1 ha. The West ETA held, by a margin, the largest quantity of floating bitumen at Kearl in 2014, with a mean coverage of almost 70 ha.

No ponds featured islands with appropriate nesting habitat or emergent vegetation in 2014 (Table 3.9). In addition, no sections of shoreline were vegetated at either PA or freshwater ponds. However, vegetation was present nearby at the West ETA (PA) as well as the East ETA and Muskeg Lake (both freshwater). At Muskeg Lake, tree cover was within 100 m of the shoreline in some places. Vegetation near the West ETA was removed throughout August.

Dond Name <sup>1</sup>		Survey Area		Emergent	Shoreline (m)		
Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Survey Station ID	(over water; ha)	Island (ha)	Veg. (ha)	Vegetated	Non-veg.	
Basal Water Treatment Pond	Basal	0.61	0	0	0	350	
Emergency Extraction Dump Pond	E_Emerg_Runoff	0.32	0	0	0	350	
Froth Run-off Pond	Froth_Runoff	0.40	0	0	0	380	
Hydrotransport Pond #1	Hydro_Dump_1	0.03	0	0	0	120	
Hydrotransport Pond #2	Hydro_Dump_2	0.09	0	0	0	140	
MSF Run-off Pond	MSF	1.5	0	0	0	520	
NODA Runoff Pond	Temp_NODA_Runoff	3.0	0	0	0	870	
OPP1 Crusher Sump	OPP1_Crusher_Sump	0.03	0	0	0	110	
OPP1 Drainage Pond	ODP_Drainage	3.2	0	0	0	800	
OPP1 Emergency Dump Pond	OPP1_Emerg_Dump	0.06	0	0	0	210	
Recycle Water Pond	RCW	4.5	0	0	0	830	
	ETA 1*	20	0	0	0	600	
	ETA Main	20	0	0	0	650	
West External Tailings Area	ETA NE	38	0	0	0	750	
West External Failings Area	ETA NW	15	0	0	0	500	
	ETA SW	30	0	0	0	700	
	All Regular Stations	103	0	0	0	2600	
West ETA Drainage Pond 1A	W_ETA_Drainage_Pond1	0.39	0	0	0	400	
West ETA Drainage Pond 2	W_ETA_Drainage_Pond2	1.63	0	0	0	690	
	East_ETA NE						
	East_ETA NW						
East External Tailings Area	East_ETA SE						
	East_ETA SW						
	All Regular Stations	75.13					
Muskeg Lake	KComp2	30	0	0		3000	
Raw Water Pond	Raw_Water	1.83	0	0	0	570	

# Table 3.8: Characteristics of survey stations monitored at Kearl in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds \* Alternative Survey Station (not included in total)

		Bitumen	Bitumen Cover				Shoreline (m)		
Pond Name <sup>1</sup> (Year of Origin)	Pond Content	%²: Mode (Min- Max)	Area <sup>3</sup> (ha): Mean (Min-Max)	(over water; ha)	Island (ha)	Emergent Veg. (ha)	Vegetated	Non-veg.	
Basal Water Treatment Pond (2012)	Process- affected	0 (0 to 16-20)	0	0.61	0	0	0	350	
Emergency Extraction Dump Pond (2012)	Process- affected	6-15 (0 to 76-100)	0.032	0.32	0	0	0	350	
Froth Run-off Pond (2012)	Process- affected	0 (0 to 6-15)	0	0.40	0	0	0	380	
Hydrotransport Pond #1 (2012)	Process- affected	1-5 (0 to 16-25)	0.0009	0.03	0	0	0	120	
Hydrotransport Pond #2 (2012)	Process- affected	6-15 (0 to 76-100)	0.009	0.09	0	0	0	140	
MSF Run-off Pond (2012)	Process- affected	0	0	1.5	0	0	0	520	
NODA Runoff Pond (2012)	Process- affected	0 (0 to 6-15)	0	3.0	0	0	0	870	
OPP1 Crusher Sump (2012)	Process- affected	0 (0 to 16-25)	0	0.03	0	0	0	110	
OPP1 Drainage Pond (2012)	Process- affected	0 (0 to 16-25)	0	3.2	0	0	0	800	
OPP1 Emergency Dump Pond (2012)	Process- affected	76-100 (1-5 to 76-100)	0.05	0.06	0	0	0	210	
Recycle Water Pond (2012)	Process- affected	0 (0 to 6-15)	0	4.5	0	0	0	830	
West External Tailings Area (2013)	Process- affected	16-25 (0 to 26-50)	69.6	103	0	0	0	2600	
West ETA Drainage Pond 1A (2013)	Process- affected	0 (0 to 1-5)	0	0.39	0	0	0	400	
West ETA Drainage Pond 2 (2012)	Process- affected	0 (0 to 16-25)	0	1.63	0	0	0	690	
East External Tailings Area	Freshwater	0	0	75.13					
Muskeg Lake	Freshwater	0	0	30	0	0	0	3000	
Raw Water Pond	Freshwater	0	0	1.83	0	0	0	570	

#### Table 3.9: Characteristics of ponds monitored at Kearl in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds. <sup>2</sup> Estimated during bird surveys. <sup>3</sup> Estimated from satellite imagery

#### 3.4.2 Bird Observations

The numbers and duration of surveys conducted at each survey station are summarized in Table 3.10, while surveys are summarized by pond in Table 3.11. Bird surveys began in April for all ponds except the East ETA, at which surveys began in September when the area became accessible. Due to site access issues, an alternate survey site at the West ETA (ETA 1) was utilized 38 times in 2014. In terms of completing scheduled surveys, the NODA Run-off Pond was the least-visited pond due to construction and access issues, with 77% of scheduled surveys completed. The mean number of landed waterbirds observed by hour after sunrise is provided in Appendix 3.B.

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Survey Duration (min)	Survey Station ID	Survey Area (over water; ha)	# Surveys Conducted in 2014
Basal Water Treatment Pond	10	Basal	0.61	170
Emergency Extraction Dump Pond	10	E_Emerg_Runoff	0.32	142
Froth Run-off Pond	10	Froth_Runoff	0.40	163
Hydrotransport Pond #1	10	Hydro_Dump_1	0.03	24
Hydrotransport Pond #2	10	Hydro_Dump_2	0.09	25
MSF Run-off Pond	10	MSF	1.5	157
NODA Runoff Pond	10	Temp_NODA_Runoff	3.0	135
OPP1 Crusher Sump	10	OPP1_Crusher_Sump	0.03	23
OPP1 Drainage Pond	10	ODP_Drainage	3.2	160
OPP1 Emergency Dump Pond	10	OPP1_Emerg_Dump	0.06	24
Recycle Water Pond	10	RCW	4.5	169
		ETA 1	20	38
		ETA Main	20	154
West External Tailings Area	30	ETA NE	38	165
		ETA NW	15	130
		ETA SW	30	161
West ETA Drainage Pond 1A	10	W_ETA_Drainage_Pond1	0.39	163
West ETA Drainage Pond 2	10	W_ETA_Drainage_Pond2	1.63	159
		East_ETA NE		31
East External Tailings Area	30	East_ETA NW		31
Last External rainings Area	50	East_ETA SE		26
		East_ETA SW		29
Muskeg Lake	30*	KComp2	30	52
Raw Water Pond	10	Raw_Water	1.83	157

Table 3.10: Bird survey effort by station at Kearl in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds

\* At Muskeg Lake, there were 48 surveys of 30 min and four surveys of 10 min, due to human error

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	# Survey Stations	Survey Area (over water; ha)	Survey Area as % of Pond Area (over water; ha)	Duration of Surveys (min)	Scheduled Monitoring Frequency (days/week)	# Surveys Conducted in 2014	% Days with all scheduled surveys conducted
Basal Water Treatment Pond	1	0.61	100	10	6	170	100
Emergency Extraction Dump Pond	1	0.32	100	10	6	142	82
Froth Run-off Pond	1	0.40	100	10	6	163	96
Hydrotransport Pond #1	1	0.03	100	10	1	24	85
Hydrotransport Pond #2	1	0.09	100	10	1	25	88
MSF Run-off Pond	1	1.5	100	10	6	157	92
NODA Runoff Pond	1	3.0	100	10	6	135	77
OPP1 Crusher Sump	1	0.03	100	10	1	23	81
OPP1 Drainage Pond	1	3.2	100	10	6	160	94
OPP1 Emergency Dump Pond	1	0.06	100	10	1	24	85
Recycle Water Pond	1	4.5	100	10	6	169	99
West External Tailings Area	4	103	29.6	30	6	648	95
West ETA Drainage Pond 1A	1	0.39	100	10	6	163	95
West ETA Drainage Pond 2	1	1.63	100	10	6	159	93
East External Tailings Area**	4	75.13	100	30	6	117	101
Muskeg Lake	1	30	100	30*	2	52	90
Raw Water Pond	1	1.83	100	10	6	157	92

# Table 3.11: Bird survey effort by pond at Kearl in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds

\* At Muskeg Lake, there were 48 surveys of 30 min and four surveys of 10 min, due to human error

\*\* New pond; monitoring started in September 2014

The number of observations by pond and guild is summarized in Table 3.12. No landed birds were observed at three PA ponds (Hydrotransport Pond #1, OPP1 Crusher Sump, OPP1 Emergency Dump Pond). Five PA ponds featured more than 100 observed landed birds in 2014 (Basal Water Treatment Pond, MSF Run-off Pond, NODA Runoff Pond, West ETA, West ETA Drainage Pond 2). Of these five ponds, monitors detected more landed birds at the West ETA (1,016) than the remaining four ponds combined. Almost half of all landed birds at PA ponds were detected at the West ETA. In addition, more birds were observed flying over the West ETA (3,610) than at all other PA and freshwater ponds combined (3,106). The West ETA was monitored from four survey station per day and for 30 minutes at each station, making it the most closely monitored pond at Kearl. As such, a higher number of birds being observed at this pond is to be expected.

Approximately 55 landed birds were observed per hectare (1,761 birds in total) at the three freshwater ponds surveyed in 2014 (Raw Water Pond, Muskeg Lake, East ETA). In comparison, approximately 17 landed birds were observed per hectare at 14 PA ponds. The most active freshwater pond was Muskeg Lake (1,058 landed birds, 468 flying birds).

Of ponds visited through the entire 2014 season, the West ETA was the most active PA pond, and the most active pond overall. It was also, by a wide margin, the largest pond visited by Kearl bird monitors in 2014 (see Table 3.7). The second-most active pond at Kearl was Muskeg Lake, which is also the second-largest pond overall.

Of the target guilds, the largest numbers of landed dabblers (340), divers (396), and gulls (177) all appeared at Muskeg Lake, a freshwater pond. The most landed waders were detected at the Basal Water Treatment Pond and West ETA Drainage Pond 2, both PA ponds (145 each). Total number of landed non-target birds observed at the East ETA was 465, which is the highest number of landed non-target birds at any pond despite the East ETA not being visited until September. More members of each guild were observed flying over the West ETA than at any other pond.

On average, more landed birds of each guild were observed per survey at freshwater ponds than at PA ponds (see Table 3.13). At PA ponds, a landed bird was detected once every 1.67 surveys, while 8.72 birds were detected per survey at freshwater ponds. On average, fewer than five landed waterbirds were detected per survey at each pond except at Muskeg Lake, which averaged 19.91 landed waterbirds per survey (see Figure 3.2).

More oiled birds were observed at West ETA Drainage Pond 2 per survey (0.182) than at any other pond (see Table 3.14). However, this value was exceeded at two survey sites in the West ETA (0.224 at ETA NE; 0.254 at ETA NW); the overall average of the West ETA was 0.164. Across all PA ponds, the average number of oiled birds detected per survey was 0.034. The average number of oiled birds detected at freshwater ponds per survey in 2014 was 0.006. While birds could not come into contact with bitumen at freshwater ponds, they could become oiled elsewhere before traveling to and being

observed at a freshwater pond. The mean number of oiled birds per survey at each survey station is illustrated in Figure 3.3.

Appendix 3.C summarizes the number of bird observations at Kearl PA ponds in 2014. Among landed birds, killdeer were detected most often by bird monitors (156 observations). Killdeer, sandhill cranes, and Baird's sandpipers, all wading species, were most commonly identified as being oiled. Despite this, only one individual of these three species resulted in a mortality. Canada geese and snow geese flew overhead in the largest numbers (1358 and 1208, respectively). Canada geese accounted for 16 detected mortalities. Four were found during searches and another 12 were found incidentally, the most of any species at Kearl.

	Dabblers		Divers		Waders		Gulls		Non-target		Total <sup>3</sup>	
Pond Name <sup>2</sup>	Landed	Flew Over	Landed	Flew Over	Landed	Flew Over	Landed	Flew Over	Landed	Flew Over	Landed	Flew Over
Basal Water Treatment Pond	6	0	30	2	145	1	4	3	35	121	220	128
Emergency Extraction Dump Pond	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	35	11	35
Froth Run-off Pond	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	2	1	27	5	29
Hydrotransport Pond #1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	9
Hydrotransport Pond #2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
MSF Run-off Pond	18	40	62	0	59	1	29	2	30	275	198	318
NODA Runoff Pond	20	30	42	0	42	12	2	0	191	17	297	64
OPP1 Crusher Sump	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	6	0	8
OPP1 Drainage Pond	0	89	0	1	22	5	1	30	13	55	36	180
OPP1 Emergency Dump Pond	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10
Recycle Water Pond	2	200	1	0	1	5	6	16	22	190	32	411
West External Tailings Area	59	1,717	365	58	141	170	153	171	206	1,456	1,016	3,610
West ETA Drainage Pond 1A	5	365	0	0	13	1	0	0	9	44	27	410
West ETA Drainage Pond 2	3	167	7	0	145	6	1	4	68	135	224	312
Total (Process-affected Ponds)	113	2,608	509	61	571	202	196	229	586	2,380	2,067	5,524
East External Tailings Area	65	110	0	17	9	3	0	1	465	318	611	432
Muskeg Lake	340	168	396	16	121	38	177	61	23	132	1,058	468
Raw Water Pond	1	0	8	0	20	8	13	6	50	278	92	292
Total (Freshwater Ponds)	406	278	421	33	150	49	190	68	538	728	1,761	1,192

Table 3.12: Number of bird observations by pond and guild at Kearl in 2014<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times
 <sup>2</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds
 <sup>3</sup> Includes unknown duck species (which may be dabblers or divers)

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Survey Station ID	Dabblers	Divers	Waders	Gulls	Non-target Guilds	All Guilds <sup>2</sup>
Basal Water Treatment Pond	Basal	0.04	0.18	0.85	0.02	0.21	1.29
Emergency Extraction Dump Pond	E_Emerg_Runoff	0	0	0	0	0.08	0.08
Froth Run-off Pond	Froth_Runoff	0	0.01	0.01	0	0.01	0.03
Hydrotransport Pond #1	Hydro_Dump_1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hydrotransport Pond #2	Hydro_Dump_2	0	0	0.04	0	0	0.04
MSF Run-off Pond	MSF	0.11	0.39	0.38	0.18	0.19	1.26
NODA Runoff Pond	Temp_NODA_Runoff	0.15	0.31	0.31	0.01	1.41	2.20
OPP1 Crusher Sump	OPP1_Crusher_Sump	0	0	0	0	0	0
OPP1 Drainage Pond	ODP_Drainage	0	0	0.14	0.01	0.08	0.23
OPP1 Emergency Dump Pond	OPP1_Emerg_Dump	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recycle Water Pond	RCW	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.13	0.19
West External Tailings Area	ETA 1	0.45	0.24	0.21	0.55	0.13	1.63
	ETA Main	0.02	0.12	0.03	0.05	0.54	0.75
	ETA NE	0.13	0.88	0.42	0.61	0.22	2.27
	ETA NW	0.11	1.24	0.22	0.14	0.54	2.92
	ETA SW	0.02	0.19	0.19	0.04	0.07	0.52
	Mean across surveys	0.09	0.56	0.22	0.24	0.32	1.57
West ETA Drainage Pond 1A	W_ETA_Drainage_Pond1	0.03	0	0.08	0	0.06	0.17
West ETA Drainage Pond 2	W_ETA_Drainage_Pond2	0.02	0.04	0.91	0.01	0.43	1.41
All Process-affected Ponds	Mean across ponds	0.03	0.11	0.21	0.04	0.21	0.60
East External Tailings Area	East_ETA NE	1.74	0.42	0.29	0	1.03	3.48
	East_ETA NW	0.03	0.13	0	0	0.23	0.39
	East_ETA SE	0.38	0	0	0	14.50	17.00
	East_ETA SW	0	0	0	0	1.69	1.69
	Mean across surveys	0.56	0.15	0.08	0	3.97	5.22
Muskeg Lake	KComp2	6.54	7.62	2.33	3.40	0.44	20.35
Raw Water Pond	Raw_Water	0.01	0.05	0.13	0.08	0.32	0.59
All Freshwater Ponds	Mean across ponds	2.37	2.60	0.84	1.16	1.58	8.72

 Table 3.13: Mean number of landed birds per survey at Kearl in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds.<sup>2</sup> Includes unknown duck species (which may be dabblers or divers).
Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Survey Station ID	Dabblers	Divers	Waders	Gulls	Non-target Guilds	All Guilds <sup>2</sup>
Basal Water Treatment Pond	Basal	0	0	0.076	0	0	0.076
Emergency Extraction Dump Pond	E_Emerg_Runoff	0	0	0	0	0	0
Froth Run-off Pond	Froth_Runoff	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hydrotransport Pond #1	Hydro_Dump_1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hydrotransport Pond #2	Hydro_Dump_2	0	0	0	0	0	0
MSF Run-off Pond	MSF	0	0	0.006	0	0	0.006
NODA Runoff Pond	Temp_NODA_Runoff	0.007	0	0	0	0	0.007
OPP1 Crusher Sump	OPP1_Crusher_Sump	0	0	0.043	0	0	0.043
OPP1 Drainage Pond	ODP_Drainage	0	0	0	0	0	0
OPP1 Emergency Dump Pond	OPP1_Emerg_Dump	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recycle Water Pond	RCW	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ETA 1	0.053	0	0	0	0	0.053
	ETA Main	0.019	0.039	0.019	0.032	0.013	0.123
West External Tailings Area	ETA NE	0.061	0.012	0.145	0.006	0	0.224
West External Tailings Area	ETA NW	0.023	0	0.031	0	0	0.254
	ETA SW	0.012	0.012	0.025	0.025	0.019	0.093
	Mean across surveys	0.031	0.015	0.054	0.015	0.008	0.164
West ETA Drainage Pond 1A	W_ETA_Drainage_Pond1	0	0	0	0	0	0
West ETA Drainage Pond 2	W_ETA_Drainage_Pond2	0	0	0.182	0	0	0.182
All Process-affected Ponds	Mean across ponds	0.003	0.001	0.026	0.001	0.001	0.034
	East_ETA NE	0.032	0	0	0	0	0.032
	East_ETA NW	0.032	0	0	0	0	0.032
East External Tailings Area	East_ETA SE	0	0	0	0	0	0
	East_ETA SW	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mean across surveys	0.017	0	0	0	0	0.017
Muskeg Lake	KComp2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Raw Water Pond	Raw_Water	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Freshwater Ponds	Mean across ponds	0.006	0	0	0	0	0.006

Table 3.14: Mean number of oiled birds per survey at Kearl in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds. <sup>2</sup> Includes unknown duck species (which may be dabblers or divers)



\* Freshwater Ponds.

Figure 3.2: Mean number of landed waterbirds per survey at Kearl in 2014.



\* Freshwater Ponds.

Figure 3.3: Mean number of oiled birds per survey at Kearl in 2014.

Three broods, all killdeer, were observed at PA ponds during bird surveys at Kearl in 2014 (Table 3.15). Two of the killdeer broods were found at West ETA Drainage Pond 2, while the third was at the Temporary NODA Pond.

process-affected ponds at Kearl in 2014							
Species	# Brood Observations <sup>1</sup>						
Killdeer	3						

# Table 3.15: Brood observations by species at process-affected ponds at Kearl in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Each brood may contain one to multiple chicks; broods may be observed repeatedly and thus be counted multiple times

#### 3.4.3 Inter-observer Variability

No comparison surveys were completed at the Imperial Kearl site in 2014.

#### 3.4.4 Mortalities

The mortality search effort at Kearl is summarized in Table 3.16. In total, 38.8 hours were spent and 180.2 km covered searching for mortalities at PA ponds, while a further 1.3 hours and 6.3 km were spent at the Raw Water Pond, a freshwater pond near the plant. Figure 3.4 illustrates the relationship between pond area, mortality search effort, and mortality search results. The number of days on which mortality searches were conducted remained roughly the same for all ponds, regardless of surface area. For ponds with less than 10 ha surface area, the total number of hours spent searching and the total distance searched were roughly equivalent. At the West ETA, which featured 103 ha of survey area over water, more hours were dedicated to mortality searches (16.5, compared to 2.6 at the Froth Run-off Pond), and a greater distance was covered during these searches (116.2 km, compared to 9.8 at West ETA Drainage Pond 2).

Pond Name <sup>2</sup>	# Days Searched	Bo	oat	Walk		Truck		Total	
	" Duyo ocuronou	h	km	h	km	h	km	h	km
Basal Water Treatment Pond	14	0	0	0.6	1.9	0.9	4.1	1.5	6.0
Emergency Extraction Dump Pond	11	0	0	0.7	1.2	0.6	1.6	1.3	2.7
Froth Run-off Pond	12	0	0	2.6	4.7	0.1	0.4	2.6	5.2
Hydrotransport Pond #1	13	0	0	1.2	1.5	0	0	1.2	1.5
Hydrotransport Pond #2	11	0	0	1.4	1.3	0	0	1.4	1.3
MSF Run-off Pond	13	0	0	1.7	2.7	0	0	1.7	2.7
NODA Runoff Pond	10	0	0	0.5	1.8	1.2	6.8	1.7	8.6
OPP1 Crusher Sump	13	0	0	1.3	0.7	0	0	1.3	0.7
OPP1 Drainage Pond	12	0	0	0.9	2.3	1.1	5.5	2.0	7.8
OPP1 Emergency Dump Pond	13	0	0	0.3	0.5	1.1	1.9	1.4	2.4
Recycle Water Pond	14	0	0	0.7	2.1	1.1	7.5	1.8	9.6
West External Tailings Area	13	12.4	105.2	0	0	4.1	11.0	16.5	116.2
West ETA Drainage Pond 1A	14	0	0	0.8	1.7	1.3	4.0	2.1	5.7
West ETA Drainage Pond 2	13	0	0	1.2	3.0	1.2	6.9	2.5	9.8
Total (Process-affected Ponds)		12.4	105.2	13.7	25.4	12.8	49.6	38.8	180.2
Raw Water Pond	14	0	0	0.3	1.2	1.0	5.1	1.3	6.3
Muskeg Lake	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
East ETA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total (Freshwater Ponds)	14	0	0	0.3	1.2	1.0	5.1	1.3	6.3

Table 3.16: Mortality search effort at Kearl in 2014<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Includes route-based and focused transects; for each search, either distance OR area counted towards effort <sup>2</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds

Mortality searches yielded four mortalities, all in the West ETA (Table 3.17). These four birds were all Canada geese and were detected on August 17<sup>th</sup> via a focused truck-based search along the shoreline of the northeast corner of the tailings pond. All four were alive when they were first observed but were at least 75% covered in bitumen. One was recovered and euthanized, while the remaining three could not be recovered and are assumed to have died in the tailings area soon afterwards. Thirty-nine (39) incidental mortalities were discovered at Kearl PA ponds in 2014, including 37 at the West ETA. Table 3.18 summarizes the mortality numbers for each species discovered at Kearl in 2014. One heavily-oiled Canada goose was detected incidentally at the East ETA Tailings Pond, which contained freshwater in 2014. This bird was not recovered and is assumed to have died shortly after its discovery. Appendix 3.D summarizes bird oiling and mortality events at the Kearl site in 2014.

The proportion of birds detected at PA ponds by guild is depicted in Figure 3.5. Dabblers represent one quarter of all birds recorded that made contact with bitumen during monitoring surveys However, dabblers were the only guild detected during mortality searches and comprised over 40% of incidental mortality observations.

Table 3.19 summarizes bird surveys, mortalities and incidental results by pond at Kearl in 2014. 28 of the 44 birds identified as mortalities were alive when first observed, and all but six were oiled to some extent. The detection of mortalities did not have clear peaks throughout the 2014 season, although small increases were evident between May 14<sup>th</sup> and May 21<sup>st</sup>, as well as a later increase on August 17<sup>th</sup> (see Figure 3.6). Both peaks took place during periods of migration.

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Mortality Search	Incidental	Total
Basal Water Treatment Pond	0	1	1
Emergency Extraction Dump Pond	0	0	0
Froth Run-off Pond	0	0	0
Hydrotransport Pond #1	0	0	0
Hydrotransport Pond #2	0	0	0
MSF Run-off Pond	0	0	0
NODA Runoff Pond	0	0	0
OPP1 Crusher Sump	0	0	0
OPP1 Drainage Pond	0	1	1
OPP1 Emergency Dump Pond	0	0	0
Recycle Water Pond	0	0	0
West External Tailings Area	4	37	41
West ETA Drainage Pond 1A	0	0	0
West ETA Drainage Pond 2	0	0	0
Total (Process-affected Ponds)	4	39	43
East External Tailings Area	0	1	1
Raw Water Pond	0	0	0
Muskeg Lake	0	0	0
Total (Freshwater Ponds)	0	1	1

Table 3.17: Number of mortalities by pond at Kearl in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds

Contacted Bitumen <sup>1</sup> Mortality											
Spacios/Spacios Group	Contacted	Bitumen	Mortality								
Species/Species Gloup	Bird Survey	Incidental	Search	Incidental							
	Wa	terbirds	1	T							
Killdeer	29										
Sandhill Crane	18			1							
Baird's Sandpiper	10										
Canada Goose	10		4	11							
California Gull	9			1							
Canvasback	6										
Northern Shoveler	6										
Mallard	4										
Spotted Sandpiper	4										
Lesser Yellowlegs	3	1									
Greater Yellowlegs	3										
Red-necked Grebe	3										
Semipalmated Sandpiper	3										
American Wigeon	2										
Bonaparte's Gull	1			4							
Common Loon	1										
Northern Pintail	1										
Unknown Gull				4							
Unknown Dabbling Duck				3							
Unknown Duck				3							
Common Tern				2							
Pied-billed Grebe				2							
Common Merganser				1							
Eared Grebe				1							
Herring Gull				1							
Unknown Sandpiper				1							
	Non-ta	rget Guilds		•							
Common Raven	5										
Barn Swallow				1							
Horned Lark				1							
Sharp-tailed Grouse				1							
Tree Swallow				1							
Total	118	1	4	39							

#### Table 3.18: Number of observations of oiling and mortalities, by species, at Kearl in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days or also observed as mortalities, and thus be counted multiple times



Figure 3.4: Relationship between pond area (over water), mortality search effort, and mortality search results



<sup>\*</sup> Incidental observations

Figure 3.5: Proportion of each guild for birds that flew over or landed at processaffected ponds, contacted bitumen, or died at Kearl in 2014.



\*Individual birds may be observed repeatedly during consecutive days

Figure 3.6: Timing of bird landings, oiling, and mortalities in spring (top) and fall (bottom) 2014 at Kearl.

	Pond		% Days	N Wate	/lean # erbirds	Lande per Su	d Irvey	# Species Landed		# Obsolutions Vations Oiled B	er- s of irds	# Mortalities	
Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Area (over water; ha)	Potential Attractants	with Floating Bitumen Present	Dabblers	Divers	Waders	Gulls	Total <sup>2</sup>	Conservation Concern <sup>3</sup>	Per Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental
West External Tailings Area	348	Large surface area, vegetation near northern and eastern shorelines	99	0.09	0.56	0.22	0.24	31	6	0.164	0	4	37
Recycle Water Pond	4.5	Relatively large surface area	1	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.04	7	0	0	0	0	0
OPP1 Drainage Pond	3.2	Relatively large surface area	10	0	0	0.14	0.01	9	1	0	0	0	1
NODA Runoff Pond	3.0	Relatively large surface area	2	0.15	0.31	0.31	0.01	16	2	0.007	0	0	0
West ETA Drainage Pond 2	1.63	Relatively large surface area	40	0.02	0.04	0.91	0.01	18	1	0.182	0	0	0
MSF Run-off Pond	1.5	Relatively large surface area	0	0.11	0.39	0.38	0.18	26	3	0.006	0	0	0
Basal Water Treatment Pond	0.61	None	1	0.04	0.18	0.85	0.02	20	3	0.076	0	0	1
Froth Run-off Pond	0.40	None	6	0	0.01	0.01	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
West ETA Drainage Pond 1A	0.39	None	3	0.03	0	0.08	0	12	2	0	0	0	0
Emergency Extraction Dump Pond	0.32	None	99	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Hydrotransport Pond #2	0.09	None	96	0	0	0.04	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
OPP1 Emergency Dump Pond	0.06	None	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OPP1 Crusher Sump	0.03	None	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.043	0	0	0
Hydrotransport Pond #1	0.03	None	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Process-affected Ponds	363.76			0.03	0.11	0.21	0.04	55	12	0.034	1	4	39

### Table 3.19: Summary of bird survey, mortality and incidental results by pond at Kearl in 2014

	Pond		% Days	Mean # Landed Waterbirds per Survey				# Species Landed		# Obser- vations of Oiled Birds		# Mortalities	
Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Area (over water; ha)	Potential Attractants	with Floating Bitumen Present	Dabblers	Divers	Waders	Gulls	Total <sup>2</sup>	Conservation Concern <sup>3</sup>	Per Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental
East External Tailings Area	75.13	Multiple small ponds, emergent and land- based vegetation	0	0.56	0.15	0.08	0	13	0	0.017	0	0	1
Muskeg Lake	30	Large surface area, isolated location, vegetation near shoreline, adjacent to Kearl Lake	0	6.54	7.62	2.33	3.40	41	9	0	0	0	0
Raw Water Pond	1.83	Relatively large surface area	0	0.01	0.05	0.13	0.08	13	1	0	0	0	0
All Freshwater Ponds	106.96			2.37	2.60	0.84	1.16	51	10	0.006	0	0	1

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds. <sup>2</sup> During bird surveys. <sup>3</sup> Includes incidental observations.

#### 3.4.5 Species of Conservation Concern

Seven waterbird species of conservation concern were observed at PA ponds in 2014 (Table 3.5). Sandhill cranes, green-winged teals, northern pintails, lesser scaup, horned grebes, pied-billed grebes, and great blue herons are all ranked as 'Sensitive' in the Alberta Wild Species General Status Listing (Government of Alberta, 2010). Eighteen (18) sandhill cranes were observed contacting bitumen in 2014, and one incidental mortality was also recorded. One northern pintail was observed contacting bitumen, and two pied-billed grebe mortalities were found through incidental observation.

Seven non-target species of conservation concern were also observed during bird surveys at Kearl in 2014 (Table 3.5). Bank swallows, rusty blackbirds, eastern phoebes, northern harriers, bald eagles, broad-winged hawks, and sharp-tailed grouse are all ranked as 'Sensitive' in the Alberta Wild Species General Status Listing (Government of Alberta, 2010). Appendix 3.C lists the number of bird observations by species at Kearl's PA ponds.

#### 3.5 Discussion

Bird monitors observed 59 landed dabbling ducks at the West ETA, the most of any PA ponds on the Kearl site in 2014 (Table 3.12). A further 20 were observed at the NODA Runoff Pond, and 18 were seen at the MSF Run-off Pond. Fewer than 10 dabbling ducks were seen at each of the remaining PA ponds in 2014. The West ETA, NODA Runoff Pond, and MSF Run-off Pond are the largest, fourth-largest, and sixth-largest PA ponds at Kearl in terms of surface area, and this may be a factor in the large number of dabbling ducks found at these locations. In terms of dabbling ducks observed flying overhead at PA ponds, more than 100 birds were recorded at the West ETA (1717). West ETA Drainage Pond 1A (365), the Recycle Water Pond (200), and West ETA Drainage Pond 2 (167). The West ETA was monitored from four stations in 2014 (a fifth was utilized when access was an issue at one of the other four stations) and is the largest pond at Kearl, which explains the high number of dabbling ducks observed. The Recycle Water Pond, which had the third-highest number of dabbling ducks flying overhead, had only two confirmed landings. The Recycle Water Pond is the secondlargest PA pond and has the fifth-lowest density of bird deterrents (1.1 units/ha; see Table 3.7) at Kearl, so a higher number of landed dabblers might have been expected. However, this pond does not feature vegetation nearby and is in close proximity to the Kearl plant; both factors may have aided in deterring birds from the area.

Three hundred sixty-five (365) diving ducks were recorded landing at the West ETA; no other PA pond featured more than 100 observations. Additionally, 58 of the 61 diving birds observed flying overhead at PA ponds were seen at the West ETA. The large surface area of the West ETA is a likely explanation for the relatively large number of diving birds observed there.

The most landed wading birds were observed at West ETA Drainage Pond 2 and the Basal Water Treatment Pond (145 each). One hundred forty-one (141) landed waders were seen at the West ETA, while no other PA pond featured more than 100 observations. Other than the West ETA (170), no PA ponds had more than 100 waders fly overhead during monitoring sessions. In terms of observations of landed birds, waders were by far the most prevalent of all target guilds at the Basal Water Treatment Pond and West ETA Drainage Pond 2. Vegetation was sparse at both ponds, particularly at the Basal Water Treatment Pond, but both also featured sandy, gravelly terrain that may have attracted sandpipers. Bird deterrent coverage at the Basal Water Treatment Pond was high (4.9 units/ha; both visual and auditory units), but this did not appear to deter wading birds from frequenting the pond.

One hundred seventy (170) landed gulls were observed at the West ETA, while the second-most observations (29) were made at the MSF Run-off Pond. In 2013, California gulls and Bonaparte's gulls successfully nested on muskeg mats floating on the West ETA, and the relatively high number of gull observations this year might be explained by gulls returning to what had been a successful breeding site. No muskeg mats were present throughout the course of the breeding season in 2014, and no gull nests were found at the West ETA over the same period. This apparent failure to breed on PA ponds may result in fewer gulls visiting the site next year.

The West ETA (206 birds) and NODA Runoff Pond (191 birds) were the only PA ponds that featured more than 100 landed non-target birds in 2014. Of the 2,380 observations of non-target birds flying over PA ponds, 1,456 were made at the West ETA while 17 were made at the NODA Runoff Pond. The majority of non-target observations at Kearl were of resident ravens, which are at a low risk of coming into contact with bitumen.

The West ETA featured the highest total of landed bird observations (1016), followed by the NODA Runoff Pond (297), West ETA Drainage Pond 2 (224), the Basal Water Treatment Pond (220), and the MSF Run-off Pond (198). Fewer than 100 observations were made at each of the remaining nine PA ponds at Kearl. The five ponds listed above comprise five of the seven largest PA ponds at site. The Recycle Water Pond and OPP1 Drainage Pond, despite being the second- and third-largest ponds at Kearl, featured relatively few observations of landed birds. Neither pond had relatively dense deterrent coverage; the OPP1 Drainage Pond ranked ninth among the 14 PA ponds at site, while the Recycle Water Pond ranked tenth. The features of these two ponds warrant further investigation in 2015, as there may be factors that are serving to deter birds that could be put to use elsewhere at Kearl to reduce landed bird observations. Both ponds are adjacent to industrial facilities, and the noise or human presence at these facilities (along with a lack of natural habitat) may be serving as a deterrent to wildlife.

Muskeg Lake, a freshwater pond, featured the most landed dabblers, divers, and gulls of all ponds included in Kearl's 2014 bird monitoring program. Overall, more landed birds were observed at Muskeg Lake than at any other pond. The East ETA, another freshwater pond in 2014, was the site of the most observations of landed non-target

birds, despite monitoring at this pond not commencing until September. Of the 384 total bird observations made at the Raw Water Pond, 278 were non-target flyovers. Following a period of heavy fog, approximately 300 diving and dabbling ducks were observed on the Raw Water Pond on November 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>, although it is likely that the same individuals were counted on both days.

Muskeg Lake and the East ETA ranked first and second, respectively, in the mean number of landed birds observed per survey at each pond at Kearl in 2014 (Table 3.13). The mean number of landed birds observed per survey at freshwater ponds was over 14 times higher than that of PA ponds. These findings indicate that more birds are visiting, staying, and potentially breeding at freshwater ponds at the Kearl site than at PA ponds in the same area. While this result is encouraging, it also suggests that the East ETA may become a priority for bird deterrence efforts in 2015, as PA water will enter this pond following the peak bird nesting season.

Of the 43 mortalities detected at Kearl in 2014, both through searches and incidental observations, 40 were at the West ETA Tailings Pond. 37 of the West ETA mortalities had some degree of oil coverage. The other three were not oiled and died of unknown causes. Contact with bitumen in the West ETA was the dominant cause of bird mortalities at the Kearl site in 2014.

The large size of the West ETA Tailings Pond, as well as the extensive cover of bitumen on its surface, clearly made it the largest on-site threat to migratory and breeding birds in 2014. To mitigate this threat, the most extensive bird BDDS at Kearl has been installed in the West ETA, including radar-linked LRADs and lasers, random-fire propane cannons, and visual deterrents. The spread of bitumen is managed by booms, and boat crews were qualified to haze landed birds using boats. The 38 West ETA mortalities are put into context by the 3610 birds observed flying over the pond by monitors, the 1016 birds identified as landed at the pond, as well as the amount of time spent monitoring for flyovers and landed birds.

Of the three mortalities discovered at Kearl that were not at the West ETA Pond, two were not oiled. These individuals were found at the Basal Water Treatment Pond and the OPP1 Drainage Pond. The third mortality, a Canada goose, was found in the East ETA and had 75-100% oil coverage. Ponds in the East ETA did not house PA water in 2014, so this individual must have contacted bitumen at another pond and subsequently travelled to the East ETA. The amount of bitumen coverage eventually rendered this goose incapable of flight. The West ETA is less than a kilometer and is likely the site at which the goose was oiled.

Thirty-nine (39) mortalities were detected incidentally, compared to four found through scheduled searches. Incidental mortalities were reported either by workers in the area or bird monitors during scheduled bird monitoring sessions. Confirmed mortalities would be retrieved whenever possible, in some cases safety concerns would prevent workers from approaching the area where a dead bird had been identified. When birds were heavily oiled but alive, efforts to capture the birds were made by bird monitors, on-site

biologists, or the Imperial Environment and Regulatory Advisors. No capture of live birds was undertaken without the knowledge and advice of E&R Advisors, who engaged ESRD prior to authorizing any activity.

Seven waterbird species identified as species of concern were observed at the Kearl site in 2014 (Table 3.5). Of these species, two (18 sandhill cranes and one northern pintail) were observed making contact with bitumen. One sandhill crane was discovered as an incidental mortality, as were two pied-billed grebes. These three individuals were each 75-100% covered in bitumen when discovered and represent the only bitumen-related mortalities among species of concern at the Kearl site this past year. One barn swallow and one sharp-tailed grouse were also found dead on site, but neither individual had come into contact with bitumen. Causes of death were not determined.

The most significant potential contributor to bias in data collection during bird monitoring at Kearl was likely the intermittent availability of monitoring stations at the West ETA Pond. Construction, beaching, and related activities in the area regularly restricted access to monitoring sites. Safe access had been identified as a concern before the 2014 monitoring program had begun, and an alternative site (ETA 1) was established to mitigate the issue. In some cases, bird monitors surveyed from more suitable vantage points; GPS coordinates of these sites were delivered to OMEI in order to better track changes to the monitoring program. Changes to monitoring station locations may reduce the reliability of the data being collected, but given the nature of the construction, it is not realistic to expect that the same stations would be available every day over the course of the monitoring program. Regular communication with operators in the West ETA may help reduce the duration over which a survey station is made unavailable or facilitate the creation of alternate access routes.

Three broods were detected during the 2014 monitoring program at Kearl, all of which were killdeer. Killdeer nests are regularly observed at Kearl by wildlife biologists during nest sweeps, and the species is considered resident during the breeding season. Killdeer, despite being shorebirds, are often found some distance from water and can nest in gravelly or sandy areas (Jackson & Jackson, 2000). Gravel and sand are both common at the Kearl site, and the observed broods may not have hatched near PA ponds. Other target species known to have nested at Kearl in recent years include greater and lesser yellowlegs, green-winged teals, mallards, and sandhill cranes. Common terns, California gulls, and Bonaparte's gulls all nested successfully at Kearl in 2013, but nesting attempts were dramatically reduced this year; these species had relied on floating muskeg mats on the West ETA Pond, which were removed as the breeding season finished in 2013. Barn and bank swallows also regularly nest at Kearl, as do ravens, but none of these species is targeted by the OSBCMP nor are they at high risk of coming into contact with PA water.

The largest effect on bird numbers at Kearl's ponds in 2014 relative to the previous year was the removal of vegetation along the northern and eastern shores of the West ETA Pond Canada geese, green-winged and blue-winged teals, sandhill cranes, killdeer, greater and lesser yellowlegs and other sandpiper species had been observed foraging

in these areas over the summer, particularly north of the pond. Nest sweep surveys undertaken during the vegetation removal process also led to the observation of numerous sandhill fledglings. With the vegetation removed and mitigative strategies to prevent its return in 2015, the anticipation is that fewer birds will stage in these areas.

Vegetation was also prevalent in the East ETA in 2014, although much of it had been removed or buried by the time monitoring began in September. Again, it is possible that fewer birds will visit the area in 2015, as foraging and nesting conditions will be more limited than in 2014. The same removal and preventative strategies employed at the West ETA in 2014 and 2015 will be employed at the East ETA in order to further reduce the area's attractiveness to birds.

The largest change in monitoring results from 2013 to 2014 came at the West ETA. In 2013, floating muskeg mats on the tailings pond provided foraging and nesting habitat for many bird species, and 3768 landed birds were observed at the pond over the course of 2013. The muskeg mats were removed by the end of August, and mats that floated to the surface afterwards were removed before vegetation could grow and provide new habitat for birds. In 2014, no muskeg mats were available for breeding birds, and a total of 1016 landed birds were observed. The number of birds flying over the West ETA did not change from year to year (3743 in 2013, 3610 in 2014). The removal of vegetation near the shorelines of the West ETA pond may further reduce the number of landed bird birds observations.

In addition, Imperial's engagement in the OSBCMP committee may lead to studies and trials aimed at improving monitoring programs.

#### 3.6 Documents Cited

- Hennan, E.G. and B. Munson. 1979. Species Distribution and Habitat Relationships of Waterfowl in Northeastern Alberta. AOSERP Report No. 81 for Alberta Oil Sands Environmental Research Program. Canadian Wildlife Service. Edmonton, AB.
- Golder (Golder Associates Ltd.). 2000. Oil Sands Tailings Pond Bird Deterrent Systems – A Review of Research and Current Practices. Prepared for Suncor Energy Inc., Syncrude Canada Ltd, and Albian Sands Energy Inc. Calgary, AB.
- Government of Alberta. 2010. *Alberta Wild Species General Status Listing*. Retrieved on December 29<sup>th</sup>, 2014 from the Government of Alberta website: http://esrd.alberta.ca/fish-wildlife/species-at-risk/albertas-species-at-riskstrategy/general-status-of-alberta-wild-species-2010/documents/SAR-2010WildSpeciesGeneralStatusList-Jan2012.pdf

- Jackson, B.J. and J.A. Jackson. 2000. Killdeer (Charadrius vociferus), The Birds of North America Online (A. Poole, Ed.). Ithaca: Cornell Lab of Ornithology; Retrieved on December 29<sup>th</sup>, 2014 from the Birds of North America Online: http://bna.birds.cornell.edu/bna/species/517
- St. Clair, C.C., S. Loots and R.A. Ronconi. 2014. 2014 Protocol, Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program. Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta. Prepared for Shell Canada Energy Ltd., Canadian Natural Resources Ltd., Imperial Oil Ltd., Suncor Energy Inc., and Syncrude Canada Ltd..

#### 3.7 Personal Communications

Adamek, C. Bird Monitor, SGS Canada Inc. Communicated via email to Simon Hall, Golder Associates, 17 December 2014.

### 3.8 Appendices



Appendix 3.A: Location of deterrents, containment booms and survey stations at Kearl ponds in 2014 (July 29, 2014).

The second starts of the PT V . The se	LITM 12N	HACKS.	on the Color and		of actual and	
B. Discoper I. and an A. Dir State and A. Discoper and A. D	Fail Ba	410 × 100	16.83 15	1.18.000	074 0003 510 000 000 01	2



Appendix 3.B: Relationship between the mean number of landed waterbirds per survey and hour after sunrise at Kearl in 2014

# Appendix 3.C: Number of bird observations by species at Kearl process-affected ponds in 2014

	Lan	ded <sup>2</sup>	Flew Over <sup>2</sup>	Conta Bitur	acted men <sup>2</sup>	Mortality		
Species/Species Group <sup>1</sup>	Bird Survey	Incidental <sup>3</sup>	Bird Survey	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental	
	W	aterbird	s					
Killdeer	156		15	29				
Common Goldeneye	148		3					
California Gull	139		76	9			1	
Canvasback	134			6				
Eared Grebe	99		11				1	
Spotted Sandpiper	96		8	4				
Unknown Duck	92		44	26			3	
Unknown Grebe	65							
Sandhill Crane	64	3	11	18			1	
Baird's Sandpiper	53		3	10				
Unknown Sandpiper	50		63	9			1	
Least Sandpiper	42							
Bonaparte's Gull	41		23	1			4	
Semipalmated Sandpiper	36			3				
Canada Goose	30		1,358	8		4	12	
Greater Yellowlegs	27		3	3				
American Wigeon	27			2				
Mallard	15		8	4				
Northern Shoveler	14			6				
Green-winged Teal	14	5	9					
Common Tern	13		26				2	
Lesser Yellowlegs	13		2	3	1			
Unknown Gull	11		42				4	
Bufflehead	11							
Unknown Diving Duck	11							
Sanderling	10							
White-rumped Sandpiper	10							
Northern Pintail	7		1	1				
Greater Scaup	7							
Lesser Scaup	6		1					
Solitary Sandpiper	5							
Red-necked Grebe	4			3				
American Coot	4							
Blue-winged Teal	4							
Herring Gull	3		21				1	
Unknown Plover	3							
Common Loon	2		7	1				
Snow Goose	2		1,208					
Horned Grebe	2							

	Lan	ded²	Flew Over <sup>2</sup>	Conta Bitur	acted men <sup>2</sup>	Mortality		
Species/Species Group <sup>1</sup>	Bird Survey	Incidental <sup>3</sup>	Bird Survey	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental	
Pectoral Sandpiper	2							
Ruddy Duck	2							
Semipalmated Plover	2							
Pied-billed Grebe	1						2	
Unknown Shorebird	1		60					
Ring-billed Gull	1		42					
Franklin's Gull	1		2					
Unknown Dowitcher	1							
Unknown Dabbling Duck			3				3	
Common Merganser							1	
Unknown Yellowlegs			36					
Unknown White-headed Gull			23					
Tundra Swan			18					
Unknown Scaup			11					
Gadwall			2					
Unknown Diver			2					
Great Blue Heron			1					
Unknown Swan			1					
	Non-	target G	uilds					
Brewer's Blackbird	271		162					
Common Raven	65		253	5				
Snow Bunting	63		322					
American Pipit	38		80					
Unknown Sparrow	31		206					
Bank Swallow	26		80					
Unknown Blackbird	23		5					
Horned Lark	22		20				1	
Barn Swallow	21		730				1	
Black-billed Magpie	10		4					
Tree Swallow	3		46				1	
American Kestrel	3		16					
American Robin	3		3					
Rusty Blackbird	2		10					
Smith's Longspur	2		4					
Eastern Phoebe	1							
Northern Hawk Owl	1							
Savannah Sparrow	1							
Snarp-tailed Grouse		4	1				1	
Unknown Pecking Bird			230					
Unknown Passerine			109					
Lapland Longspur			35					
Unknown Swallow			35					

	Landed <sup>2</sup>		Flew Over <sup>2</sup>	Conta Bitur	acted men <sup>2</sup>	Mortality	
Species/Species Group <sup>1</sup>	Bird Survey	Incidental <sup>3</sup>	Bird Survey	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental
Cliff Swallow			9				
Lincoln's Sparrow			3				
Northern Harrier			3				
White-crowned Sparrow			3				
Bald Eagle			2				
Unknown Gleaner			2				
White-throated Sparrow			2				
Black-capped Chickadee			1				
Broad-winged Hawk			1				
Cedar Waxwing			1				
Rough-legged Hawk			1				
Unknown Raptor			1				

<sup>1</sup> Pink shading: Species of Conservation Concern
 <sup>2</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times
 <sup>3</sup> Only for Species of Conservation Concern

Date	Species	Pond Name (Survey	Location	% Oiled	Outcome	Context of	Method of	Potential Reason
Buto	opooloo	Station ID)	Description	<i>,</i> ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	Cutoonio	Detection	Detection	for Mortality/Oiling
16-Apr	MALL	ETA SW	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
20-Apr	CAGU	ETA Main	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
20-Apr	CAGU	ETA NE	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
21-Apr	NSHO	ETA NE	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
21-Apr	CAGU	ETA SW	Flew Over	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
23-Apr	Unknown Duck	ETA NW	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
23-Apr	CANG	ETA NW	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
25-Apr	CANG	ETA NW	Unknown	75-100%	Euthanized	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
26-Apr	CANG	ETA Main	Unknown	75-100%	Found dead	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
3-May	CORA	ETA Main	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
3-May	Unknown Gull	ETA Main	Unknown	50-75%	Found dead	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
3-May	Unknown Gull	ETA Main	Unknown	25-50%	Found dead	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
4-May	CORA	ETA Main	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
7-May	CORA	ETA SW	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
7-May	CORA	ETA SW	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
9-May	CANV	ETA Main	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
11-May	RNGR	ETA NE	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
11-May	COLO	ETA SW	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
11-May	RNGR	ETA SW	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
11-May	PBGR	ETA NE	Unknown	75-100%	Euthanized	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
12-May	Unknown Duck	ETA NW	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
12-May	NSHO	ETA NE	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
14-May	Unknown Duck	ETA NW	Water	75-100%	Found dead	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
15-May	BOGU	ETA SW	Unknown	75-100%	Found dead	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
17-May	EAGR	ETA NE	Unknown	25-50%	Euthanized	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
17-May	PBGR	ETA NW	Unknown	75-100%	Euthanized	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
19-May	TRES	ODP_Drainage	Shore	0%	Found dead	Incidental	Unknown	Unknown
19-May	HOLA	ETA NW	Shore	0-25%	Euthanized	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
27-May	KILL	OPP1_Crusher_Sump	Flew overhead	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
14-Jun	NSHO	ETA 1	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
20-Jun	NOPI	ETA NE	Flew overhead	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
22-Jun	CANG	ETA NE	Shore	50-75%	Not recovered	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
22-Jun	CAGU	ETA NW	Unknown	50-75%	Not recovered	Incidental	Binoculars	Floating bitumen

#### Appendix 3.D: Bird oiling and mortality events at Kearl in April–October 2014

Data	Species	Pond Name (Survey	Location % Oiled		Outoomo	Context of	Method of	Potential Reason
Date	Species	Station ID)	Description	% Olleu	Outcome	Detection	Detection	for Mortality/Oiling
4-Jul	CANG	ETA SW	Water	75-100%	Not recovered	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
4-Jul	CANG	ETA Main	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
7-Jul	BOGU	ETA Main	Unknown	0%	Found dead	Incidental	Unknown	Unknown
21-Jul	COTE	ETA NW	Shore	0%	Found dead	Incidental	On foot	Unknown
21-Jul	COTE	ETA NW	Shore	0%	Found dead	Incidental	On foot	Unknown
23-Jul	SPSA	ETA NE	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
26-Jul	SPSA	MSF	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
27-Jul	BOGU	ETA Main	Unknown	75-100%	Found dead	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
28-Jul	SACR	ETA NW	Shore	75-100%	Not recovered	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
28-Jul	KILL	W_ETA_Drainage_Pond2	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
30-Jul	KILL	W_ETA_Drainage_Pond2	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
31-Jul	KILL	W_ETA_Drainage_Pond2	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
1-Aug	BOGU	ETA Main	Unknown	75-100%	Found dead	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
2-Aug	BOGU	ETA Main	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
2-Aug	CANG	ETA Main	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
3-Aug	Unknown Gull	ETA NW	Unknown	50-75%	Found dead	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
4-Aug	Unknown Duck	ETA NW	Unknown	75-100%	Euthanized	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
4-Aug	CANG	ETA NW	Unknown	50-75%	Euthanized	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
11-Aug	KILL	W_ETA_Drainage_Pond2	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
13-Aug	CANG	ETA NE	Unknown	75-100%	Euthanized	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
15-Aug	KILL	W_ETA_Drainage_Pond2	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
15-Aug	SPSA	W_ETA_Drainage_Pond2	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
17-Aug	MALL	ETA NE	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
17-Aug	KILL	W_ETA_Drainage_Pond2	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
17-Aug	CANG	ETA Main	Shore	75-100%	Not recovered	Focused	On foot	Floating bitumen
17-Aug	CANG	ETA Main	Shore	75-100%	Euthanized	Focused	On foot	Floating bitumen
18-Aug	GRYE	ETA NW	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
20-Aug	SACR	ETA NE	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
23-Aug	BASA	Basal	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
24-Aug	BASA	Basal	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
25-Aug	BASA	Basal	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
27-Aug	HERG	ETA SW	Unknown	75-100%	Found dead	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
29-Aug	Unknown Sandpiper	ETA NE	Shore	75-100%	Found dead	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen

Date	Species	Pond Name (Survey	Location	% Oiled	Outcome	Context of	Method of	Potential Reason
		Station ID)	Description			Delection	Delection	for wortailty/Olling
29-Aug	Unknown Sandpiper	ETA NE	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
29-Aug	LEYE	Basal	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
31-Aug	LEYE	Basal	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
31-Aug	Unknown Sandpiper	ETA Main	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
1-Sep	LEYE	Basal	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
3-Sep	SPSA	ETA NE	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
3-Sep	CANG	ETA NE	Unknown	25-50%	Euthanized	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
5-Sep	COME	ETA SW	Unknown	75-100%	Not recovered	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
5-Sep	CORA	ETA SW	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
6-Sep	CANG	ETA NW	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
6-Sep	CANG	ETA Main	Cokebeach	75-100%	Euthanized	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
7-Sep	KILL	W_ETA_Drainage_Pond2	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
8-Sep	CANG	ETA NW	Unknown	75-100%	Not recovered	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
10-Sep	KILL	W_ETA_Drainage_Pond2	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
10-Sep	CANG	ETA NW	Unknown	75-100%	Not recovered	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
10-Sep	Unknown Duck	ETA NW	Unknown	75-100%	Not recovered	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
12-Sep	AMWI	ETA NE	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
17-Sep	SACR	ETA SW	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
20 6 0 0	CANC		Linknown	75 1000/	Not receivered	Incidental	Linknown	West ETA
20-3ep	CANG	East ETA NE	UTIKHUWH	75-100%	Not recovered	incluentai	UTIKITOWIT	bitumen
22-Sep	SESA	ETA SW	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
22-Sep	STGR	Basal	Shore	0%	Found dead	Incidental	Unknown	Unknown
24-Sep	GRYE	ETA NW	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
27-Sep	BARS	ETA NE	Shore	0%	Found dead	Incidental	Unknown	Unknown
4-Oct	AMWI	Temp_NODA_Runoff	Water	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
4-Oct	CANG	East_ETA NW	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
4-Oct	CANG	East_ETA NE	Shore	Unknown	Unknown	Bird survey	Binoculars	Floating bitumen
12-Oct	Unknown Gull	ETA NE	Unknown	75-100%	Found dead	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen
31-Oct	Unknown Duck	ETA NW	Unknown	75-100%	Found dead	Incidental	Unknown	Floating bitumen

Appendix 3.E: Incidental bird oilin	ng and mortality	events at Kearl	post-monitoring prog	ram (after Oct 31, 201	14)
-------------------------------------	------------------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------------	-----

Date	Species	Pond Name (Survey Station ID)	Location Description	% Oiled	Outcome	Context of Detection	Method of Detection	Potential Reason for Mortality/Oiling
5-Nov	AMCO	ETA NW	On bitumen	Unknown	Unknown	Incidental	Scope	Floating bitumen



### 2014 Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program Report

#### March 2015

Prepared for:

Shell Canada Energy Fort McMurray, Alberta

#200 - 850 Harbourside Drive, North Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V7P 0A3 • Tel: 1.604.926.3261 • Fax: 1.604.926.5389 • www.hatfieldgroup.com





Shell Canada Energy P.O. Box 5670 Fort McMurray, Alberta T9H 4W1 Tel (780) 713-4400 Internet www.shell.ca

March 12, 2014

Albert Liu Industrial Engineer, Mining Authorizations Alberta Energy Regulator 111 Twin Atria Bldg. 4999 - 98 Avenue Edmonton, AB T6B 2X3

#### RE: Shell Albian Sands Oil Sands Bird Monitoring Program 2014 Annual Report JPM: Approval #153125-00-00 (as amended), MRM: Approval #20809-01-00 (as amended)

Dear Mr. Liu;

Shell Canada Energy (Shell) is pleased to provide Alberta Energy Regulator (AER) with the 2014 annual report for the Shell Albian Sands Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program (OSBCMP). This report will also be included in the regional report that the OSBCMP Program Manager, Owl Moon Environmental Inc., will be submitting by March 15, 2015.

If you require further information please feel free to contact Paul Knaga (Environmental Specialist – Wildlife and Biodiversity) at 1-780-713-4507 (paul.knaga@shell.com).

Yours truly,

SHELL CANADA ENERGY.

Paul Knaga Environment Specialist – Wildlife and Biodiversity

cc: Marie Nietfeld, Alberta Energy Regulator Kenneth Yap, Alberta Energy Regulator Andrea McGregor, Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development Joann Skilnick, Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development Richard Wiacek, Environment Canada Shell Environment Regulatory Files





# 2014 OIL SANDS BIRD CONTACT MONITORING PROGRAM REPORT

Prepared for:

SHELL CANADA ENERGY PO BOX 5670 FORT MCMURRAY, AB CANADA T9H 4W1

Prepared by:

HATFIELD CONSULTANTS #200 - 850 HARBOURSIDE DRIVE NORTH VANCOUVER, BC CANADA V7P 0A3

**MARCH 2015** 

SHELL6688 VERSION 4

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST	OF AF	PPENDI	CES	iii
GLO	SSAR	Υ		iv
ACK	NOWL	EDGEN	IENTS	vi
4.0	SHEI		ADA ENERGY	1
	4.1	SUMMA	NRY	1
		4.1.1	Bird Landings and Mortalities at Process-affected Ponds	1
		4.1.2	Bird Landings at Freshwater Pond	2
		4.1.3	Standardized Monitoring	2
		4.1.4	Species of Conservation Concern	3
		4.1.5	Adaptive Management	4
	4.2	INTROD	DUCTION	4
		4.2.1	Site	4
		4.2.2	Personnel	6
		4.2.3	Management of Avian Attractants and Control of Hazards	7
		4.2.4	Deterrents	7
		4.2.5	Hazing Procedures	10
	4.3	METHO	DS	10
		4.3.1	Pond Characteristics	10
		4.3.2	Bird Surveys	10
		4.3.3	Inter-observer Variability (IOV)	11
		4.3.4	Mortality Searches	11
		4.3.5	Incidental Observations and Reporting	13
	4.4	RESUL	TS	13
		4.4.1	Pond Characteristics	13
		4.4.2	Bird Observations	15
		4.4.3	Inter-observer Variability	20
		4.4.4	Mortalities	20
		4.4.5	Species of Conservation Concern	25
	4.5	DISCUS	SION	25
		4.5.1	Bird Deterrents	25
		4.5.2	Bird Contacts	26
		4.5.3	Inter Observer Variability	29
		4.5.4	Recommendations	29
	4.6	DOCUM	IENTS CITED	30

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 4.1	Monitoring effort at process-affected ponds at Shell in 2014.	1
Table 4.2	Bird observations at process-affected ponds at Shell in 2014	1
Table 4.3	Survey effort on the freshwater pond at Shell in 2014	2
Table 4.4	Bird observations on the freshwater pond at Shell in 2014.	2
Table 4.5	Number of observations of birds of conservation concern at process-affected ponds at Shell in 2014.	3
Table 4.6	Positions fulfilled at Shell in 2014.	7
Table 4.7	Avian deterrents deployed at Shell (as of Fall 2014).	8
Table 4.8	Number of avian radars and deterrents at process-affected ponds at Shell (as of Fall 2014).	9
Table 4.9	Characteristics of survey stations monitored at Shell in 2014.	. 13
Table 4.10	Characteristics of ponds monitored at Shell in 2014.	. 14
Table 4.11	Bird survey effort by station at Shell in 2014.	. 15
Table 4.12	Bird survey effort by pond at Shell in 2014.	. 16
Table 4.13	Number of bird observations by pond and guild at Shell in 2014 <sup>1</sup>	. 17
Table 4.14	Mean number of landed birds per survey at Shell in 2014.	. 17
Table 4.15	Mean number of oiled birds per survey at Shell in 2014	. 18
Table 4.16	Brood observations by species at process-affected ponds at Shell in 2014	. 19
Table 4.17	Inter-observer variability at Shell in 2014	. 20
Table 4.18	Mortality search effort at Shell in 2014	. 20
Table 4.19	Number of mortalities by pond at Shell in 2014	. 21
Table 4.20	Number of observations of oiling and mortalities, by species, at Shell in 2014	. 21
Table 4.21	Summary of bird survey, mortality and incidental results by pond at Shell in 2014	. 24

# **LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 4.1	Process-affected and freshwater ponds at Shell in 2014.	. 5
Figure 4.2	Mean number of landed birds per survey at Shell in 2014.	18
Figure 4.3	Mean number of oiled birds per survey at Shell in 2014	19
Figure 4.4	Relationship between pond area, mortality search effort, and mortality search results	22
Figure 4.5	Proportion of each guild for birds that flew over, landed, contacted bitumen, or died at Shell in 2014.	22
Figure 4.6	Timing of bird landings, oiling, and mortalities in spring (top) and fall (bottom) 2014 at Shell.	23

### LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 4A	Location of Deterrents, Containment Booms and Survey Stations at Shell Ponds in 2014
Appendix 4B	Relationship Between the Mean Number of Landed Waterbirds Per Survey and Hour After Sunrise at Shell in 2014
Appendix 4C	Number of Bird Observations by Species at Shell Process-affected Ponds in 2014
Appendix 4D	Bird Oiling and Mortality Events at Shell in April–October 2014
Appendix 4E	2014 Post-Monitoring Migration Landing Event Summary

## GLOSSARY

AHD	Acoustic Hailing Device; powerful directional speaker, including Long Range Acoustic Device (LRAD) and HyperSpike models, typically activated by a bird detection radar linked through wireless signal. May be combined with a visual deterrent (e.g., laser).
ΑΤV	All-terrain vehicle, including amphibious vehicles (e.g., Argo).
Bird, Contacted Bitumen; or Oiled	Bird with 5-100% of its body surface oiled, usually when some feathers on the underside or breast are matted or speckled with a black sticky substance. Behaviour may provide clues, as some birds obsessively attempt to preen without successfully removing the substance, and the substance may be visible on the bill.
Bird, Flew Over (during a survey)	Bird that flew below 100 m of elevation over the <b>survey area</b> , within the survey period. Birds that both flew over and landed were recorded as landed only.
Bird, Landed (during a survey)	Bird that was in contact with a <b>pond</b> , within 500 m of the <b>survey station</b> , within the survey period.
Bird, Oiled	See "bird, contacted bitumen".
Bird Survey	Conducted by observers from a <b>survey station</b> ; identification and count of birds that <b>landed</b> within the <b>survey area</b> during the <b>survey period</b> , and birds that <b>flew over</b> , along with the collection of other information (e.g., weather conditions, visibility, bird oiling).
Bird Contact	Bird (s) observed touching the surface or shore of a freshwater or process affected water pond.
Brood	One or a group of <b>chicks</b> , with a parent usually nearby.
Chick	Young local bird that has not yet developed the ability to fly.
Effluent	Water and other substances deposited in a <b>process-affected pond</b> , typically through a pipeline.
Guild, Non-target	Species that peck, fly, glean, stoop/depredate, or scavenge (except gulls) as their primary means of foraging (Appendix A). Includes passerines, raptors, grouse, and woodpeckers.
Guild, Target; or Waterbird	Species that wade, dabble, or dive in water as their primary means of foraging (Appendix A). The program targets these birds because they have a greater likelihood of becoming in contact with ponds. Includes ducks, geese, shorebirds, grebes, loons, cranes, cormorants, swans, pelicans, coots, rails, gulls, terns, herons, and kingfishers.
ha	Hectare; 1 ha = 2.47 acres, or 100 x 100 m; 100 ha = 1 km <sup>2</sup> .
Incidental Observation	Bird detected in April–October outside a <b>bird survey</b> or <b>mortality search</b> that was 1) <b>oiled</b> , dead, or euthanized; or 2) a <b>species of conservation concern</b> in contact with a <b>process-affected pond</b> .
Island	Structure on a <b>pond</b> , surrounded by water, where birds may stand; may be permanent or temporary, natural or artificial, floating or fixed. Includes mats of floating logs or muskeg.
Monitoring	Bird surveys and mortality searches.

Mortality	Bird of any species found dead or euthanized in association with <b>process-affected ponds</b> , either during a <b>mortality search</b> or as an <b>incidental observation</b> .
Mortality Search	Search at a <b>pond</b> or section of a pond's surface or <b>shoreline</b> for dead or dying birds. Searches were conducted by boat, truck, or walking.
OSBCMP	Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program
Pond	Open-air body of water or water storage facility, including its contents, <b>shore</b> , and <b>islands</b> ; may be permanent or temporary.
Pond, Freshwater	<b>Pond</b> (including its contents, <b>shore</b> , and <b>islands</b> ) containing groundwater, rainwater or runoff water unaffected by the mining process or plant operations.
Pond, Process-affected	<b>Pond</b> (including its contents, <b>shore</b> , and <b>islands</b> ) containing water and substances that have been used in or affected by the mining process or plant operations, including tailings, runoff and recycled water. Bitumen may be present (floating or sinking) or absent.
Shore	An area along <b>shorelines</b> that may be reached by changing water levels or effluent.
Shoreline	Perimeter, expressed in metres (m) or kilometres (km), along which the pond's water meets land.
Species of Conservation Concern	Species designated as Endangered, Threatened, or Special Concern under the Canadian <i>Species at Risk Act</i> , COSEWIC or the Alberta <i>Wildlife Act</i> , or listed within Alberta as At Risk, May Be at Risk, or Sensitive (Appendix A).
Survey Area	Area comprising the pond's surface, <b>shores</b> and <b>islands</b> within 500 m of the <b>survey station</b> .
Survey Period	Pre-determined amount of time during which <b>bird surveys</b> were conducted. Surveys were 10 min for stations at ponds smaller than 150 ha and 30 min for stations at ponds of 150 ha or larger.
Survey Station	A fixed location near the edge of a <b>pond</b> , where <b>bird surveys</b> were conducted at regular intervals.
Waterbird	See "guild, target".

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This monitoring program was implemented by Hatfield Consultants Partnership (Hatfield) for Shell Canada Energy (Shell) in conjunction with the Regional Bird Monitoring Program. Mr. Fred Kuzmic, Mr. Paul Knaga and Ms. Chelsie Hoff from Shell coordinated the monitoring program as well as the Shell bird deterrent crew, and contributed information about the program requirements and standard operating procedures. Hatfield staff contributing to this program included: Mr. Jason van Rooyen, Ms. Serafina Dalla-Longa, Mr. Todd Heakes, Mr. Nick Paryako, Ms. Chelsea McIsaac, Ms. Linda Dupuis, Ms. Felicia Juelfs, Mr. Garth Taylor and Dr. Peter McNamee.

### 4.0 SHELL CANADA ENERGY

### 4.1 SUMMARY

### 4.1.1 Bird Landings and Mortalities at Process-affected Ponds

Monitoring of bird contact with seven process-affected (PA) ponds operated by Shell Canada Energy (Shell) was implemented from April 1 to October 31, 2014. The level of effort involved in monitoring PA ponds is summarized in Table 4.1. A total of 5,436 birds comprising 54 species were documented at PA water ponds (Table 4.2). A total of 2,055 birds (38% of observations) were documented contacting the water in PA ponds (Table 4.2). More contacts occurred at ponds with higher amounts of vegetation. Two deceased diving ducks were documented during designated mortality searches and another 31 birds were recorded as incidental mortalities. A total of 106 birds were documented contacting bitumen during the 2014 monitoring season.

#### Table 4.1Monitoring effort at process-affected ponds at Shell in 2014.

Bird Surveys										
# Ponds Surveyed 7										
Total Surface Area (over water) of Ponds Surveyed (ha)		364.6	51							
# 10-min Surveys Conducted		314	1							
# 30-min Surveys Conducted 1280										
Mortality Searches										
# Ponds Searched	7									
Total Surface Area (over water) of Ponds Surveyed (ha) 1165.58										
# Searches		67								
Search Method	Boat	Walk	Truck	Total						
Total Time Searched (h)	200.05	0	0	200.05						
Distance Searched <sup>1</sup> (km)	870.77	0	0	870.77						
Area Searched <sup>1</sup> (ha)	9657.38	0	0	9657.38						

<sup>1</sup> For each search, either distance OR area counted towards effort.

#### Table 4.2Bird observations at process-affected ponds at Shell in 2014.

	Waterbirds					Non-target Guilds										
							Contac Bitum	cted nen	Morta	ality			Cont Bitu	acted men	Morta	ality
	Landed	Fly Over	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental	Landed	Fly over	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental				
Number of birds <sup>1</sup>	1803	2310	89	17	2	31	252	1071	0	0	0	1				
Number of species	43	24	7	4	2	10	11	21	0	0	0	1				

<sup>1</sup> Individual live birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times.
## 4.1.2 Bird Landings at Freshwater Pond

Bird contacts with PA ponds were compared with bird contacts on a freshwater pond known as Jackpine Lake, which is a compensation lake. Monitoring efforts at Jackpine Lake are summarized in Table 4.3. A total of 625 birds comprising 43 species were documented at Jackpine Lake (Table 4.4).

# Pond(s) Surveyed	1
Total Surface Area (over water) of Pond(s) Surveyed (ha)	23.88
# 10-min Surveys Conducted	0
# 30-min Surveys Conducted	52

#### Table 4.3Survey effort on the freshwater pond at Shell in 2014.

#### Table 4.4Bird observations on the freshwater pond at Shell in 2014.

			Waterbi	rds		Non-target Guilds						
		Contacted Bitumen						Contacted	d Bitumen			
	Landed	Fly Over	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality (Incidental)	Landed	Fly Over	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality (Incidental)		
# Birds <sup>1</sup>	413	149	n/a n/a		n/a	21	42	n/a	n/a	n/a		
# Species	25	15	n/a	n/a	n/a	3	9	n/a	n/a	n/a		

<sup>1</sup> Individual live birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times.

## 4.1.3 Standardized Monitoring

Surveys adhered to the OSBCMP protocols (St. Clair et al 2014) and took place from April 1 to October 31, 2014. Bird monitoring was conducted at all tailings PA ponds and at one freshwater pond. Monitoring took place daily for 30 minutes at two stations on each pond >1.5km<sup>2</sup> (ETF and Inpit in MRM and MFT in JPM) and for ten minutes at one station on each pond <1.5km<sup>2</sup> (SEA and Inpit 2B in MRM and TT in JPM). SC2 in JPM (<1.5km<sup>2</sup>) was monitored for 30 minutes at one station due to the high potential of bird contacts. Jackpine Lake is a freshwater waterbody that was monitored for 30 minutes at one station twice per week. All birds within the specified survey area were counted during the survey period, which occurred on a daily basis if sites were accessible and weather conditions acceptable. Details of the standardized methods for bird surveys are provided in Section 4.3.2.

Mortality surveys were conducted as per the 2014 OSBCMP protocols (St. Clair et al 2014). Route-based and focused searches were conducted every two weeks on each of the PA water ponds included in this program. Route-based mortality surveys attempted to cover the entire pond, while focused searches encompassed smaller areas that were identified as higher risk to birds due to bitumen content and the number of mortalities in the previous year.

Intra-year changes in survey locations (Appendix 4A), required primarily to accommodate construction activities in the tailings area, are summarized below along with the number of weather-related survey cancellations:

- Survey sites inaccessible due to construction or field truck issues 15 days;
- Alternate monitoring locations used 19 days; and
- Survey sites inaccessible due to weather-related events 14 days.

## 4.1.4 Species of Conservation Concern

In total, 1,033 observations of species of conservation concern, either federal (SARA) or provincial (ESRD) were documented at PA ponds during bird monitoring surveys (Table 4.5).

## Table 4.5Number of observations of birds of conservation concern at process-<br/>affected ponds at Shell in 2014.

	Lanc	led <sup>1</sup>	Fly Over <sup>1</sup>	Contacted	d Bitumen <sup>1</sup>	Mortality		
Species	Bird Survey	Incidental	Bird Survey	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental	
Waterbirds								
Lesser scaup	430	189	44	0	0	1	1	
Horned grebe	41	5	0	0	0	0	0	
Northern pintail	30	93	46	0	0	0	0	
Green-winged teal	29	12	0	12	0	0	2	
White-winged scoter	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Sandhill crane	0	6	11	0	0	0	0	
Black tern	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	
Great blue heron	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Pied-billed grebe	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Non-target Guilds								
American kestrel	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	
Northern harrier	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	
Sharp-tailed grouse	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	
Bald eagle	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Northern goshawk	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Barn swallow	0	0	53	0	0	0	0	
Peregrine falcon	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	

<sup>1</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times.

## 4.1.5 Adaptive Management

Site management adaptations in 2014 included:

- Testing a new radar head on the marine radars as part of the deterrent detection system. This
  allows the radars to detect much more and mask less, increasing the detection and deterrent
  ability. Shell will upgrade all radar heads to the new HD head in 2015;
- Shell Projects finished stripping the muskeg in SC2 that was acting as a green up area and attractant for waterfowl; and
- Argos were used for hazing purposes on SC2, particularly in areas that had not yet been flooded and on small ponds where waterfowl would tend to congregate.

## 4.2 INTRODUCTION

## 4.2.1 Site

The 2014 Shell bird monitoring program was conducted at two mine sites: Muskeg River Mine (MRM) west of Muskeg River and Jackpine Mine (JPM) east of Jackpine Creek (Figure 4.1).



#### Figure 4.1 Process-affected and freshwater ponds at Shell in 2014.

465,000

480,000 K\Data\Project\SHELL6688\A\_MXD\Report\_Figures\SHELL6688\_Fig4\_1\_Overview\_20141217\_SB.mxd MRM has been operating since late 2002 (Shell 2015a). It is located on Lease 13 approximately 70 km north of Fort McMurray, and about 500 km northeast of Edmonton, Alberta (Shell 2015a). The MRM is contained within Township 94 and 95, Ranges 9, 10 and 11.

The MRM contains four PA ponds (Figure 4.1):

- External Tailings Facility pond (ETF) located at 12V E 466077 N 6343488;
- South Expansion Area pond (SEA) located at 12V E 465648 N 6340245;
- Cell 1 pond (Inpit) located at 12V E 470698 N 6346877; and
- Cell 2B pond (Inpit 2B) located at 12V E 472414 N 6349342.

The Jackpine Mine has been in operation since August, 2010 (Shell 2015b). JPM is located on the east side of Lease 13, approximately 70 km north of Fort McMurray, Alberta.

The JPM contains three PA ponds (Figure 4.1):

- Sand Cell 1 (MFT) located at 12V E 478574 N 6342134;
- Thickened Tailings pond (TT) located at 12V E 477583 N 6342387; and
- Sand Cell 2 (SC2) located at 12V E 480393 N 6342651.

JPM also contains one freshwater pond, Jackpine Lake that was monitored under the OSBCMP. It is located at 12V E 476307 N 635075 (Figure 4.1).

In addition to the ponds monitored in 2013 under the OSBCMP (ETF, SEA, Inpit, MFT, TT and Jackpine Lake), the 2014 monitoring program included two new ponds: Inpit 2B and SC2 (Figure 4.1). Inpit 2B is an Inpit Tailings Pond and a Dedicated Disposal Area (DDA) for D74 Fines Capture. Consolidated Tailings (CT) are deposited in the pond, which is a mixture of coarse sand tailings, mature fine tailings and alum. SC2 was constructed to increase the tailings capacity at JPM, and acts primarily as a sand storage facility. Construction was not complete during the 2014 OSBCMP, and the pond contained fresh water from rain and snowmelt. A small amount of mature fine tailings was dispensed into a section of the pond on April 29, 2014, but posed no risk to birds contacting the pond surface.

## 4.2.2 Personnel

Minimum qualifications for bird monitoring crew members included a B.Sc. in ecology or terrestrial biology and a minimum of one year experience in avian biology and bird identification. Two of the five crew members had previous experience working with the OSBCMP at Shell. All crew members received approximately three weeks of training prior to the commencement of the surveys. Training included the study of monitoring protocols and mine site orientation. Approximately 14 days of on-site survey experience was required by new crew members before they were able to fulfill monitoring roles independently.

Mortality search personnel on the Shell site included the Bird Crew Foremen and Bird Crew Laborers. The Bird Crew Foremen managed the mortality surveys, trained Bird Crew Laborers, and performed QA/QC checks on final mortality search data. Foremen and laborers completed intensive site training, including mine driving, boat training, flare guns and wildlife hazing training. New personnel were typically given 40 hours of training at the beginning of the summer, but were also mentored over the entire monitoring season. Mortality search personnel were not allowed to perform mortality searches alone until approved by the Bird Crew Foremen. Mortality search protocols were reviewed and evaluated by the Bird Crew Foreman and Shell Canada Energy.

Position	Crews	Shift Length
Site lead, bird hazing, data verification	One crew, two personnel	10hr X 4 days
Bird surveys, data verification	Two crews, two personnel	10hr X 7 days
Mortality searches, deterrent maintenance, bird hazing	Two crews, three personnel	12hr X 14 days
Program manager	Off-site management personnel	

#### Table 4.6Positions fulfilled at Shell in 2014.

## 4.2.3 Management of Avian Attractants and Control of Hazards

To limit the attractiveness of PA ponds to wildlife, vegetation was regularly removed from the edges of PA ponds and along the perimeter dykes. Vegetation was removed for mine-related purposes, which indirectly benefited waterfowl by reducing attractants on the sites. On TT pond, specifically, two floating backhoes flipped and buried floating muskeg mats throughout the season to prevent green-up and establishment of vegetation on the pond and to eventually sink them. Bitumen containment booms were placed on ETF, MFT, and Inpit.

### 4.2.4 Deterrents

The current deterrent system employed by Shell is an on-demand BirdAvert TM deterrent system, which consists of land-based cannons and water-based floats. Units were deployed between March 18 and April 20, 2014, prior to bird migration in northern Alberta, and were disassembled in November 2014 following fall migration.

PA ponds at MRM are protected by a total of 73 BirdAvert TM units, all linked to radar and established at a density of 0.09 units/ha (Table 4.8, Figure 4A.1). PA ponds at JPM are protected by a total of 94 BirdAvert TM units, all linked to radar and established at a density of 0.15 units/ha (Table 4.8, Figure 4A.2). There are 3 floating units (Bird Guard) that are not hooked to radar, but are used in conjunction with the radar based units.

Implementation and placement of bird deterrent components was similar to last year. Units were placed at 250 m intervals over the ponds and associated shorelines as per the Shell Waterfowl Protection Plan (Shell 2014). On occasion, individual units were re-situated to accommodate construction work at the tailings ponds. The bulk of the deterrents were allocated to ETF and MFT, which have the largest surface area and have generally been the most active ponds for bird contacts and flyovers for the three years of the program. Additional deterrent system components will be placed around the developing SC2 pond in the spring of 2015.

Deterrent Name	Description	Stimuli	Sound Intensity at 1m (dB)	Activation Control	Placement	Number and Location
Floating Deterrent Unit	Floating units with propane cannons, strobe lights, and motorized falcon effigy with falcon sounds. Floats are relatively fixed but may move occasionally due to water levels, beach encroachment, anchor failure and some minor movement due to the necessary slack in anchor ropes to avoid unit damage or loss from increasing water depth and wind.	Audio, Visual	118	Radar	Floating	89: JPM - MFT, SC2, TT MRM – ETF, SEA, Inpit, Inpit 2B
Land Cannon	Propane cannon	Audio	118	Radar	Land	105: JPM - MFT, SC2, TT MRM – ETF, SEA, Inpit, Inpit 2B
Bird Guard	Floating units with propane cannons, strobe lights, and motorized falcon effigy with falcon sounds. Floats are relatively fixed but may move occasionally due to water levels, beach encroachment, anchor failure and some minor movement due to the necessary slack in anchor rope to avoid unit damage or loss from increasing water depth and wind.	Audio	118	Random	Floating	3: MRM – Inpit 2B

#### Table 4.7Avian deterrents deployed at Shell (as of Fall 2014).

	ha)	; ha) )	Combined Audio & Visual Deterrents <sup>1</sup>			Audio-only Deterrents				Visual-only Deterrents				Total		
	r water;	(adar(s	Link Ra	Linked to Radar		Not Linked		Linked to Not		Not Linked Rad		Linked to Radar		Not Linked		ha)
Pond Name	Pond Area (ove	Number of	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Units	Density (units/
ETF	423.06	1	17	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	0.08
SEA	42.21	1	4	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0.36
Inpit	183.56	1	6	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0.08
Inpit 2B	67.66	1	4	0	3	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0.19
MFT	194.49	1	17	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	0.17
TT	100.69	1	12	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	0.27
SC2	153.91	1	23	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	0.21
Total	1165.58	7	83	0	3	0	0	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	170	0.15

### Table 4.8 Number of avian radars and deterrents at process-affected ponds at Shell (as of Fall 2014).

<sup>1</sup> Combined deterrents count as one unit; individual components are described in Table 4.7.

## 4.2.5 Hazing Procedures

Manual hazing involves the use of flare guns, various noise flares (screamers, whistlers, bangers) and boats are used to avert waterfowl that are not deterred from the radar activation. Personnel on the deterrent crews receive classroom and practical training at the beginning of the season on the proper use, handling and storage of the flare guns, and are taught and mentored from experienced individuals on how to initiate effective hazing. Effective hazing may involve assessing the risk to the waterfowl and to personnel and the type of species you are trying to haze, and deciding on the direction and distance of displacement so as to reduce the inadvertent risk of exposure to oil in a different pond.

## 4.3 METHODS

Bird monitoring and bird deterrent methods followed the 2014 OSBCMP protocol as per St. Clair et al. (2014). Details are provided below.

## 4.3.1 **Pond Characteristics**

Descriptions of PA pond characteristics and contents are required as part of the OSBCMP. Pond contents could potentially include process-affected water, surface bitumen, islands (vegetated and non-vegetated) and floating mats of vegetation. Pond perimeter, pond island perimeter(s), bitumen coverage, and perimeter of emergent vegetation on ponds were traced onto September 2014 satellite images of the MRM and JPM mine sites by the project field crew leader. These tracings were then digitized into polygons using Geographic Information Systems. Once polygons were checked and finalized, measurements were made of total pond area (ha); shoreline length (vegetated and non-vegetated, in meters); total island area (ha); total bitumen coverage (ha), and total emergent vegetation coverage (ha).

## 4.3.2 Bird Surveys

Bird surveys were conducted by Hatfield bird monitors from April 1 to July 6, and from July 25 to October 31, 2014, to document bird activity during migration periods. Monitoring stations on each PA pond were visited daily. In MRM, monitors visited two stations at ETF and Inpit and one station at SEA and Inpit 2B. In JPM, monitors visited two stations at MFT and one station at TT and SC2 (Appendices 4A.3 and 4A.4). One monitoring station at Jackpine Lake (JPM) was visited twice weekly.

Survey methods were conducted as per the 2014 OSBCMP protocol. Bird observations involved pond surface and shoreline scans within a 500 m radius of the observation point and aerial scans 100 m above the observation point. The total survey area was defined as the area within the 500 m radius that included the pond surface and adjacent beach within 45 degrees on either side of the monitoring station. Observers used binoculars and spotting scopes to aid in the detection and identification of birds. Each survey was conducted for 30 minutes at ponds >1.5km<sup>2</sup> (ETF, Inpit and MFT) and for ten minutes at ponds <1.5km<sup>2</sup> (SEA and Inpit 2B). One 30 minute survey was conducted for both TT and SC2, which are both <1.5km<sup>2</sup> but were deemed high risk ponds for waterbirds by ESRD. As an alternative to the timer on the tablets, monitors used stop watches to keep track of survey times. Locations of monitoring stations are presented in Appendix 4A.

Upon observing a bird, observers recorded:

- Pond name;
- Date and time of observation;
- Number of individuals seen;
- Identification of individuals to guild or species level;
- Age, sex and plumage of individuals; and
- Direction of travel, distance and altitude of individuals.

In the event that a bird was observed contacting a pond, observers recorded:

- How many individuals landed;
- Landing location (on water, on shore, in vegetation); and
- Presence and proximity of floating bitumen.

Data were recorded in field notebooks and entered into PC tablets. Results were submitted to OMEI daily for PA ponds and twice weekly for the freshwater pond, as outlined in the OSBCMP.

## 4.3.3 Inter-observer Variability (IOV)

Inter-observer variability (IOV) is the difference in the observed number and species of birds between observers while conducting the same survey. IOV observation surveys were randomly conducted on Wednesdays throughout the entire monitoring period. The IOV comparison surveys are replicate observations of the number of birds and the number of species recorded independently by two observers at the same time and location. They were used to provide a measure of repeatability and consistency in the observation data. The relative percent difference (RPD) in the duplicate observations was calculated according to the following formula:

$$\mathsf{RPD}_{\#\mathsf{birds}} = \frac{|\alpha - \beta|}{\gamma} * 100$$

Where  $\alpha$  is the number of birds from Observer 1,  $\beta$  is the number of birds observed from Observer 2, and  $\gamma$  is the mean of the number of birds from both observers. The mean number of birds provides the reference value against which the two individual observations are compared and assumes that the correct answer is likely between Observer 1 and Observer 2.

The same equation was used to determine the number of species counted by each observer (i.e., to obtain RPD<sub>#species</sub>).

## 4.3.4 Mortality Searches

Shell retained the Paradox Environmental bird deterrent crew to conduct the bird mortality searches. Mortality surveys were comprised of boat searches along randomly established transects (route-based) and focussed searches in areas of high risk to birds. Route-based transects were pre-determined and crossed the entire surface of ponds. Focussed searches targeted pre-determined high risk areas on each PA pond. High risk areas were selected based on site-knowledge of the bird crew foreman on where surface bitumen tends to collect. Each pond was visited at least once every two weeks. Crew members used binoculars to scan the surface and shoreline of the PA pond. Mortality protocols followed the 2014 OSBCMP Monitoring Plan, with crew members collecting the following:

- Date the survey took place;
- Pond name;
- Type of mortality survey;
- Number of birds found during the survey;
- GPS track log information;
- Visibility conditions;
- Minutes spent conducting survey;
- Distance covered during survey;
- Percentage of pond and shoreline searched;
- Percentage of bitumen coverage on pond;
- Cloud cover;
- Wind speed and direction; and
- Precipitation (none, rain, fog, snow, hail).

In the event that birds were found during a mortality search observers would also record:

- Identification of individual(s) to guild or species;
- Number of individuals found;
- End state (dead or alive); and
- Whether the carcass was collected, and if so, a carcass identification code.

All information was recorded on Avian Mortality Search forms and in field notebooks. There were deviations from the mortality search of the Monitoring Plan. For each pond, the number of surveys was not consistent with the 24 (12 route-based, 12 focussed) survey sites recommended in the 2014 OSBCMP protocol. Deviations were as follows:

- Two focussed and four route-based surveys were missed at ETF due to restricted pond access;
- One route-based survey was missed at both SEA and Inpit 2B due to low water levels and access constraints;
- One focussed and three route-based surveys were missed at TT due to low water levels, which made pond access very difficult; and
- One route-based survey was missed at SC2 due to equipment problems.

## 4.3.5 Incidental Observations and Reporting

Incidental observations were made of birds present outside the 500 m radius during a PA pond survey, and outside of a designated survey area at the freshwater ponds.

Supplemental information from incidental observations included: 'new' species that were not detected during standardized bird surveys, species at risk, species that were abundant on site but not well-represented during surveys and any individuals or species exhibiting unusual behaviour.

Incidental observations were documented in the field notebooks and PC tablet and included the following information:

- Location, date and time;
- Identification of individual(s) to guild or species;
- Notes on unusual behavior;
- Number of individuals found; and
- Potential contact with bitumen.

## 4.4 **RESULTS**

### 4.4.1 **Pond Characteristics**

Total pond surface cover within survey areas ranged from 48.2 ha at SC2 2 to 1.59 ha at MFT 4. Monitoring stations ETF 1 and ETF 3 had the largest amounts of shoreline within the survey area, while MFT 4 had the lowest (Table 4.9). ETF 1, Inpit 2B 1 and SC2 2 had the greatest proportion of water within the survey area and SC2 1 and SC2 2 were the only stations with islands (Table 4.9).

ETF and MFT had the largest surface areas of all PA ponds (Table 4.10). TT had the highest island coverage and was the only PA pond with emergent vegetation. All of the emergent vegetation on TT was outside of the 500m radius of the survey station. Jackpine Lake was the only pond with vegetation around the perimeter of the pond surface area (Table 4.10).

Dand Nama <sup>1</sup>	Survey Station ID	Area (over	Island	Emergent	Shoreli	ne (m)
Pond Name	Survey Station ID	water; ha)	(ha)	Veg. (ha)	Vegetated	Non-veg.
	ETF 1	46.83	0	0	0	2595.07
ETF	ETF 3	15.87	0	0	0	2413.57
	Subtotal	62.7	0	0	0	5008.64
	SEA 1	18.95	0	0	0	2078.86
SEA	SEA 2	22.12	0	0	0	2142.21
	Subtotal	41.07	0	0	0	4221.07
Inpit	Inpit 1	13.2	0	0	0	1362.66
	Inpit 2	22.93	0	0	0	1601
	Subtotal	36.13	0	0	0	2963.66

#### Table 4.9 Characteristics of survey stations monitored at Shell in 2014.

Dand Nama <sup>1</sup>	Survey Station ID	Area (over	Island	Emergent	Shoreli	ne (m)
Pond Name	Survey Station ID	water; ha)	(ha)	Veg. (ha)	Vegetated	Non-veg.
Inpit 2B	Inpit 2B 1	44.29	0	0	0	2041.91
	MFT 2	16.53	0	0	0	2011.89
	MFT 3	15.14	0	0	0	987.78
MFT	MFT 4	1.59	0	0	0	360.13
	MFT 5	10.51	0	0	0	1024.12
	Subtotal	88.06	0	0	0	6425.83
ТТ	TT 1	9.8	0	0	0	1148.1
	SC2 1	34.34	0.07	0	0	1883.81
SC2	SC2 2	48.22	0.09	0	0	1997.84
	Subtotal	82.56	0.16	0	0	3881.65
Jackpine Lake	Comp Lake 1	23.88	0	0	88.32	895.94

#### Table 4.9(Cont'd.)

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater pond.

#### Table 4.10Characteristics of ponds monitored at Shell in 2014.

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Dand	Bitumen C	over	Dand Area	la la u d	Emanuel	Shoreli	ne (m)
(Year of Origin)	Contents	% <sup>2</sup>	Area <sup>3</sup> (ha)	rea <sup>3</sup> (over water; ha) ha)		Veg. (ha)	Vegetated	Non-veg.
ETF (2003)	PA Water	Range: 0-75 Mode: 26-50	319.79	423.06	0	0	0	14392.3
SEA (2008)	PA Water	Range: 0-25 Mode: 1-25	0.58	42.21	0	0	0	4120.6
INPIT (2009)	PA Water	Range: 0-75 Mode: 6-15	93.4	183.56	0	0	0	7906.3
INPIT 2B (2014)	PA Water	Range: 0-75 Mode: 1-5	30.05	67.66	0.02	0	0	5732.9
MFT (2010)	PA Water	Range: 1-50 Mode: 6-15	27.64	194.49	0	0	0	7498.9
TT (2010)	PA Water	Range: 6-100 Mode: 26-50	100.69	108.99	3.19	0.15	0	7822.6
SC2 (2014)	PA Water	Range: 0.5 Mode: 0	0	153.91	2.89	0	0	11980.3
Jackpine Lake	Fresh Water	0	0	48.81	0	0	2764.5	2273.7

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater pond

<sup>2</sup>Estimated during bird surveys

<sup>3</sup> Estimated from satellite imagery

## 4.4.2 Bird Observations

Surveys were conducted during both the spring (April 1 to July 6) and the fall (July 25 to October 31), to coincide with migration periods. PA ponds were surveyed daily for the entire duration of the seasons and involved a total of 1565 visits (Table 4.11), which translates to 680.5 hours of observation. Effort for the freshwater pond was 52 visits (26 hours) (Table 4.12).

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Duration of Surveys (min)	Survey Station ID	Survey Area (over water; ha)	Number of Surveys Conducted in 2014	Number of Surveys Conducted in spring 2014 (Apr 1 to July 5)	Number of Surveys Conducted in fall 2014 (July 25 to Oct 31)
ETF	30	ETF 3	46.83	167	82	85
ETF	30	ETF 2	20.93	1	1	0
ETF	30	ETF 1	15.87	160	77	83
SEA	10	SEA 2	18.95	120	49	71
SEA	10	SEA 1	22.12	24	10	14
Inpit	30	IP 2	13.2	163	83	80
Inpit	30	IP 1	22.93	170	85	85
Inpit 2B	10	IP2B 2	44.29	8	7	1
Inpit 2B	10	IP2B 1	5.41	162	78	84
MFT	30	MFT 4	16.53	58	57	1
MFT	30	MFT 3	15.14	73	0	73
MFT	30	MFT 2	1.59	148	68	80
тт	30	TT 4	9.8	21	21	0
тт	30	TT 1	31.09	162	82	80
SC2	30	SC2 2	34.34	6	6	0
SC2	30	SC2 1	48.22	151	71	80
Jackpine Lake	30	CL 1	23.88	52	20	32

#### Table 4.11Bird survey effort by station at Shell in 2014.

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater pond(s)

Survey effort was highest at ETF and Inpit because two monitoring stations were required for larger ponds. Search effort was lowest at Jackpine Lake because the 2014 OSBCMP protocol requires freshwater ponds to be visited twice per week rather than daily (Table 4.12). Deviations from the monitoring protocol at JPM and MRM are described in Section 4.1.3. Construction-related restraints, poor road conditions, timing of spring ice melt on the ponds, and variability in weather led to greater variation in the number of survey days during the spring. Constraints in station placement resulted in variable amounts of water surface area being surveyed (Table 4.12).

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>		Surv	ey Area		Scheduled	Number of Surveys Conducted in 2014 328 144 333 162 279 162 157	Percent of
	Number of Survey Stations	Water Surface (ha)	% of Pond Area Over Water (ha)	Duration of Surveys (min)	Monitoring Frequency (days/week)	Surveys Conducted in 2014	days with all scheduled surveys conducted
ETF	2	49.70	73.46	30	6	328	96.5
SEA	1	83.63	19.77	10	6	144	84.7
Inpit	2	36.13	19.68	30	6	333	97.9
Inpit 2B	1	41.07	97.29	10	6	162	95.3
MFT	2	82.56	53.64	30	6	279	82.1
ТТ	1	33.26	17.10	10	6	162	95.3
SC2	1	40.89	37.52	30	6	157	92.4
Jackpine Lake	1	23.88	48.92	30	2	52	100

#### Table 4.12Bird survey effort by pond at Shell in 2014.

<sup>1</sup>Blue shading: freshwater ponds(s)

Bird counts varied among PA ponds. The highest bird counts occurred at SC2; however there were moderately high bird counts at ETF, Inpit, MFT and TT (Table 4.13, Figure 4.2).

The total number of bird contacts differed between ponds. Inpit had the lowest number of contacts relative to the number of birds flying over, whereas SC2 had the highest. Inpit 2B had similar, but very low, numbers of contacts and flyovers. All other ponds had larger proportions of fly-overs than landed birds Table 4.13 and Table 4.14).

Species guilds documented contacting and flying over PA ponds included dabblers, divers, waders, gulls and non-target species (Table 4.13 and Table 4.14, Figure 4.2). Dabblers accounted for 55% of all flyover observations while divers and waders accounted for 45% and 37% of all pond contacts, respectively (Table 4.13 and Table 4.14, Figure 4.2).

The five most common species observed contacting ponds were lesser scaup (*Aythya affinis*), Canada goose (*Branta canadensis*), unknown sandpiper, eared grebe (*Podiceps nigricollis*), and an unknown small wader of the *Calidris* genus (Appendix 4C). The five most common species observed flying over the ponds were Canada goose, American pipit (*Anthus rubescens*), snow bunting (*Plectrophenax nivalis*), an unidentified shorebird, and common raven (*Corvus corax*) (Appendix 4C).

Total number of bird contacts on Jackpine Lake was greater than the number of flyovers (Table 4.13 and Table 4.14, Figure 4.2). Overall, dabblers and divers were the most commonly-observed species coming into contact with and flying over the freshwater pond. Waders were primarily observed flying over the freshwater pond and in numbers similar to the divers that flew over (Table 4.13 and Table 4.14). Jackpine Lake had a higher mean number of landed birds than any of the PA ponds except SC2 (Table 4.14).

	Dabblers		Div	Divers		ders	Gulls		Non- target		Total <sup>3</sup>	
Pond Name <sup>2</sup>	Landed	Flew Over	Landed	Flew Over	Landed	Flew Over	Landed	Flew Over	Landed	Flew Over	Landed	Flew Over
ETF	1	114	10	1	116	178	3	5	0	0	130	298
SEA	4	5	16	3	7	155	8	3	0	0	35	166
Inpit	0	195	4	0	5	50	5	97	2	0	16	342
Inpit 2B	3	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	1	0	9	5
MFT	15	88	54	8	13	110	1	16	1	18	84	240
TT	15	213	1	0	50	47	0	5	0	0	66	265
SC2	164	656	723	80	463	207	109	46	4	5	1463	994
Total of Process Affected Ponds	202	1271	808	92	659	752	126	172	8	23	1803	2310
Jackpine Lake	232	81	153	28	3	23	25	16	0	1	413	149

#### Table 4.13 Number of bird observations by pond and guild at Shell in 2014<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times

<sup>2</sup> Blue shading: freshwater pond(s)

<sup>3</sup> Including unknown duck species (which may be dabblers or divers)

#### Table 4.14Mean number of landed birds per survey at Shell in 2014.

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Station ID	Dabblers	Divers	Waders	Gulls	Non-target Guilds	All Guilds <sup>2</sup>
SEA	SEA 1	0.04	0.04	0	0	0	0.08
SEA	SEA 2	0.03	0.13	0.06	0.07	0	0.39
Inpit 2B	IP2B 1	0	0.00	0.05	0	0.01	0.06
Inpit	IP 1	0	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.16
Inpit	IP 2	0	0.00	0.02	0	0	0.08
ETF	ETF 1	0	0.06	0.57	0	0	0.67
ETF	ETF 3	0.01	0	0.15	0.02	0	0.31
TT	TT 1	0.09	0.02	0	0	0.31	0.43
SC2	SC2 1	1.09	4.79	3.07	0.72	0.03	10.66
SC2	SC2 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
MFT	MFT 2	0.01	0.32	0	0	0.01	0.52
MFT	MFT 3	0	0.01	0.18	0.01	0	0.41
MFT	MFT 4	0.22	0.10	0	0	0	0.33
Jackpine Lake	CL 1	4.46	2.94	0.06	0.48	0	8.37

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater pond(s)

<sup>2</sup> Including unknown duck species (which may be dabblers or divers)





Oiled birds were observed at three ponds (Inpit, TT, and ETF) during PA pond monitoring. The rate of detection at these ponds was generally low (0.01 to 0.07 birds per survey) except at ETF 1 where it was 0.44 birds per survey (Table 4.15, Figure 4.3). During scheduled bird surveys, 89 oiled birds were detected, while two were encountered during mortality searches (refer to Section 4.4.4), and 31 were recorded as incidental findings by the deterrent crew (Appendix 4.D), for a total of 114 oiled birds in 2014. Three large groups of shorebirds were documented landing and contacting bitumen at ETF during the spring migration; the largest was a flock of 50 unidentified sandpipers. Due to the distance of the observers from these landings, the fate of these birds could not be determined. Of the ducks that could be identified to the species level, green-winged teal was the most common oiled dabbling duck and long-tailed duck was the most common diver (Table 4.20). None of the oiled birds found by the bird monitors were documented as mortalities (see section 4.4.4).

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Station ID	Dabblers	Divers	Waders	Gulls	Non-target Guilds	All Guilds <sup>2</sup>
SEA	SEA 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
SEA	SEA 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Inpit 2B	IP2B 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Inpit	IP 1	0	0.01	0	0	0.01	0.02
Inpit	IP 2	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.01
ETF	ETF 1	0	0.01	0.44	0	0	0.44
ETF	ETF 3	0	0	0	0	0	0

#### Table 4.15Mean number of oiled birds per survey at Shell in 2014.

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Station ID	Dabblers	Divers	Waders	Gulls	Non-target Guilds	All Guilds <sup>2</sup>
TT	TT 1	0.07	0.01	0	0	0	0.08
SC2	SC2 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
SC2	SC2 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
MFT	MFT 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
MFT	MFT 3	0	0	0	0	0	0
MFT	MFT 4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jackpine Lake	CL 1	0	0	0	0	0	0

#### Table 4.15 (Cont'd.)

<sup>1</sup>Blue shading: freshwater pond(s)

<sup>2</sup> Including unknown duck species (which may be dabblers or divers)

#### Figure 4.3 Mean number of oiled birds per survey at Shell in 2014.



Four broods were observed on SC2 in 2014 (Table 4.16).

#### Table 4.16Brood observations by species at process-affected ponds at Shell in 2014.

Species/Species Group	# Brood Observations <sup>1</sup>
Canada goose	1
Lesser scaup	1
Unknown scaup	2

<sup>1</sup> Each brood may contain one to multiple chicks; broods may be observed repeatedly and thus be counted multiple times.

## 4.4.3 Inter-observer Variability

IOV surveys were conducted at six ponds during 2014 and differences between observers were measured using RPD. Differences were only detected at two ponds, Sand Cell 2 and Jackpine Lake, and ranged from 0% to 200% (Table 4.17). The large IOV for birds flying over both ponds was the difference between one bird during the May 14 IOV survey at Sand Cell 2, and the difference between six birds and two species during the June 18 survey at Jackpine Lake. Overall the IOV differences were within reasonable limits for the monitors at Shell – 10% difference or less.

Comparison Survey		Lan	ded*	Flew Over*				
	Survey Station ID	RPD: Number of Individual Birds	RPD: Number of Avian Species	RPD: Number of Individual Birds	RPD: Number of Avian Species			
9 April 2014	TT 1	0	0	0	0			
16 April 2014	Inpit 2	0	0	0	0			
30 April 2014	TT 4	-	-	-	-			
14 May 2014	SC2 1	25	50	200	200			
18 June 2014	CL 1	0	0	200	200			
18 June 2014	MFT 2	0	0	0	0			
22 Oct 2014	CL 1	0 0		0	0			
Mean		4.2	8.3	66.7	66.7			

#### Table 4.17Inter-observer variability at Shell in 2014.

\* Dash (-) indicates no birds present. Zero (0) indicates no difference between observers.

## 4.4.4 Mortalities

A total of 154 transects were surveyed across the seven ponds in MRM and JPM (Table 4.18). Total search time was greater for JPM than for MRM; however total distance searched was greater for MRM (Table 4.18). TT had the greatest morality search effort and SEA had the least (Table 4.18).

#### Table 4.18Mortality search effort at Shell in 2014.

Pond	Number		Boat			Walk		Truck			Total		
Name	of Days Searched	hrs	km	ha	hrs	km	ha	hrs	km	ha	hrs	km	ha
ETF	18	21.35	157.60	1793.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	21.35	157.60	1793.1
SEA	23	9.40	74.61	757.46	0	0	0	0	0	0	9.40	74.61	757.46
Inpit	24	18.10	141.52	1589.83	0	0	0	0	0	0	18.10	141.52	1589.83
Inpit 2B	22	11.78	116.30	952.79	0	0	0	0	0	0	11.78	116.30	952.79
MFT	24	18.85	191.49	2269.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	18.85	191.49	2269.8
TT	20	104.29	50.66	472.19	0	0	0	0	0	0	104.29	50.66	472.19
SC2	23	16.27	138.60	1822.21	0	0	0	0	0	0	16.27	138.60	1822.21
Total	154	200.05	870.77	9657.38	0	0	0	0	0	0	200.05	870.77	9657.38

<sup>1</sup> Including route-based and focused transects; for each search, either distance OR area counted towards effort.

A total of 33 mortalities were documented on site in 2014. One American coot and one unknown scaup were documented during designated mortality searches, and 31 individuals comprising 14 species were documented as incidental mortalities by the deterrent crews (Table 4.19 and Table 4.20, Figure 4.4).

Pond Name	Mortality Search	Incidental	Total
ETF	1	3	4
SEA	0	5	5
Inpit	1	8	9
Inpit 2B	0	0	0
MFT	0	9	9
TT	0	6	6
SC2	0	0	0
Total	2	31	33

#### Table 4.19Number of mortalities by pond at Shell in 2014.

## Table 4.20Number of observations of oiling and mortalities, by species, at Shell in<br/>2014.

Species / Species Oreum	Contacted	Bitumen	Mortality				
Species / Species Group	Bird Survey Incidental		Mortality Search	Incidental			
Unknown sandpiper	53	12	0	0			
Unknown <i>Calidris</i> sp.	17	0	0	0			
Green-winged teal	12	0	0	2			
Unknown shorebird	8	0	0	0			
Unknown duck	2	0	0	3			
American golden-plover	2	0	0	0			
American coot	1	1	1	2			
Ruddy duck	1	0	0	1			
Unknown grebe	1	0	0	5			
Unknown diving duck	0	3	0	0			
Canada goose	0	1	0	3			
Unknown scaup	0	0	1	1			
Northern shoveler	0	0	0	6			
Long-tailed duck	0	0	0	3			
Herring gull	0	0	0	1			
Lesser scaup	0	0	0	1			
Mallard	0	0	0	1			
Pied-billed grebe	0	0	0	1			
Red-winged blackbird	0	0	0	1			
Total	97	17	2	31			

<sup>1</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days or also observed as mortalities, and thus be counted multiple times.

## Figure 4.4 Relationship between pond area, mortality search effort, and mortality search results.



\*does not include incidental mortalities x and y axes have a Log10 scale

Although waders were the guild most commonly observed contacting bitumen, no wading birds were found dead during the 2014 monitoring season. Mortality was most common among dabbling ducks, followed by divers. Dabblers were most commonly seen flying over the ponds. Over 80% of mortalities recorded in 2014 (mortality surveys and incidentals) were ducks, with about 50% being divers and 35% dabbling ducks (Figure 4.5).



Figure 4.5 Proportion of each guild for birds that flew over, landed, contacted bitumen, or died at Shell in 2014.

\*incidental observations

The mean number of landed birds per survey was higher during fall migration than during spring migration at both the PA ponds and at Jackpine Lake (Figure 4.6). The number of oiled birds was highest during May and low during all of the fall migration months. The number of mortalities was spread equally across the entire monitoring session. Jackpine Lake had higher numbers of landed birds during fall migration than during the spring months.





\*Individual birds may be observed repeatedly on consecutive days

Pond Name <sup>4</sup> (o		Potential Attractants	Occurrence of Floating Bitumen	Mean Number of Landed Waterbirds per Survey				Nur Sp La	nber of becies anded	Observations of Oiled Birds		Number of Mortalities	
	Pond Area (over water; ha)			Dabblers	Divers	Waders	Gulls	Total <sup>2</sup>	Species of Conservation Concern <sup>3</sup>	Per Survey <sup>2</sup>	Incidental <sup>1</sup>	Mortality Search	Incidental
ETF	423.06	Sandy shoreline	Always	0	0.03	0.35	0.01	159	4	71	1	1	3
SEA	42.21	Sandy shoreline	Always	0.03	0.11	0.05	0.06	49	2	0	0	0	5
Inpit	183.56	Sandy shoreline	Always	0	0.01	0.02	0.02	41	2	5	2	1	8
Inpit 2B	67.66	Inlets	Always	0.02	0	0.03	0	9	0	0	0	0	0
MFT	194.49	Sandy shoreline	Always	0.05	0.19	0.05	0	126	20	0	1	0	9
тт	100.69	Islands, floating vegetation, emergent vegetation	Always	0.09	0.01	0.31	0	69	13	13	0	0	6
SC2	153.91	Islands, floating vegetation, emergent vegetation	Less than half the days	1.04	4.61	2.95	0.69	1609	481	0	0	0	0
Jackpine Lake	48.81	Inlets, shallows	Never	4.46	2.94	0.06	0.48	435	55	0	0	0	0

#### Table 4.21 Summary of bird survey, mortality and incidental results by pond at Shell in 2014.

<sup>1</sup> 26 of the 31 oiled birds that were detected incidentally were not associated with any potential attractants

<sup>2</sup> During bird surveys

<sup>3</sup> Including incidental observations

<sup>4</sup> Blue shading: freshwater pond(s)

## 4.4.5 Species of Conservation Concern

Species of conservation concern, as defined in the OSBCMP, were detected at PA ponds and at Jackpine Lake. At PA ponds, 16 species were observed (Table 4.5):

- Two dabblers green-winged teal (Anas crecca) and northern pintail (Anas acuta);
- Five divers black tern (*Chlidonias niger*), horned grebe (*Podiceps auritus*), lesser scaup (*Aythya affinis*), pied-billed grebe (*Podilymbus podiceps*) and white-winged scoter (*Melanitta fusca*);
- Two waders great blue heron (*Ardea herodias*) and sandhill crane (*Grus canadensis*); and
- Seven non-target species American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*), bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), barn swallow (*Hirundo rustica*), northern goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*), northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*), peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*) and sharp-tailed grouse (*Tympanuchus phasianellus*).

The majority of observations during bird surveys were of lesser scaup coming into contact with the PA ponds. Large numbers of this species were also documented flying over as incidental observations (Table 4.5). Non-target species documented were only observed flying over the monitoring station.

At Jackpine Lake, eight species of conservation concern were documented:

- One dabbler northern pintail (*Anas acuta*);
- Three divers horned grebe (*Podiceps auritus*), lesser scaup (*Aythya affinis*) and white-winged scoter (*Melanitta fusca*); and
- Three non-target species barn swallow (*Hirundo rustica*), northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*) and sharp-tailed grouse (*Tympanuchus phasianellus*).

Two species documented during monitoring surveys are federally listed on Schedule 1 of the Species at Risk Act (SARA). Peregrine falcon is designated as 'Special Concern' and barn swallow is designated as 'Threatened'. These are non-target species that were observed flying over the PA ponds.

## 4.5 DISCUSSION

### 4.5.1 Bird Deterrents

The density of deterrents at the four oldest ponds (ETF, Inpit, MFT and TT) in the two mine sites has been consistent since 2011. Units are placed at 250 m intervals over the ponds and associated shorelines, such that the effective areas of the units covered the entire tailings pond and shorelines. On occasion, individual units are re-situated to accommodate construction work at the tailings ponds.

The number of deterrents on TT was increased in 2014 from 20 to 27 and this may have contributed to the large decline in the number of flyovers recorded.

Two new ponds, SC2 and Inpit 2B, contained PA water in 2014 and bird deterrents have been placed at these sites in densities similar to those of the other ponds. Additional deterrent system components will be placed around SC2 in 2015 to accommodate the increasing size and pond surface area.

## 4.5.2 Bird Contacts

#### 4.5.2.1 Trends in Bird Contacts

Over four thousand birds were detected at PA ponds during the 2014 field season. Birds were more frequently observed flying over the survey area than landing on the ponds (56% of all PA pond observations). Total flyovers ranged from five at Inpit 2B to 994 at SC2, with an average of 219 flyovers across all PA ponds. Just under one half of the birds flying over tailings ponds were noted at SC2. The highest percentage of birds making contact with PA ponds in 2014 was at SC2, where 1,463 birds were recorded landing (81% of PA pond observations). The pond with the second highest proportion of bird contacts was ETF, with 130 (7% of PA pond observations), and the lowest number of contacts was documented at Inpit 2B, where only nine birds landed (0.5% of PA pond observations). The average number of landings at all other PA ponds was 57 birds. In comparison, less than 600 birds were detected at Jackpine Lake. Birds were more frequently documented landing on the freshwater pond (74% of all observations). Despite the overall low numbers of birds at this site, the number of bird contacts was substantially higher than at all PA ponds except SC2. This suggests that Jackpine Lake continues to provide refuge to migrating birds passing through disturbed landscapes from oil and gas development in Northern Alberta (St. Clair et al. 2012).

SC2 has a unique composition relative to the other PA ponds at Shell. The very short time during which mature fine tailings was poured into the pond has resulted in a mostly freshwater composition with a relatively high proportion of islands. Some of these islands and the adjacent shoreline are sparsely vegetated, with not enough vegetation to show up on aerial photographs, but enough to be an attractant for dabbling ducks and wading birds. These vegetated areas, combined with areas of deeper water, are providing habitat for all four of the target guilds that are monitored regularly at Shell; however, there is no risk to birds landing on this pond under present conditions, and additional deterrents will be added to this pond in 2015. Inpit 2B is a steep-walled pond with no vegetation or beach area and has very little shoreline for birds to land. These features are probably the reason for few bird observations and landings at this pond.

The peak time for bird landings at PA ponds and at Jackpine Lake was during the months of August and September (Appendix 4B). Greater numbers of flyovers were also recorded during the fall migration. Northeast Alberta experienced a late spring in 2014, with ice covering the two largest PA ponds until the middle of April and Jackpine Lake until May 1. This may have contributed to lower numbers of birds observed in the spring of this year.

### 4.5.2.2 Trends in Species Observed

Species abundance and diversity within the target foraging guilds was much lower at Jackpine Lake than at PA ponds. More specifically, 54 target species, including 13 dabblers, 16 divers and 16 waders, were documented at PA ponds, whereas 43 target species consisting of eight dabblers, 14 divers and four waders were documented at Jackpine Lake. The ten most abundant species at PA ponds were Canada

goose, lesser scaup, American pipit, an unknown shorebird, snow bunting, an unidentified wader of the genus *Calidris*, unknown white-headed gull, common raven, unknown sandpiper and mallard. Geese in particular, breed in wetlands and are most likely to be associated with open water habitats. At Jackpine Lake, the most common species detected were Canada goose, mallard, ruddy duck, lesser scaup, gadwall, common goldeneye, tree swallow, common loon, bufflehead and greater yellowlegs. All of these species are within their breeding range (Sibley 2003). Tree swallow observations consisted of individuals nesting in the nest boxes along the shoreline.

There were four observations of broods at Shell in 2014, all at SC2. A family of Canada geese was identified on one occasion and lesser scaup was identified on the three other occasions. The lesser scaup were all from the same survey station and may thus represent a single family. All four brood sightings were made in August.

Four species of conservation concern were observed landing on PA ponds in moderate to high numbers, including 600 lesser scaup. Moderate numbers of northern pintail (1 - 24), green-winged teal (1 - 8) and horned grebe (1 - 12) were also recorded contacting these ponds. Just over 90% of these observations were on SC2. These numbers include individuals that were counted on successive days and so individuals may have been counted multiple times.

During the spring migration bird monitoring crews saw two large groups of sandpipers contacting bitumen at ETF. This included a group of 50 unidentified sandpipers landing on the shore on May 23 and another group of 15 on May 18. Due to survey time constraints, the distance between the observers and the birds, and the general flighty behaviour displayed by shorebirds, the outcome of these bird observations could not be determined.

The largest single landing event occurred in the fall when the above mentioned 50 unidentified sandpipers landed on the shore at ETF. Aside from this event no large flocks were documented contacting PA pond surfaces, including the TT pond with its vegetated islands. There were more frequent occurrences of large numbers of individuals landing on Jackpine Lake; the largest involved 45 Canada geese in September 2014.

### 4.5.2.3 Inter-Year Comparisons

In the 2013 Shell OSBCMP report, comparisons were made to the previous monitoring years (2012 and 2011). Bird detections at PA ponds were seven times higher in 2012 compared to 2013 and dabblers and pecks were the most frequently documented forging guilds. At Jackpine Lake, dabblers, pecks and divers were the most frequently observed forging guilds. In 2012 and 2013, monitoring at SEA and Inpit consistently resulted in the fewest bird observations. Between the 2012 and 2013 monitoring years, changes in the length of bird surveys (changed from 45 minutes to 30 minutes) and the survey area boundaries (unbounded in 2012 to a 500m radius and 100m ceiling limit in 2013) had substantial impacts on bird detections at both PA ponds and Jackpine Lake (Hatfield 2013).

The 2014 monitoring protocols were most similar to those implemented in 2013; therefore, a comparison of these two years is appropriate. SC2 and Inpit 2B were not monitored during 2013 and as such bird observations from these two ponds are not included. Almost 40% more birds were documented making

contact with Shell PA ponds in 2014 than in 2013, and all survey sites except Inpit had more birds contacting PA water this year than in 2013.

Roughly three times fewer birds were recorded flying over PA ponds. The most noticeable change in the number of flyovers occurred at TT where numbers dropped from 1,456 in 2013 to 265 in 2014. Two significant changes occurred at TT in 2014: the number of deterrents was increased and the percentage of vegetation on the pond was decreased. Both of these factors may have contributed to the decline in flyovers. More flyovers were recorded in 2014 at all ponds except Inpit. The total number of birds both flying over and contacting water in 2013 at Jackpine Lake was considerably higher in 2013 than in 2014, however there were four times as many surveys conducted in 2013 so a direct comparison cannot be made.

In 2013, ponds with greater deterrent density had fewer bird contacts. In general, the larger ponds had lower deterrent density. In comparison, deterrent density was increased at all ponds in 2014; however the number of contacts also increased. This was true for all ponds except Inpit, where the number of bird contacts was lower in 2014. This suggests that the deterrent systems in place at Shell may be effective for some species, but not others. For example, SC2 had the second highest deterrent density of all PA ponds but had substantially more contacts. In addition, the largest ponds also had the greatest amounts of open water and beach characteristics, which may influence contact rates. Without considering these features, as well as vegetated islands, it is difficult to make comparisons.

A total of 16 species with some risk designations under provincial and/or federal legislation were detected in 2014 compared to 17 in 2013, 14 in 2012 and eight in 2011. One species of conservation concern was newly detected in 2014 – a single northern goshawk was documented as an incidental observation at Inpit. One western grebe was observed at Jackpine Lake in 2012, but not during any other monitoring year.

### 4.5.2.4 Mortalities

Incidental observations accounted for 100% of the 2013 mortalities (17) and 89% of 2014 mortality observations (31 of 34 birds). Approximately 80% of all oiled birds were first discovered during scheduled bird surveys. These surveys are not only used to quantify the number of birds landing on PA and FW ponds, they are often the first means of detection of a bird on PA ponds. Only two of the 89 oiled birds that were detected during bird surveys had significant amounts of bitumen on their feathers, the rest were not counted as mortalities. That the mortality search crews only found mortalities (both lesser scaup) during designated searches, suggests that very few birds die relative to the number that land on the ponds.

Based on the number of incidentally encountered mortalities relative to the total number of bird observations at PA ponds, it can be suggested that boat transects are not the most effective means of detecting mortalities. This may be due in part to inadequate coverage during searches, the observer's ability to detect oiled birds from a boat, or that oiled birds move or sink and are therefore more difficult to find.

## 4.5.3 Inter Observer Variability

The lack of bird observations during many PA pond surveys limits the effectiveness of the inter-observer variability tests. At Shell, Jackpine Lake and SC2 are the only two ponds that have a sufficient number of landed birds to be able to make usable comparisons between observers and these sites should be used for comparison tests. In addition, if time permits, surveyors may be able to make periodic visits to other local ponds in the area such as Crane Lake to perform IOV tests.

## 4.5.4 Recommendations

TT had the highest proportion of both emergent vegetation and islands and these attributes often serve as an attractant for dabbling ducks and wading birds. Because all of the vegetated islands on TT were outside of the 500m survey radius, all wading birds were recorded as incidental observations during bird surveys. The percent of vegetation on this pond has dropped from 5% in the spring of 2013 to 0.15% in 2014 due floating backhoes removing and submerging vegetation. This task of turning over and sinking islands of floating vegetation should continue on TT through 2015 to reduce the potential for these islands to draw birds down to land on them.

SC2 also has a relatively high proportion of islands. Some of these islands and the adjacent shoreline are sparsely vegetated. Although there is not enough vegetation to show up on aerial photographs, there is enough to attract dabbling ducks and wading birds. SC2 is being prepared to receive bitumen next year and deterrent crews were kept busy hazing birds at this site in anticipation of this. This pond will need careful vegetation management in 2015 to ensure that islands and floating vegetation do not attract nesting or migrant birds.

The distance to water from survey stations varies throughout the monitoring season and is often greater than 250 m at MFT, TT, Inpit and ETF. This reduces the pond surface area of the formal bird surveys considerably. Opportunities to relocate these survey sites to vantage points that are closer to the water's edge should be explored early in the 2015 monitoring season.

## 4.6 DOCUMENTS CITED

[Hatfield] Hatfield Consultants Partnership. 2014. 2013 Oil sands bird contact monitoring program report. Report to Shell Canada Energy. Fort McMurray (AB).

- Shell Canada Energy. 2015a. Shell Canada Energy 2014 environment report Muskeg River Mine. Fort McMurray (AB): Shell Canada Energy.
- Shell Canada Energy. 2015b. Shell Canada Energy 2014 environment report Jackpine Mine. Fort McMurray (AB): Shell Canada Energy.
- Shell Canada Energy. 2014. Waterfowl protection plan. Fort McMurray (AB): Shell Canada Energy.
- St. Clair CC, Loots S, Ronconi RA. 2014. Oil sands bird contact monitoring program (OSBCMP). Research on Avian Protection Project, Department of Biological Sciences. [Edmonton (AB)]: University of Alberta.
- St. Clair CC, Loots S, McCallum C, Ronconi RA. 2013. Oil sands bird monitoring plan. Research on Avian Protection Project, Department of Biological Sciences. [Edmonton (AB)]: University of Alberta.
- St. Clair CC, Loots S, McCallum C, Thayer D, Fontaine T, Gilhooly P. 2012. 2012 report of the regional bird monitoring program for the oil sands. Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta.

**APPENDICES** 

Appendix 4A

Location of Deterrents, Containment Booms and Survey Stations at Shell Ponds in 2014



# Figure 4A.1 Process-affected water ponds and bird deterrent locations at Shell Muskeg River Mine, 2014.









K:\Data\Project\SHELL6688\A\_MXD\Report\_Figures\SHELL6688\_Fig4A\_1\_Bird\_Deterrents\_Muskeg\_20141217\_SB.mxd



#### Figure 4A.2 Process-affected water ponds and bird deterrent locations at Shell Jackpine Mine, 2014.

Legend Radar station Bird Avert system location Major road Watercourse Waterbody





0.25 0.5

K:\Data\Project\SHELL6688\A\_MXD\Report\_Figures\SHELL6688\_Fig4A\_2\_Bird\_Deterrents\_Jackpine\_20141217\_SB.mxd

0



K:\Data\Project\SHELL6688\A\_MXD\Report\_Figures\SHELL6688\_Fig4A\_3\_Bird\_Monitoring\_Muskeg\_20141217\_SB.mxd

Figure 4A.3 Bird monitoring stations at Shell Muskeg River Mine, 2014.



#### Figure 4A.4 Bird monitoring stations at Shell Jackpine Mine, 2014.

K:\Data\Project\SHELL6688\A\_MXD\Report\_Figures\SHELL6688\_Fig4A\_4\_Bird\_Monitoring\_Jackpine\_20141217\_SB.mxd

Appendix 4B

Relationship Between the Mean Number of Landed Waterbirds Per Survey and Hour After Sunrise at Shell in 2014


Appendix 4C

Number of Bird Observations by Species at Shell Process-affected Ponds in 2014

		Lan	ded <sup>1</sup>	Flew Over <sup>1</sup>	Contacted	d Bitumen <sup>1</sup>	Mortality	
Guild	Species/Species Group	Bird Survey	Incidental <sup>2</sup>	Bird Survey	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	
	Lesser scaup	470	189	44	0	0	1	
	Canada goose	151	0	1202	0	1	0	
	Mallard	121	0	7	0	0	0	
	Unknown sandpiper	110	0	28	53	12	0	
	Eared grebe	86	0	0	0	0	0	
	Unknown <i>Calldris</i> sp.	71	0	215	17	0	0	
	American pipit	66	0	0	0	0	0	
	Ruddy duck	61	0	0	1	0	0	
	Unknown shorebird	60	0	283	0	0	0	
	Unknown white-headed gull	60	0	111	0	0	0	
	Unknown scaup	59	0	0	0	0	1	
	Lesser yellowlegs	58	0	57	0	0	0	
	Semipalmated plover	52	0	53	0	0	0	
	Unknown diving duck	47	0	23	0	3	0	
	Semipalmated sandpiper	42	0	26	0	0	0	
	Bufflehead	42	0	6	0	0	0	
	Unknown phalarope	42	0	0	0	0	0	
	Horned grebe	41	5	0	0	0	0	
	American coot	33	0	0	1	1	1	
		31	0	3	0	0	0	
	Northern pintail	30	0	46	0	0	0	
	Baird's sandpiper	29	95 0	14	0	0	0	
	American wigeon	29	0	0	0	0	0	
	Green-winged teal	29	12	0	12	0	0	
	Herring gull	29	0	0	0	0	0	
	Common goldeneye	27	0	12	0	0	0	
	Greater yellowlegs	23	0	64	0	0	0	
irds	Northern shoveler	22	0	12	0	0	0	
terb	Ring-necked duck	18	0	0	0	0	0	
Ma	California gull	17	0	3	0	0	0	
	Bonaparte's gull	15	0	0	0	0	0	
	Least sandpiper	13	0	4	0	0	0	
	Unknown dabbling duck	13	0	2	0	0	0	
		13	0	0	0	0	0	
		13	0	0	0	0	0	
	Unknown aull	11	0	9	0	0	0	
	Unknown grebe	11	0	0	1	0	0	
	Gadwall	10	0	15	0	0	0	
	Canvasback	10	0	6	0	0	0	
	Unknown duck	8	0	24	2	0	0	
	White-winged scoter	8	0	1	0	0	0	
	Mew gull	8	0	0	0	0	0	
	Redhead	8	0	0	0	0	0	
	Sanderling	8	0	0	0	0	0	
	Spotted sandpiper	7	0	0	0	0	0	
	Unknown dowitcher	7	0	0	0	0	0	
	King-Dillea gull Killdeer	6	U	21	0	U	U	
		5	0	0	0	0	0	
	American golden-ployer	c A	0	0	2	0	0	
	Pectoral sandniner	4	0	0	2 0	0	0	
	Franklin's gull	3	0 0	41	0	0	0	
	Greater white-fronted goose	3	0	24	0	0	0	
	Red-breasted merganser	3	0	0	0	0	0	
	Red-necked grebe	3	0	0	0	0	0	
	Unknown black-headed gull	2	0	3	0	0	0	
	Greater scaup	2	0	0	0	0	0	
	Common merganser	1	0	2	0	0	0	

		Land	ded <sup>1</sup>	Flew Over <sup>1</sup>	Contacted	I Bitumen <sup>1</sup>	Mortality		
Guild	Species/Species Group	Bird Survey	Incidental2	Bird Survey	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental	
	Stilt sandpiper	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Unknown swan	0	0	42	0	0	0	0	
-	Common tern	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	
iť d.	Unknown pecking bird	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	
Cor	Sandhill crane	0	6	11	0	0	0	0	
) sp.	Black tern	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	
erbii	Unknown dabbler	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	
Nate	Great blue heron	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
	Surf scoter	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
	Horned lark	66	0	29	0	0	0	0	
	Snow bunting	60	0	447	0	0	0	0	
	Lapland longspur	36	0	38	0	0	0	0	
	Common raven	18	0	138	0	0	0	0	
	Brewer's blackbird	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	
L C N	Unknown passerine	6	0	108	0	0	0	0	
	Clay-colored sparrow	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Merlin	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	
	Savannah sparrow	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Unknown sparrow	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Northern harrier	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	
	Sharp-tailed grouse	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	
	American kestrel	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	
	Snowy owl	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Bald eagle	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
et	Northern goshawk	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
targ	Unknown swallow	0	0	55	0	0	0	0	
lon	Barn swallow	0	0	53	0	0	0	0	
Z	Tree swallow	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	
	Cliff swallow	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	
	American robin	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	
	Pine siskin	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	
	Unknown depredator	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	
	Yellow-rumped warbler	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	
	American crow	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	
	Rough-legged hawk	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	
	Black-capped chickadee	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	
	Peregrine falcon	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	
	Red-tailed hawk	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	
	Brown-headed cowbird	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
	Black-billed magpie	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
	Long-tailed duck	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
	Pied-billed grebe	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	Red-winged blackbird	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	

Pink shading: Species of Conservation Concern

<sup>1</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times

<sup>2</sup> Only for Species of Conservation Concern

**Appendix 4D** 

Bird Oiling and Mortality Events at Shell in April–October 2014

Date	Species/Species Group	Number of Birds	Pond Name (Survey Station ID)	Location Description	% Oiled	Outcome	Context of Detection	Method of Detection	Potential Reason for Mortality/Oiling
18/Apr/14	Canada goose	1	MR_IP	unknown	75-100	mortality	found dead but not recovered	incidental	unknown
29/Apr/14	Ruddy duck	1	MR_ETF_1	floating on open water	unknown	unknown	during bird survey	using scope and binoculars	floating bitumen nearby
4/May/14	Green-winged teal	8	JP_TT_1	floating on open water	unknown	unknown	during bird survey	using scope and binoculars	floating bitumen nearby
5/May/14	Herring gull	1	JP_MFT	unknown	0-25	mortality	found dead	incidental	unknown
6/May/14	Green-winged teal	4	JP_TT_1	floating on open water	unknown	unknown	during bird survey	using scope and binoculars	floating bitumen nearby
17/May/14	Pied-billed grebe	1	JP_TT_1	unknown	0-25	sent to rehab, died after washing process	found oiled	incidental	unknown
18/May/14	American golden plover	2	MR_ETF_1	floating vegetation	unknown	unknown	during bird survey	using scope and binoculars	bitumen on the floating vegetation
18/May/14	Unknown <i>Calidris</i> sp.	15	MR_ETF_1	at shoreline	unknown	unknown	during bird survey	using scope and binoculars	bitumen at the shoreline
18/May/14	Lesser scaup	1	MR_ETF	unknown	75-100	mortality	found dead	incidental	unknown
21/May/14	American coot	1	JP_MFT_2	unknown	75-100	found injured, bird died	during bird survey	using scope and binoculars	floating bitumen nearby
23/May/14	Unknown sandpiper	50	MR_ETF_1	at shoreline	unknown	unknown	during bird survey	using scope and binoculars	bitumen at the shoreline
24/May/14	Unknown sandpiper	3	MR_ETF_1	at shoreline	unknown	unknown	during bird survey	using scope and binoculars	bitumen at the shoreline
24/May/14	Unknown sandpiper	12	MR_ETF_1	at shoreline	unknown	unknown	during bird survey	using scope and binoculars	bitumen at the shoreline
2/Jun/14	Long-tailed duck	3	MR_IP_1	floating on open water	75-100	found injured, birds died	during bird survey	using scope and binoculars	floating bitumen nearby
2/Jun/14	Ruddy duck	1	MR_IP_1	at shoreline	75-100	found injured, bird died	during bird survey	using scope and binoculars	bitumen at the shoreline
2/Jun/14	Unknown duck	1	MR_IP_1	at shoreline	75-100	found injured, bird died	during bird survey	using scope and binoculars	bitumen at the shoreline
15/Jun/14	Canada goose	2	JP_TT	unknown	75-100	mortality	found injured	incidental	unknown
7/Jul/14	Red-winged blackbird	1	JP_TT	unknown	75-100	mortality	found injured	incidental	unknown
4/Aug/14	Unknown Calidris sp.	2	MR_IP_2	at shoreline	unknown	unknown	during bird survey	using scope and binoculars	bitumen at the shoreline
5/Aug/14	Unknown grebe	1	MR_IP_1	floating on open water	75-100	found injured, bird died	during bird survey	using scope and binoculars	floating bitumen nearby
9/Aug/14	Green-winged teal	1	MR_ETF	unknown	75-100	mortality	found injured	incidental	unknown
10/Aug/14	Unknown grebe	4	MR_SEA	unknown	75-100	mortality	found injured	incidental	unknown
28/Aug/14	Northern shoveler	1	JP_MFT	unknown	75-100	mortality	found injured	incidental	unknown
5/Sep/14	Unknown duck	1	MR_ETF	unknown	75-100	mortality	found injured	incidental	unknown
6/Sep/14	Northern shoveler	5	JP_MFT	unknown	75-100	mortality	found injured	incidental	unknown
18/Sep/14	Unknown shorebird	8	MR_ETF_1	at shoreline	unknown	unknown	during bird survey	using scope and binoculars	bitumen at the shoreline
26/Sep/14	Green-winged teal	1	JP_MFT	unknown	75-100	mortality	found injured	incidental	unknown
26/Sep/14	Unknown duck	1	MR_SEA	unknown	0	mortality	found dead	incidental	unknown
5/Oct/14	American coot	1	MR_ETF	unknown	75-100	mortality	found injured	route-based survey	
6/Oct/14	American coot	1	JP_TT_1	floating vegetation	75-100	found injured, bird died	during bird survey	using scope and binoculars	bitumen on the floating vegetation
19/Oct/14	Unknown scaup	1	MR_IP	unknown	75-100	mortality	found injured	incidental	unknown
25/Oct/14	Ring-necked duck	1	JP_SC2_1	floating on open water	unknown	unknown	during bird survey	using scope and binoculars	floating bitumen nearby
28/Oct/14	Mallard	1	JP_TT	unknown	75-100	mortality	found injured	incidental	unknown

Appendix 4E

2014 Post-Monitoring Migration Landing Event Summary In November 2014, flocks of late southbound migrating birds passed over the Oil Sands Region of Alberta. This was likely influenced by the late spring and abnormally warm fall conditions in Northern Alberta and British Columbia compared to the previous three years of monitoring for the OSBCMP. These events are unpredictable and uncommon given the traditional timing of migration through this region, which ranges from mid to late April for spring migration and mid-September to early October for fall migration. This event occurred after the 2014 OSBCMP was completed for the season. A number of birds landed on PA ponds at Shell, however no birds came into contact with bitumen. Shell personnel responded to this event by documenting and monitoring all PA ponds on site and by actively hazing birds off of the ponds. All results were documented and communicated to ESRD in a timely fashion.



# OIL SANDS BIRD CONTACT MONITORING PROGRAM SUNCOR OIL SANDS BASE MINE PROJECT- SUNCOR ENERGY INC. 2014 WATERFOWL MONITORING PROGRAM REPORT

Prepared for:

Suncor Energy Inc.

March 13, 2015



Suncor Energy Inc. Oil Sands P.O Box 2844 150 6th Avenue SW Calgary, AB T2P 3E3 Tel 403 296 8000 Fax 403 296 3030 Suncor Energie Inc. Oil Sands P O. Box 2844 150 6th Avenue SW Calgary, AB T2P 3E3 Tél 403 296 8000 Télèc. 403-296 3030 www.suncor.com

March 13, 2015

Alberta Energy Regulator 111 Twin Atria Bldg. 4999 - 98 Avenue Edmonton, AB T6B 2X3

#### RE: 2014 Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program Report Suncor Energy Inc. Oil Sands Processing Plant and Mine EPEA Approval No. 94-02-00 (as amended)

Dear Sir or Madame:

Please find attached a copy of the Suncor's site specific section of the Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program Report as required by Clauses 6.1.82 and 6.1.83 of Suncor's Base Mine EPEA Approval 94-02-00 (as amended).

Please contact me at (403) 296-4665 with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

narlyss Long

Marlyss Long Environmental Compliance Suncor Energy Services Inc.

Cc: Sheila Chernys, Suncor Energy Inc. Andrea McGregor, ESRD Joann Skilnick, ESRD Richard Wiacek, Environment Canada

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

#### PAGE

5.0	SUNC		GY INC	5-1
	5.1	Summary		5-1
		5.1.1	Bird Landings and Mortalities at Process-affected Ponds	5-1
		5.1.2	Bird Landings at Freshwater Ponds	5-2
		5.1.3	Standardized Monitoring	5-3
		5.1.4	Species of Conservation Concern	5-3
		5.1.5	Adaptive Management	5-4
	5.2	Introduction	on	5-5
		5.2.1	Site	5-5
		5.2.2	Personnel	5-7
		5.2.3	Management of Avian Attractants and Control of Hazards	5-7
		5.2.4	Deterrents	5-7
		5.2.5	Hazing Procedures	5-11
	5.3	Methods.	-	5-12
		5.3.1	Pond Characteristics	5-12
		5.3.2	Bird Surveys	5-12
		5.3.3	Inter-observer Variability (IOV)	5-16
		5.3.4	Mortality Searches	5-18
		5.3.5	Incidental Observations and Reporting	5-18
	5.4	Results		5-19
		5.4.1	Pond Characteristics	5-19
		5.4.2	Bird Observations	5-19
		5.4.3	Inter-observer Variability (IOV)	5-26
		5.4.4	Mortalities	5-27
		5.4.5	Species of Conservation Concern	5-35
	5.5	Discussio	n	5-35
	5.6	Documen	ts Cited	5-39
	5.7	Appendic	es 5.A to 5.E	5-40





# TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

#### PAGE

#### LIST OF TABLES

Table 5.1:	Monitoring Effort at Process-affected Ponds at Suncor Base Mine in 2014.	5-1
Table 5.2:	Bird Observations at Process-affected Ponds at Suncor Base Mine in	5_1
Table 5.3 <sup>.</sup>	Monitoring Effort at Freshwater Ponds at Suncor Base Mine in 2014	5-1
Table 5.4:	Bird Observations at Freshwater Ponds at Suncor Base Mine in 2014	5-2
Table 5.5:	Number of Observations of Birds of Conservation Concern at Process-	
	affected Ponds at Suncor Base Mine in 2014	5-4
Table 5.6:	Avian Deterrents Deployed at Suncor Base Mine (as of Fall 2014)	5-9
Table 5.7:	Number of Avian Radars and Deterrents at Process-affected Ponds at	
	Suncor Base Mine (as of Fall 2014)	5-10
Table 5.8:	Characteristics of Survey Stations Monitored at Suncor Base Mine in	
	2014	5-13
Table 5.9:	Characteristics of ponds monitored at Suncor Base Mine in 2014	5-14
Table 5.10:	Bird Survey Effort by Station at Suncor Base Mine in 2014	5-15
Table 5.11:	Bird Survey Effort by Pond at Suncor Base Mine in 2014	5-17
Table 5.12:	Number of Bird Observations by Pond and Guild at Suncor Base Mine in	
	2014 <sup>1</sup>	5-20
Table 5.13:	Mean Number of Landed Birds per Survey at Suncor Base Mine in 2014	5-23
Table 5.14:	Mean Number of Oiled Birds per Survey at Suncor Base Mine in 2014	5-24
Table 5.15:	Brood Observations by Species at Process-affected Ponds at Suncor	
	Base Mine in 2014	5-26
Table 5.16:	Inter-observer Variability in Terms of Relative Percent Difference at	
	Suncor Base Mine in 2014	5-27
Table 5.17:	Mortality Search Effort at Suncor Base Mine in 2014 <sup>1</sup>	5-28
Table 5.18:	Number of Mortalities by Pond at Suncor Base Mine in April to October	
	2014	5-29
Table 5.19:	Number of Observations of Oiling and Mortalities, by Species, at Suncor	
	Base Mine in 2014	5-31
Table 5.20:	Summary of Bird Survey, Mortality and Incidental Results by Pond at	<b>-</b>
T 11 504	Suncor Base Mine in 2014	
1 able 5.21:	Summary of Potential Attractants by Pond at Suncor Base Mine in 2014	

#### **LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 5.1: Figure 5.2	Process-affected and Freshwater Ponds at Suncor Base Mine in 2014 Mean Number of Landed Waterbirds per Survey at Suncor Base Mine in	5-6
i igure ei <u>-</u> i	2014	5-21
Figure 5.3:	Mean Number of Oiled Birds per Survey at Suncor Base Mine in 2014	5-25
Figure 5.4:	Relationship Between Pond Area (over water), Mortality Search Effort,	
	and Mortality Search Results	5-30
Figure 5.5:	Proportion of each Guild for Birds that Flew Over or Landed at Process-	
	affected Ponds, Contacted Bitumen, or Died at Suncor Base Mine in 2014	5-32
Figure 5.6:	Timing of Bird Landings, Oiling, and Mortalities in Spring (top) and Fall	
0	(bottom) 2014 at Suncor Base Mine	5-34





#### 5.0 SUNCOR ENERGY INC.

#### 5.1 Summary

Suncor Energy Inc. (Suncor) is one of five mining operators in the Alberta oil sands region participating in the regional Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program (OSBCMP) since 2011. This Suncor report summarizes data collected in 2014 at the Suncor Oil Sands Base Mine Project, and is submitted per Conditions Subsection 6.1.81 to 83 in the Suncor Energy *Environmental Protection & Enhancement Act* Approval No. 94-02-00, issued to Suncor for operation of the Base Mine Project.

#### 5.1.1 Bird Landings and Mortalities at Process-affected Ponds

Bird landings were monitored at 16 process-affected ponds on Suncor Oil Sands Base Mine from April 3 to October 31, 2014. Monitoring effort at these ponds is compiled in Table 5.1. In total, 7,465 birds (5,439 landed, 2,026 flyovers) were recorded at these process-affected ponds in 2014 (Table 5.2). Waterbirds (target guilds) consisted of 35 landed and 15 flyover species while non-target guilds comprised 13 and 18 species, respectively. Landed birds were observed more frequently on ponds with known attractants.

Bird Surveys									
# Ponds Surveyed	16								
# 10-min Surveys Conducted	1,803								
# 30-min Surveys Conducted	2,021								
Mortality Searches									
# Ponds Searched	24	(16 of which are pa	art of the OSBCMP	")					
# Searches	366	(53 focused and 37	13 transect searche	es)					
Search Method	Boat	Walk	Truck	Total					
Total Time Searched	28.1 h	82.5 h	0 h	110.6 h					
Distance Searched	191.7 km	172.7 km	0 km	364.4 km					

#### Table 5.1: Monitoring Effort at Process-affected Ponds at Suncor Base Mine in 2014

#### Table 5.2: Bird Observations at Process-affected Ponds at Suncor Base Mine in 2014

			Non-target Guilds									
			Conta Bitu	Contacted Bitumen		Mortality			Contacted Bitumen		Mortality	
	Landed	Flew Over	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental	Landed	Flew over	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental
# Birds <sup>1</sup>	5,305	891	1 <sup>2</sup>	0	5	13	134	1,135	0	0	1	0
# Species	35	15	1	0	2	7	13	18	0	0	1	0

#### Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Individual live birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times.

<sup>2</sup> This bird was also recorded as an incidental mortality.





Mortality searches were conducted at the 16 OSBCMP ponds as well as eight other processaffected ponds not included in the OSBCMP (effort summarized in Table 5.1). Six bird mortalities were documented during designated mortality searches and 13 were documented as incidental mortalities. In the 2014 monitoring season, a total of 19 birds were reported as contacting bitumen and an additional six were recorded post- monitoring season from November 4 to 5 after a weather event (Appendices 5.D and 5.E).

### 5.1.2 Bird Landings at Freshwater Ponds

Suncor's freshwater ponds, Crane Lake and Weir 1 South Mine Drainage, are included in the OSBCMP. Monitoring efforts at these ponds are summarized in Table 5.3. In 2014, a total of 2,932 birds (2,630 landed, 302 fly-overs) were recorded at these freshwater ponds (Table 5.4). Target guilds consisted of 23 landed and 12 flyover species; whereas, non-target guilds comprised 6 and 10, respectively.

Bird Surveys									
# Ponds Surveyed	2								
# 10-min Surveys Conducted	223								
# 30-min Surveys Conducted	0								

# Table 5.3: Monitoring Effort at Freshwater Pondsat Suncor Base Mine in 2014

#### Table 5.4: Bird Observations at Freshwater Ponds at Suncor Base Mine in 2014

		V	Vaterbird	S	-	Non-target Guilds				
			Con Bitu	Contacted Bitumen				Contacted Bitumen		
	Landed	Flew Over	Bird Survey	Incidental	<b>Mortality</b> (Incidental)	Landed	Flew over	Bird Survey	Incidental	<b>Mortality</b> (Incidental)
# Birds <sup>1</sup>	2,589	202	0	0	0	41	100	0	0	0
# Species	23	12	0	0	0	6	10	0	0	0

Note:

<sup>1</sup> Individual live birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times.





# 5.1.3 Standardized Monitoring

Survey Stations were monitored according to the OSBCMP protocol (St. Clair et al. 2014). Bird monitoring surveys were conducted from April 3 to October 31, 2014, and were applied at all 16 process-affected ponds and the two freshwater ponds. On a daily basis, 30 minute surveys were done on ponds greater than 1.5 km<sup>2</sup>, per station (Pond 2/3, Pond 6, Pond 7, Pond 8B, South Tailings Pond) and 10 minute surveys were done on ponds less than 1.5 km<sup>2</sup>, per station (Extraction Waste Water Pond East, Millennium API Surge Pond, Mine North Gate Sump, PAW Pond, Pond 1A, Pond 8A, Pond B East, Pond F, Sand Dump 8, Upgrader Ponds A, B, D, and Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage). Crane Lake was monitored for 10 minutes at one station, twice a week. Weir 1 South Mine Drainage was originally scheduled to be monitored twice a week, as per protocol; however, because of the proximity to other process-affected ponds this pond was monitored approximately six times a week. Details of the standardized methods for bird surveys are provided in Section 5.3.2.

Upgrader Ponds A, B, D were monitored from a single survey station, whereas, typically there would be one survey station for each pond. Access restrictions and poor viewpoint availability did not allow for establishment of separate survey stations at each of Upgrader Ponds A, B, D.

Survey stations, including alternate stations, were not monitored if safe access to the survey location was not available (e.g., construction, poor road conditions, vehicle malfunction). Missed surveys were made up mostly on Sundays, the Suncor Comparison Day.

All mortality searches were conducted by foot and boat, and according to 2014 OSBCMP protocol (St. Clair et al 2014). Route-based and focused mortality searches were conducted at least every two weeks on each of the OSBCMP process-affected ponds. Route-based mortality transects were standardized, recorded using tracking options on portable GPS units, and covered as much ground as possible. Focused searches were conducted in areas where there was bitumen present and where previous bird mortalities had been found. Route-based search transects were later revised to include high risk areas after they were revealed during the focused searches in early spring.

#### 5.1.4 Species of Conservation Concern

Landed species of conservation concern from target guilds (Table 5.5) are all listed as Sensitive (Alberta Sustainable Resource Development 2010): Green-winged Teal (including one oiled greater than 50% that was euthanized), Lesser Scaup, Pied-billed Grebe (including one oiled greater than 50% that was euthanized), American White Pelican, and Black Tern. Landed individuals of species of conservation concern in non-target guilds are all listed as Sensitive in Alberta; Barn Swallow is also listed as Threatened by COSEWIC (2014), and Rusty Blackbird as Special Concern under the *Species at Risk Act* and COSEWIC (2014).





	Lan	Landed <sup>1</sup>		wContactedr1Bitumen1		Mortality	
Species	Bird Survey	Incidental	Bird Survey	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental
	۷	Vaterbirds					
Lesser Scaup	415	111	10				
Green-winged Teal	384						1
American White Pelican	48						
Black Tern	5		9				
Pied-billed Grebe	1			1			1
Northern Pintail		10					
Sandhill Crane		2					
	Non	-target Gu	ilds				
Barn Swallow	34		320				
Rusty Blackbird	8		11				
American Kestrel	1		1				
Bank Swallow			166				
Golden Eagle			1				
Northern Harrier			1				

# Table 5.5: Number of Observations of Birds of Conservation Concernat Process-affected Ponds at Suncor Base Mine in 2014

Note:

<sup>1</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times.

#### 5.1.5 Adaptive Management

In 2014, Suncor made corrections to address protocol deviations that were recognized in 2013. Corrections made included adjustments to bird survey crew schedules and improved distribution and positioning of bird survey stations. To improve the randomization of bird contact surveys throughout the day and focus surveys as close to sunrise as per the OSBCMP protocol, both observers worked the same hours in 2014, as compared to 2013, where each observer had a different shift time during the late spring and summer periods.

Prior to the beginning of the 2014 monitoring season, some bird survey station barcodes were relocated to ensure distance to water's edge was less than 500 m, while others were moved to space out otherwise overlapping survey stations. Station changes occurred at Pond 2/3, Pond 6, Sand Dump 8, South Tailings Pond, and Upgrader Ponds A, B, D. The new locations for these stations accommodate operational constraints while complying with the protocol. Bird survey barcode locations may need adjustment in 2015 to account for changing pond characteristics, which arise due to operational changes.





Bird scare cannons were adjusted in 2014 to provide better distribution on Pond 6 and Pond 8A (Appendix 5.A). Meanwhile, Secondary Deterrent Unit (SDU) cannons were changed from mechanical to electric to provide greater consistency in cannon effectiveness.

Suncor remains committed to implementing improvements to the program and to site operations in response to program findings. Vegetation management prior to spring on select ponds (e.g., on Pond B East and South Tailings Pond in Q1 2014) is a method used to control attractants. Use and placement of new and existing bitumen booms is a method used to control the risk of oiling across a pond.

#### 5.2 Introduction

### 5.2.1 Site

Suncor Energy Inc. operates an oil sands mining, extraction and upgrading facility north of Fort McMurray, known as the Suncor Oil Sands Base Mine (Suncor) project, in the Athabasca Oil Sands region of northeastern Alberta, Canada (Figure 5.1). Operations at this facility began in 1967. In 2011, Suncor along with the four other operators in the Athabasca Oil Sands Region, changed the monitoring of their process-affected ponds to improve understanding of bird landings and mortalities, using the Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program protocol (St. Clair et al. 2014, 2013, 2012; Ronconi 2011).

Monitoring at Suncor includes 16 process-affected ponds, covering a total area of 2,676 ha, and two freshwater bodies (Crane Lake and Weir 1 South Mine Drainage) covering 24.5 ha. There are eight other process-affected ponds (totalling 18.6 ha) on site on which deterrents were deployed, and were searched for bird mortalities.

Suncor is committed to minimizing and understanding interactions between birds and the process-affected ponds required for its operations. Deployment of a variety of deterrents, reducing bird attractants where possible, monitoring for bird contacts, hazing of landed waterbirds, searching for bird mortalities, as well as developing and implementing a Waterfowl Protection Plan are among a few of the ways Suncor addresses these interactions, some of which are actions performed outside of the OSBCMP.

The OSBCMP states five objectives (St. Clair et al. 2014):

- 1. Estimate bird landings and mortalities at process-affected ponds;
- 2. Estimate bird landings at freshwater ponds;
- 3. Develop a standardized monitoring program across ponds, sites, seasons, and years;
- Identify species of conservation concern potentially affected by process-affected water; and
- 5. Provide direction on adaptive management for long-term monitoring and bird deterrent programs.







Figure 5.1: Process-affected and Freshwater Ponds at Suncor Base Mine in 2014





This report summarizes data collected and findings in 2014 at the Suncor Oil Sands Base Mine Project in relation to the five objectives of the regional program.

# 5.2.2 Personnel

Suncor contracted qualified personnel to conduct bird surveys, mortality searches and hazing, deterrent maintenance, verification of data collected in these three processes, and manage and coordinate these on-site activities. Each crew worked a 12-hour day for a one week on, one week off rotation, except the program coordinator and data verifier who worked Monday through Thursday for 10 hours per day.

Each bird survey crew consisted of two observers who worked independently of each other, with shifts from 5 a.m. to 5 p.m. Due to the later sunrise in April, September and October, the monitoring shift was from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. From April 3 to 15, 2014 observers were oriented to the protocol, procedures for bird surveys, and roads on-site before the official monitoring period commenced on April 16, 2014. All observers participated in Inter-observer Variation Studies (IOV) through the spring and fall monitoring periods.

Mortality search and hazing crews completed two weeks of training prior to April. There were a total of three per crew, with a shift from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Four personnel inspected and maintained the bird deterrent system on a daily basis from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. to ensure deterrents remained functional.

#### 5.2.3 Management of Avian Attractants and Control of Hazards

Vegetation management and removal is a practice used to reduce avian attractants. Prior to spring of 2014, and prior to peak spring migration, all emergent vegetation was removed from Pond B East, and the southeast corner of the South Tailings Pond underwent shoreline vegetation control. Vegetation removal is performed at select ponds, as required each year, in response to new or reoccurring growth that may have developed since the last season.

Bitumen containment booms on site are permanent and remain in approximately the same locations (Pond 2/3, Pond 1A and Sand Dump 8) year round, with only minor adjustments made when necessary. These booms were used to contain bitumen and reduce the chances of birds landing or coming into contact with bitumen. Booms may be deployed at other ponds for operational reasons.

# 5.2.4 Deterrents

The 2014 bird deterrent program was implemented and maintained by a qualified contractor under the direction of Suncor's Extraction Tailings department. Suncor implemented a combination of radar linked and non-radar linked deterrents, and managed pond attributes to discourage waterfowl from landing on tailings and other process-affected ponds. The combination, placement, and number of deterrents deployed were designed to address the characteristics and risks unique to each pond. The deterrent systems were inspected weekly to ensure proper function, and maintenance (including adjustments to cannon firing frequency) was performed as required. On process-affected ponds monitored within the OSBCMP,





64 audio deterrents, 439 visual deterrents, and 45 combined audio/visual deterrents (linked to radar) were deployed in 2014 (Tables 5.6 and 5.7, Appendix 5.A). Another nine audio deterrents and four visual deterrents were deployed at nine process-affected ponds not monitored within the OSBCMP.

#### Radar Linked Deterrents

Some deterrents were programmed to trigger randomly, and others were activated by the *Merlin Detect and Deter*<sup>TM</sup>*Bird Control Radar System (BCRS)* bird detection system. The BCRS (a combination of a horizontal scanning and vertical scanning radars) can detect birds up to 5.6 km away. Upon detection by the radar, the BCRS software transmits radio signals to activate the auditory and visual bird deterrent devices in the corresponding control zone to haze or provoke a flight response, while minimizing habituation risk. In the event that communications between the BCRS and deterrent devices are interrupted, the deterrents revert to a random mode until communications are restored.

The primary deterrent component of the BCRS is the satellite unit, which consists of mobile trailers equipped with acoustic hailing devices (AHD) and lasers. The AHD model used in 2014 was the LRAD 1000<sup>™</sup> Long Range Acoustic Device<sup>®</sup>. AHDs have a powerfully focused sound beam that can project at variable intensities (up to 152 decibels at 1 m) ranging out to approximately 2 km, and include a large number of sound tracks (e.g., bird distress calls). Green lasers provide visual deterrence to birds in low visibility conditions and are active from sunset to sunrise. To enhance deterrence at low LRAD coverage areas and in high risk areas, SDUs were deployed. SDUs consist of smaller mobile trailers equipped with a combination of propane powered bird scare cannons, omni-directional Bird Gard Super Pro Amps, and inflatable effigies. Both the primary and secondary deterrent components are placed on trailers to facilitate coverage flexibility, transportation and storage.

Three bird detection radar systems were used on Suncor Oil Sands Base Mine site, one on Pond 2/3, one that covered Pond 7 and Sand Dump 8, and one that covered Pond 8B and the South Tailings Pond (Tables 5.6 and 5.7). Radars were activated on March 4, 2014 and their locations did not change through the season. Both satellite and Secondary Deterrent units were deployed on the same day on the shores of Pond 2/3, Pond 7, Pond 8B, Sand Dump 8, and the South Tailings Pond (Appendix 5.A). Radar systems were turned off on November 16, 2014.

#### Non-radar Linked Deterrents

Non-radar linked deterrent units were deployed on all process-affected ponds monitored within the OSBCMP (Tables 5.6 and 5.7). Propane powered bird scare cannons produce a loud, shotgun-like noise that is created by igniting propane. Bird scare cannons were deployed on pond shores by March 4, 2014 and recovered between November 14 and 23 as ponds began to freeze. Bird scare cannons were deployed (November 12 to 14) at areas on Pond 2/3, Pond 7, Pond 8B, and the South Tailings Pond that were expected to remain open throughout the winter. Pond Cannons remain operational at Extraction Waste Water Pond East, Millennium API Surge Pond, Pond 1A (two cannons near discharge pipes), and Upgrader Ponds A, B, D all months of the year.





Deterrent Name	Description	Stimuli	Sound Intensity at 1 m (dB)	Activation Control	Placement	t Number and Location	
Primary Deterrent Unit	Acoustic Hailing	Audio and	149	radar	on land	Pond 2/3	2
	Dovico	visual				Pond 7	2
	Device					Pond 8B	4
	Laser					Sand Dump 8	2
						South Tailings Pond	4
Secondary Deterrent	Wailer	Audio and	125	radar	on land	Pond 2/3	6
Unit	Bird scare cannon	visual	1			Pond 7	4
	BIRG scare cannon		1			Pond 8B	10
	Inflatable effigy		1			South Tailings Pond	11
Bird scare cannon	Propane powered	Audio	125	random	on land	Extraction Waste Water Pond East	2
	cannon					Millennium API Surge Pond	2
						Mine North Gate Sump	1
						PAW Pond	2
						Pond 1A	12
Effigy	Human effigies	Visual	-	-	on land and	Extraction Waste Water Pond East	2
	dressed as				floating	Millennium API Surge Pond	1
	workers					Mine North Gate Sump	1
						PAW Pond	2
Avian wire	Physical deterrent	Visual	-	-	-	Millennium API Surge Pond Extraction Waste Water Pond Paw Pond	

#### Table 5.6: Avian Deterrents Deployed at Suncor Base Mine (as of Fall 2014)

Note:

\* Ponds not included in the OSBCMP.







Pond Name		<u> </u>	Comb	Dined Au Deter	udio & V rents <sup>1</sup>	'isual	Aud	lio-only	Deterre	ents	Visu	al-only	Deterre	ents	То	tal
	Pond Area (over water; ha)	adar(s	Linko Ra	ed to dar	Not Li	inked	Linke Ra	ed to dar	Not L	inked	Linke Rae	ed to dar	Not L	inked		
		Number of Ra	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Units	Density (units/ha)
Extraction Waste Water Pond East	4.79									2				2	4	0.84
Millennium API Surge Pond	0.90									2				1	3	3.33
Mine North Gate Sump	3.04									1				1	2	0.66
PAW Pond	3.68									2				2	4	1.09
Pond 1A	51.39									12			13		25	0.49
Pond 2/3	249.36	1		8									53		62	0.25
Pond 6	269.41									31			75		106	0.39
Pond 7	479.82	0.5		6									65		71	0.15
Pond 8A	33.67									5			21		26	0.77
Pond 8B	713.42	0.5		14									65		79.5	0.11
Pond B East	1.83									2				1	3	1.64
Pond F	1.64									2				1	3	1.83
Sand Dump 8	58.14	0.5		2										8	11	0.19
South Tailings Pond	794.41	0.5		15									125		140.5	0.18
Upgrader Ponds A, B, D	8.82									4				4	8	0.91
Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage	1.57									1				2	3	1.91
DDA-1*	0.92									1					1	1.09
Mist Pond*	0.97									1				1	2	2.06
North Booster Pump House Sump*	0.18									1				1	2	11.11
South Booster Pump House Sump*	0.43									1				1	2	4.65
System 4 Sump*	0.46									1					1	2.17
System 5 Sump*	3.77									1					1	0.27
System 7 Sump*	10.80									1					1	0.09
Upper Wood Creek*	1.03									2				1	3	2.91

#### Table 5.7: Number of Avian Radars and Deterrents at Process-affected Ponds at Suncor Base Mine (as of Fall 2014)

#### Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Combined deterrents count as one unit; individual components are described in Table 5.6. \* Ponds not included in the OSBCMP.





Effigies are human-like structures consisting of high-visibility coveralls and hard hats attached to metal frames. They may be anchored to remain in place, attached to a permanent structure or placed on shore, or float on the pond surface. Effigies were deployed on all OSBCMP ponds and remain deployed year round.

Avian wires function as a physical deterrent to approaching waterfowl. The actual mechanism by which avian wire works is unknown, but it is thought that birds are startled by the thin, hard to see line when approaching to land (Harris and Davis 1998). The wire is hung on a level plane over the area from which birds are to be excluded. Avian wires remain in place on Extraction Waste Water Pond East, Millennium API Surge Pond, and PAW Pond from previous seasons.

#### **Deterrent Placement and Adaptations made in 2014**

Bird scare cannons were distributed as evenly as possible by March 4, 2014, given access restrictions, on Pond 6 and Pond 8A (Appendix 5.A). Early in the season, blowing sand and subzero temperatures compromised SDU cannon effectiveness. The cannons would misfire in freezing temperatures and sandy conditions due to the oil thickening inside the cannon, as well as the propane blowing away in the wind since it was not a sealed unit. Installation of new electric cannons that included moving parts and a direct propane feed resulted in greater consistency in cannon operation. None of the deterrents deployed in the spring required relocation during the year.

# 5.2.5 Hazing Procedures

Hazing crews had CAPA<sup>™</sup> launchers, pyrotechnic scare cartridges (bangers, screamers and howlers), air horns, and boats on hand as possible bird hazing instruments. Hazing effort was focused on birds on process-affected ponds. Hazing strategy was decided on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the relative risk posed to birds at different ponds, including consideration if birds were divers or dabblers. Shorebirds typically respond to hazing by circling and landing again and were, therefore, hazed less frequently. Fatigued birds, and birds at risk of being pushed into a potentially hazardous area, were not hazed as doing so would have caused unnecessary stress with limited potential for hazing success. Bird survey monitors did not haze birds on a regular basis and any hazing occurred after the bird survey was completed. Observation of a bird on any of the process-affected ponds that could not be hazed by a bird survey crew would be called directly into the hazing crew.

All personnel on site could contact Tailings operators, Environmental On-Call, or Security to report bird sightings, and the message would be relayed to the hazing crew. Crew response times could vary from two minutes to more depending on the hazing crew location and safety constraints when the crew was called.





#### 5.3 Methods

Monitoring activities at Suncor were consistent with the 2014 OSBCMP protocol (St Clair et al. 2014). From April 3 to July 5, and July 26 to October 31, 2014, monitoring surveys were conducted daily and mortality searches conducted every two weeks. These methods are described in detail in this section. The procedures described in the protocol were followed with the exception of the few deviations described below.

#### 5.3.1 Pond Characteristics

Suncor pond characteristics were derived from interpretation of a May 2014 satellite image. Areas of open water, floating bitumen, islands, and emergent vegetation, and vegetated and non-vegetated shoreline length were delineated in a Geographic Information System. These were adjusted based on field observations taken during monitoring activities. Results from this analysis are presented in Tables 5.8 and 5.9.

### 5.3.2 Bird Surveys

#### **Schedule and Description of Activities**

Bird monitoring surveys were conducted at each process-affected pond survey location six times per week, while freshwater ponds, Crane Lake and Weir 1 South Mine Drainage, were monitored twice weekly (refer to Appendix 5.A to show survey stations). There were 13 ponds that had one station surveyed for 10 minutes, three ponds that had two stations surveyed for 30 minutes, and two ponds that had three stations surveyed for 30 minutes (Table 5.10). Surveys included all avian species landed on the pond surface, islands, and shores within 500 m of the survey station, and flying within 100 m above that area. Shores, as defined by the protocol, encompassed areas that could be water-covered at any time of the year (due to changing water levels).

Two observers were available to perform bird surveys at all times. Each observer would follow an independent six-day randomized monitoring schedule, except in May and June when Crane Lake was monitored by two observers for safety reasons. The path to the lake required walking through natural habitat in which frequent bear sightings had been reported.

#### **Materials**

Surveys were conducted using a Zeiss Diascope FL85 spotting scope on a tripod and 10X42 binoculars. Data were entered into Google Drive forms (fields provided by the University of Alberta in 2014) on electronic tablets and immediately exported to Microsoft Office Excel for Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC), a system put in place by Suncor. All other equipment required by the protocol was available for use when it was needed (St. Clair et al. 2014). Following the site-level data QA/QC, data files were transmitted to the OSBCMP program manager for additional review and QA/QC processes. Finalized data were returned to Suncor for use in reporting.





Pond Namo <sup>1</sup>	Survey Station ID	Area	Island	Emergent Veg.	Shoreline (m)	
Foliu Nallie	Survey Station ID	(over water; ha)	(ha)	(ha)	Vegetated	Non-veg.
Extraction Waste Water Pond East	EWWP_1	3.68	0	0	0	1,085
Millennium API Surge Pond	MAPISS_1	0.90	0	0	0	371
Mine North Gate Sump	MMNGS_1	3.04	0	0	0	744
PAW Pond	PAW	3.68	0	0	0	800
Pond 1A	Pond1A_1	25.28	0.03	0	0	1,267
	Pond23_1	34.99	0	0	0	1,778
Pond 2/3	Pond23_2	29.00	0	0	0	1,182
	Total (2 regular stations)	63.99	0	0	0	2,960
	Pond6_1	20.44	0	0	238	898
	Pond6_1A*	16.18	0	0	0	1,445
Pond 6	Pond6_2	0.50	0	0	0	257
	Pond6_2A*	0	0	0	0	0
	Total (2 regular stations)	20.94	0	0	238	1,155
2 1 2	Pond7 1	26.57	0	0	0	1,799
	Pond7 2	27.96	0	0	0	1,066
Pond 7	Pond7 2A*	35.35	0	0	0	1,134
	Total (2 regular stations)	54.53	0	0	0	2,865
Pond 8A	Pond8A 1	7.82	0	0	0	1,053
	Pond8B_1	35.02	0	0	0	1,200
	Pond8B_2	33.63	0	0	0	1,080
Pond 8B	Pond8B_2A*	35.77	0	0	0	1,097
	Pond8B_3	29.00	0	0	0	1,266
	Total (3 regular stations)	97.65	0	0	0	3,546
Pond B East	PondBEast_1	1.83	0	0	0	589
Pond F	PondF_1	1.64	0	0	0	600
Sand Dump 8	SD8_1	12.63	0	0	0	1,136
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	STP_1	12.00	0	0	0	1,146
Couth Toilings Dond	STP 2	40.72	0.07	0	0	3,467
South Tailings Pond	STP 3	17.99	0	0	0	1,327
	Total (3 regular stations)	70.71	0.07	0	0	5,940
Upgrader Ponds A, B, D	UABD_1	8.67	0	0	0	2,305
Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage	W10_1	1.57	0	0.13	306	318
Crane Lake	CL_1	10.47	0.03	0	1,147	0

5.73

0

0.02

1,233

#### Table 5.8: Characteristics of Survey Stations Monitored at Suncor Base Mine in 2014

#### Notes:

Weir 1 South Mine Drainage

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds.
\* Alternative Survey Station (not included in total).

W1 1





0

Table 5.9: Characteristics of	ponds monitored at Suncor Base Mine in 2014
-------------------------------	---

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>		Bitumen Co	over	Pond Area		Emergent	Shoreline (m)	
(Year of Origin)	Pond Content	%²: Mode (Min-Max)	ha³: Mean	(over water; ha)	Island (ha)	Veg. (ha)	Vegetated	Non-veg.
Extraction Waste Water Pond East	Industrial waste	16-25 (1-5 to 76-100)	2.27	4.79	0	0	0	1,660
Millennium API Surge Pond	Industrial waste	1-5 (0 to 51-75)	0	0.90	0	0	0	371
Mine North Gate Sump	Mine drainage	0 (0 to 0)	0	3.04	0	0	0	744
PAW Pond (2001)	Industrial run-off	0 (0 to 1-25)	0	3.68	0	0	0	800
Pond 1A (1976)	Tailings	1-5 (0 to 51-75)	0.72	51.39	0.03	0	0	3,173
Pond 2/3 (1976)	Tailings	6-15 (1-5 to 76-100)	5.89	249.36	0	0	0	8,246
Pond 6 (2002)	Tailings	1-5 (0 to 26-50)	0.45	269.41	0	0	635	7,845
Pond 7 (2007)	Tailings	1-5 (0 to 26-50)	15.83	479.82	0	0	0	10,478
Pond 8A (2001)	Tailings	6-15 (1-5 to 76-100)	3.99	33.67	0	0	0	3,351
Pond 8B (2003)	Tailings	1-5 (0 to 16-25)	0	713.42	0	0	0	11,358
Pond B East	Industrial waste	1-5 (0 to 26-50)	0.01	1.83	0	0	0	589
Pond F	Industrial waste	0 (0 to 0)	0	1.64	0	0	0	600
Sand Dump 8 (2012)	Tailings	26-50 (6-15 to 76-100)	26.55	58.14	0	0	0	3,643
South Tailings Pond (2006)	Tailings	1-5 (0 to 26-50)	11.47	794.41	0.55	0	0	20,809
Upgrader Ponds A, B, D	Industrial waste	6-15 (0 to 51-75)	0	8.82	0	0	0	2,345
Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage	Industrial run-off	0 (0 to 1-25)	0	1.57	0	0.13	306	319
Crane Lake	Freshwater	0	0	18.72	0.05	0	2,119	0
Weir 1 South Mine Drainage	Freshwater	0	0	5.75	0	0.02	1,268	0

Notes: <sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds. <sup>2</sup> Estimated during bird surveys. <sup>3</sup> Estimated from satellite imagery.





	Table 5.10: Bird Surve	y Effort by	Station at	Suncor	Base N	line in	2014
--	------------------------	-------------	------------	--------	--------	---------	------

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Survey Duration (min)	Survey Station ID	Survey Area (over water; ha)	# Surveys Conducted in 2014
Extraction Waste Water Pond East	10	EWWP_1	3.68	168
Millennium API Surge Pond	10	MAPISS_1	0.90	166
Mine North Gate Sump	10	MMNGS_1	3.04	168
PAW Pond	10	PAW	3.68	159
Pond 1A	10	Pond1A_1	25.28	166
Bond 2/2	20	Pond23_1	34.99	178
	30	Pond23_2	29.00	174
		Pond6_1	20.44	140
Dond 6	20	Pond6_1A	16.18	38
		Pond6_2	0.50	173
		Pond6_2A	0	5
		Pond7_1	26.57	168
Pond 7	30	Pond7_2	27.96	82
		Pond7_2A	35.35	85
Pond 8A	10	Pond8A_1	7.82	161
		Pond8B_1	35.02	161
Pond 8B	30	Pond8B_2	33.63	159
	50	Pond8B_2A	35.77	3
		Pond8B_3	29.00	163
Pond B East	10	PondBEast_1	1.83	167
Pond F	10	PondF_1	1.64	173
Sand Dump 8	10	SD8_1	12.63	149
		STP_1	12.00	164
South Tailings Pond	30	STP_2	40.72	166
		STP_3	17.99	162
Upgrader Ponds A, B, D	10	UABD_1	8.67	168
Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage	10	W10_1	1.57	158
Crane Lake	10	CL_1	10.47	55
Weir 1 South Mine Drainage	10	W1_1	5.73	168*

#### Notes:

<sup>1</sup>Blue shading: freshwater ponds.

\* Weir 1 South Mine Drainage based on monitoring six days a week.





#### **Deviations from Protocol**

Observers followed procedures described in the Oil Sands Bird Monitoring Plan (St. Clair et al. 2014), with three exceptions. Only one survey station could safely be established to conduct the surveys on each of the Upgrader A, B, and D process-affected ponds, nor could an alternate station be safely established for these ponds.

Second, the 2014 Protocol requires that freshwater ponds be monitored twice weekly. However, due to close proximity to other process- affected ponds on site, Weir 1 South Mine Drainage was monitored more frequently (Tables 5.10 and 5.11).

### **Oiled Birds Seen During Bird Surveys**

Birds were identified as oiled when observers were confident that the bird was in contact with bitumen. Observers were also trained to recognize unusual bird behaviour that may offer clues that a bird may be oiled, such as excessive preening without removing the substance.

### 5.3.3 Inter-observer Variability (IOV)

Inter-observer variability (IOV) surveys were conducted by two observers who completed separate, but simultaneous surveys, with similar equipment and field of view, at the same location at intervals through the monitoring season. This included recordings of the number of birds and number of species. These sessions were often held on Sundays, Suncor's Comparison Day, unless another opportunity presented itself.

Of the ponds on site, only five ponds met the size criteria of greater than 1.5 km<sup>2</sup> for an IOV survey as outlined in the protocol: Pond 2/3, Pond 6, Pond 7, Pond 8B, and South Tailings Pond. IOVs that were done outside of these five ponds, were removed from the analyses. If there were no birds observed landed or flying by both observers during an IOV session, data from the session would also be removed from the analyses to prevent bias towards a zero Relative Percent Difference (RPD).

Duplicate observations of the number of birds and species between each observer provide a measure of repeatability and consistency of the observation data. The RPD in the duplicate observations is calculated according to the following formula:

RPD#birds or RPD#species = 
$$\frac{|x_1 - x_2|}{\bar{x}}$$
 \*100

where

 $x_1$  is the number of birds or species from Observer 1,  $x_2$  is the number of birds or species from Observer 2, and  $\bar{x}$  is the mean of the number of birds or species from both observers. The mean number of birds or species provides the reference value against which the two individual observations are compared by assuming that the correct answer is likely between Observer 1 and Observer 2.





Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	# Survey Stations	Survey Area (over water; ha)	Survey Area as % of Pond Area (over water; ha)	Duration of Surveys (min)	Scheduled Monitoring Frequency (days/week)	# Surveys Conducted in 2014	% Days with all Scheduled Surveys Conducted
Extraction Waste Water Pond East	1	3.68	77	10	6	168	101
Millennium API Surge Pond	1	0.90	100	10	6	166	99
Mine North Gate Sump	1	3.04	100	10	6	168	101
PAW Pond	1	3.68	100	10	6	159	96
Pond 1A	1	25.28	49	10	6	166	101
Pond 2/3	2	63.99	26	30	6	352	108
Pond 6	2	20.94	8	30	6	356	111
Pond 7	2	54.53	11	30	6	335	103
Pond 8A	1	7.82	23	10	6	161	99
Pond 8B	3	97.65	14	30	6	486	101
Pond B East	1	1.83	100	10	6	167	102
Pond F	1	1.64	100	10	6	173	105
Sand Dump 8	1	12.63	22	10	6	149	90
South Tailings Pond	3	70.71	9	30	6	492	101
Upgrader Ponds A, B, D	1	8.67	98	10	6	168	102
Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage	1	1.57	100	10	6	158	102
Crane Lake	1	10.47	56	10	2	55	92
Weir 1 South Mine Drainage	1	5.73	>99	10	6	168	102*

# Table 5.11: Bird Survey Effort by Pond at Suncor Base Mine in 2014

#### Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds.
\* Weir 1 South Mine Drainage based on monitoring six days a week.





An RPD<sub>#birds</sub> and an RPD<sub>#species</sub> of less than 10% is considered optimum, up to 25% may be acceptable, but greater than 25% would suggest that the reasons for the difference be examined. This is based on subjective evaluation of how much variability is expected and acceptable to the program given the type of data collected. As such, there is no standard means by which a definitive percent cutoff can be determined. The results of the IOV analyses will be reviewed to evaluate consistency and to also help identify what other factors might be responsible for observer variability in the results.

# 5.3.4 Mortality Searches

#### **Schedule of Activities**

Standardized mortality searches were conducted at process-affected ponds at a minimum of every two weeks during spring and fall migration periods, by foot, and boat, as set out in the protocol.

Mortality search transects conducted by boat were done on Pond 1A, Pond 2/3, Pond 6, Pond 7, Pond 8B, and the South Tailings Pond. Search routes were recorded using the tracking options on portable GPS units. Where accessible, 100% of the pond shoreline and area were searched every two weeks, and were not necessarily standardized. If searching the pond perimeter by foot was not possible, due to weather for example, it was rescheduled for later that week.

Focused searches were situated in high-risk areas (e.g., bitumen mats or where previous mortalities were found). Focused searches could change location depending on operational activities and wind direction. Route-based search transects were later revised to include high risk areas revealed during the focused searches conducted in early spring.

#### Data Analysis

Mortality search data were recorded on paper data sheets and entered in an Excel spreadsheet within 24 hours of a search being completed. Data proofing and verification was completed internally, with data files transmitted to the OSBCMP manager approximately every two weeks.

The OSBCMP manager conducted a second QA/QC process on the entire Suncor dataset at the end of the season. Discrepancies were identified and corrected in collaboration with the contractor on-site and Suncor personnel.

# 5.3.5 Incidental Observations and Reporting

#### Live Incidentals

Observers that collected bird survey data also recorded live bird incidental observations using tablet forms. Live incidental observations were only recorded and included in the data if a species of conservation concern was viewed contacting process-affected water outside of a bird survey, as specified in the direction provided by the OSBCMP manager in July 2014.





#### Incidental Mortalities

Any observations of landed dead and/or oiled birds resulting in a mortality outside of a scheduled mortality search were recorded as incidental mortalities.

#### 5.4 Results

#### 5.4.1 Pond Characteristics

Pond attributes are presented in Tables 5.8 and 5.9. Of the 16 process-affected ponds surveyed in the OSBCMP, eight contained tailings, five contained industrial wastewater, two contained industrial run-off water and one contained mine drainage water. Based on a May 2014 satellite image and confirmation from monitoring crews, floating bitumen was identified on the image as being present on Extraction Waste Water Pond East, Pond 1A, Pond 2/3, Pond 6, Pond 7, Pond 8A, Pond B East, Sand Dump 8, and the South Tailings Pond. These nine ponds pose a potential risk of oiling to birds if they come in contact with bitumen on the pond surface area or shore. Small amounts of bitumen, not visible from the satellite images but observed by field personnel, were also present on the remaining five process-affected ponds.

Based on the same satellite image, the GIS specialist and site contacts confirmed two processaffected ponds with vegetation along their perimeter, for a total of 635 m at Pond 6 and 306 m at Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage. Islands covered 0.55 ha on the South Tailings Pond and 0.03 ha at Pond 1A. Emergent vegetation covered 0.13 ha at Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage, but was not present on any of the other process-affected ponds.

The freshwater ponds, Crane Lake and Weir 1 South Mine Drainage, consisted of 1,147 m and 1,233 m of perimeter vegetation, respectively, both potential attractants for avian species (Table 5.8). Weir 1 South Mine Drainage had 0.02 ha of emergent vegetation and Crane Lake had 0.03 ha of islands.

#### 5.4.2 Bird Observations

#### Survey Effort

In 2014, a total of 4,047 monitoring surveys were conducted over 1,348.2 hours: 3,824 surveys (1,311 hours) at process-affected ponds (Table 5.10) and 223 surveys (37.2 hours) at the two freshwater ponds, Crane Lake and Weir 1 South Mine Drainage (Table 5.11).

#### Process-affected Ponds

A total of 5,439 observations of landed birds and 2,026 observations of bird flyovers within the survey areas were recorded at all process-affected ponds (Table 5.12, Figure 5.2). Landed birds included 5,305 detections of birds from target guilds and 134 detections from non-target guilds. Considering all guilds, 50.2% of landed birds were divers, 41.3% dabblers, 5.6% waders, 0.3% gulls, and 2.5% were from non-target guilds, with the remainder being of birds that could not be identified beyond an "unknown" designation (e.g., Unknown Duck) (Table 5.12).





	Dabblers		Div	Divers		Waders		Gulls		Non-target		Total <sup>3</sup>	
Pond Name <sup>2</sup>	Landed	Flew Over	Landed	Flew Over	Landed	Flew Over	Landed	Flew Over	Landed	Flew Over	Landed	Flew Over	
Extraction Waste Water Pond East	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	
Millennium API Surge Pond	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	70	0	49	0	120	
Mine North Gate Sump	2	28	45	0	55	2	3	2	0	13	105	45	
PAW Pond	1,774	9	2,037	0	236	6	11	0	0	20	4,058	35	
Pond 1A	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	15	0	18	
Pond 2/3	0	28	1	8	0	0	0	39	24	81	25	156	
Pond 6	0	58	1	6	2	0	0	19	2	70	5	153	
Pond 7	2	286	14	0	1	2	2	0	34	137	54	516	
Pond 8A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	0	35	
Pond 8B	26	21	319	15	0	16	1	12	1	442	353	510	
Pond B East	0	0	2	0	2	4	0	0	2	6	6	10	
Pond F	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	8	1	11	
Sand Dump 8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
South Tailings Pond	71	52	58	4	0	0	0	5	1	93	130	154	
Upgrader Ponds A, B, D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	9	0	18	
Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage	371	0	253	4	7	2	0	82	70	155	701	243	
Total (Process-affected Ponds)	2,246	482	2,731	39	304	33	17	242	134	1,135	5,439	2,026	
Crane Lake	342	2	1,499	92	0	4	490	0	10	24	2,341	122	
Weir 1 South Mine Drainage	4	7	253	37	0	0	1	60	31	76	289	180	
Total (Freshwater Ponds)	346	9	1,752	129	0	4	491	60	41	100	2,630	302	

#### Table 5.12: Number of Bird Observations by Pond and Guild at Suncor Base Mine in 2014<sup>1</sup>

#### Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times.
 <sup>2</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds.
 <sup>3</sup> Includes unknown duck species (which may be dabblers or divers).







\* Freshwater Ponds (in green). Bars = 95% Confidence Intervals.

Figure 5.2: Mean Number of Landed Waterbirds per Survey at Suncor Base Mine in 2014





In total, 59 species were observed during bird surveys (Appendix 5.C). Of these species, 48 were reported as landed: 35 from target guilds (divers, dabblers, waders, and gulls) and 13 from non-target guilds. The most common landed target guild species (>100 detections each) on process-affected ponds, in descending order, were American Wigeon, Bufflehead, Mallard, Ring-necked Duck, Lesser Scaup, Green-winged Teal, Common Goldeneye, Ruddy Duck, Redhead, and Lesser Yellowlegs (Appendix 5.C).

Of the total landings, the majority (88%) were observed at the lowest risk ponds with smaller pond areas; PAW Pond (3.68ha) and Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage (1.57), containing industrial run-off water (Table 5.9, Table 5.12).The mean number of landed target birds per survey was highest at PAW Pond with a mean of 25.5 (50.2% divers, 43.7% dabblers, 5.8% waders, and 0.3% gulls) and then Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage (Table 5.13) with a mean of 4.4 (53% dabblers, 36% divers, 1% waders, and 10% non-target birds). Pond 8B had the third highest mean number of landed birds per survey at 0.7. Landings observed at survey station Pond 8B\_2 (mean of 1.53) were higher than Pond8B\_1 (mean of 0.4) and PondB\_3 (mean of 0.3). At six of the 16 process-affected ponds, no landed birds from target guilds were detected: Millennium API Surge Pond, Pond 1A, Pond 2/3, Pond 8A, Sand Dump 8, and Upgrader Ponds A, B, D.

The number of detections of landed birds from target guilds peaked during the periods of May 2 to 9 and August 10 to September 7 (Figure 5.6). There was an increase of landed birds detected on June 3: 10 different species were seen at PAW Pond including 11 Canada goose. A relatively high number of landed bird observations occurred on July 27 (113), including five Black Tern at survey station STP\_3 (South Tailings Pond), with the majority of sightings at Crane Lake (27 American Wigeon, 23 American Coot, 15 Mallard, 14 Ring- necked Duck, 11 Bufflehead, 10 Common Goldeneye and eight Green-winged Teal). Additionally, an increase in observations also occurred on October 12 at Crane Lake (65 Bufflehead and 28 Ring- necked Duck).

Detection rates for landings of all bird guilds at process-affected ponds varied between 0 to 16 hours after sunrise, peaking at midday, 8 to 10 hours after sunrise (Appendix 5.B). High variability is associated with observations taken 12 hours after sunrise, this is likely due to only five surveys being completed at this time of day. Two of the five surveys monitored at this time were at PAW Pond, a pond that generally has more landed birds per survey, potentially introducing an artifact into the dataset. For example, one PAW Pond survey included 24 landed birds (June 14).

There was only one observation of an oiled bird during a bird survey, a Pied-billed Grebe (target guild), at Pond 2/3 (Table 5.14, Appendix 5.D.). Consequently, the Pond23\_2 survey station at Pond 2/3 had a mean of 0.01 oiled birds per survey (Figure 5.3). Field observations from both the bird survey and the mortality incidental records indicate that the Pied-billed Grebe was greater than 50% oiled (Appendix 5.D).





Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Survey Station ID	Dabblers	Divers	Waders	Gulls	Non-target Guilds	All Guilds <sup>2</sup>
Extraction Waste Water Pond East	EWWP_1	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.01
Millennium API Surge Pond	MAPISS_1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mine North Gate Sump	MMNGS_1	0.01	0.27	0.33	0.02	0	0.63
PAW Pond	PAW	11.16	12.81	1.48	0.07	0	25.52
Pond 1A	Pond1A_1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Pond23_1	0	0	0	0	0.10	0.10
Pond 2/3	Pond23_2	0	0.01	0	0	0.03	0.04
	Mean across surveys	0	<0.01	0	0	0.07	0.07
	Pond6_1	0	0.01	0.01	0	0.01	0.03
	Pond6_1A	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pond 6	Pond6 2	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01
	Pond6_2A	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mean across surveys	0	<0.01	0.01	0	0.01	0.01
Pond 7	Pond7_1	0.01	0	0	0	0.20	0.21
	Pond7_2	0	0	0	0	0	0.01
	Pond7 2A	0.01	0.16	0.01	0.02	0	0.21
	Mean across surveys	0.01	0.04	<0.01	0.01	0.10	0.16
Pond 8A	Pond8A_1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Pond8B 1	0	0.30	0	0.01	0	0.35
	Pond8B 2	0.01	1.51	0	0	0.01	1.53
Pond 8B	Pond8B 2A	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Pond8B 3	0.15	0.18	0	0	0	0.33
	Mean across surveys	0.05	0.66	0	<0.01	<0.01	0.73
Pond B East	PondBEast_1	0	0.01	0.01	0	0.01	0.04
Pond F	PondF_1	0	0.01	0	0	0	0.01
Sand Dump 8	SD8_1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	STP_1	0	0.30	0	0	0	0.30
South Tailings Dand	STP_2	0.43	<0.01	0	0	0	0.43
South Tailings Pond	STP_3	0	0.04	0	0	0.01	0.05
	Mean across surveys	0.14	0.12	0	0	<0.01	0.26
Upgrader Ponds A, B, D	UABD_1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage	W10_1	2.35	1.60	0.04	0	0.44	4.44
All Process-affected Ponds	Mean across ponds	0.86	0.97	0.12	0.01	0.04	1.99
Crane Lake	CL_1	6.22	27.25	0	8.91	0.18	42.56
Weir 1 South Mine Drainage	W1_1	0.02	1.51	0	0.01	0.18	1.72
All Freshwater Ponds	Mean across ponds	3.12	14.38	0	4.46	0.18	22.14

#### Table 5.13: Mean Number of Landed Birds per Survey at Suncor Base Mine in 2014

#### Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds.
 <sup>2</sup> Includes unknown duck species (which may be dabblers or divers).





Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Survey Station ID	Dabblers	Divers	Waders	Gulls	Non-target Guilds	All Guilds <sup>2</sup>
Extraction Waste Water Pond East	EWWP_1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Millennium API Surge Pond	MAPISS_1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mine North Gate Sump	MMNGS_1	0	0	0	0	0	0
PAW Pond	PAW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pond 1A	Pond1A_1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Pond23_1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pond 2/3	Pond23_2	0	0.006	0	0	0	0.006
	Mean across surveys	0	0.003	0	0	0	0.003
	Pond6_1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Pond6 1A	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pond 6	Pond6 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Pond6 2A	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mean across surveys	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pond 7	Pond7 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Pond7 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Pond7 2A	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mean across surveys	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pond 8A	Pond8A 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Pond8B 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Pond8B 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pond 8B	Pond8B 2A	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Pond8B 3	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mean across surveys	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pond B East	PondBEast 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pond F	PondF 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sand Dump 8	SD8 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	STP 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Couth Tailings David	STP 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Tailings Pond	STP 3	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mean across surveys	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upgrader Ponds A, B, D	UABD 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage	W10 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Process-affected Ponds	Mean across ponds	0	<0.001	0	0	0	<0.001
Crane Lake	CL_1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Weir 1 South Mine Drainage	W1_1	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Freshwater Ponds	Mean across ponds	0	0	0	0	0	0

#### Table 5.14: Mean Number of Oiled Birds per Survey at Suncor Base Mine in 2014

#### Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds.
 <sup>2</sup> Includes unknown duck species (which may be dabblers or divers).






\* Freshwater Ponds. Bar = 95% Confidence Interval.

Figure 5.3: Mean Number of Oiled Birds per Survey at Suncor Base Mine in 2014





Incidental live bird observations contained no records of oiled birds, only species of conservation concern (Appendix 5.C). All live incidental observations (species of concern in contact with process-affected ponds) occurred at Pond 8B (108 Lesser Scaup, two Northern Pintail) and the South Tailings Pond (three Lesser Scaup, two Sandhill Crane).

#### Freshwater Ponds

Crane Lake had more birds per survey (42.7) than other ponds on-site. At Crane Lake, 64% of landed birds were divers, 21% gulls, 14.6% dabblers, 0.4% non-target guilds (Tables 5.12 and 5.13). There was a mean of 42.56 landed birds from target guilds per survey.

#### **Broods**

Broods were found at PAW Pond (125), Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage (45), Mine North Gate Sump (6), STP (2), Pond 8B (1), and freshwater ponds, Crane Lake (29) and Weir 1 South Mine Drainage (15). Broods included 13 species; most were Bufflehead, American Wigeon and Mallard ducklings (Table 5.15). At process- affected ponds, a mean of 0.05 broods were detected per survey, whereas freshwater ponds had a mean of 0.20 broods detected per survey.

Species/Species Group	# Brood Observations <sup>1</sup>
Bufflehead	51
American Wigeon	31
Mallard	30
Ruddy Duck	17
Ring-necked Duck	12
Common Goldeneye	10
Green-winged Teal	10
Canada Goose	5
Lesser Scaup	4
Redhead	4
Northern Shoveler	3
Blue-winged Teal	1
Canvasback	1

#### Table 5.15: Brood Observations by Species at Process-affected Ponds at Suncor Base Mine in 2014

Notes:

Pink shading: Species of Conservation Concern

<sup>1</sup> Each brood may contain one to multiple chicks; broods may be observed repeatedly and thus be counted multiple times

#### 5.4.3 Inter-observer Variability (IOV)

A total of 165 IOVs were conducted at 17 ponds across the Suncor site during the 2014 season. Fifty-two IOVs were conducted at Pond 2/3, Pond 6, Pond 7, Pond 8B, and South Tailings Pond, and were subject to analyses. Of these 52, 39 were removed from the analyses due to no birds observed landed or flying during the IOV. The inter-observer comparisons from the remaining 13 IOVs, with either flying or landed birds present, are found in Table 5.16. The RPD between observers varied from 0 to 200% (Table 5.16).





		Land	Landed <sup>2</sup> Flew		
Comparison Survey <sup>1</sup>	Survey Station ID	RPD (%): Number of Individual Birds	RPD (%): Number of Avian Species	RPD (%): Number of Individual Birds	RPD (%): Number of Avian Species
1	Pond23_2	-	-	0	0
2	Pond6_2	_	—	0	0
3	Pond8B_2	-	-	200	200
4	Pond6_1A	-	-	200	200
5	Pond7_1	_	—	0	0
6	Pond8B_1	12	67	-	-
7	Pond23_2	-	-	0	0
8	Pond6_1	_	_	200	200
9	Pond7_1	14	0	-	-
10	Pond6_1	_	_	67	0
11	Pond7_1	-	-	0	0
12	Pond8B_2	_	_	200	200
13	Pond23_1	_	_	0	0

#### Table 5.16: Inter-observer Variability in Terms of Relative Percent Difference at Suncor Base Mine in 2014

#### Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Comparisons where no landed or flying birds were observed were removed prior to analysis.

<sup>2</sup> Dash = no birds were observed by either observer.

Two surveys are available to compare RPD percentages for landed birds. On May 25, both observers recorded 16 Lesser Scaup at survey station Pond8B\_1 (Pond 8B). One of the observers also observed two landed American Coot, two more individual birds and one more species than were noted by the other observer, an RPD of 12% and 67%, respectively (Table 5.16). On June 29, both observers saw Barn Swallows at survey station Pond7\_1 (Pond 7), which is designated as 0% variance in number of avian species (comparison survey 9, Table 5.16); however the number of individual birds varied, the first observer recorded 20 and the second recorded 23 (an RPD of 14%).

RPDs for flyover birds were derived using 11 surveys' worth of data. RPD values of 200% are reasonable for flyover birds, as these observations are more subjective (e.g., likely due to differences in height perception combined with low bird numbers) (Table 5.16).

Other potential sources of variability in observers may include differences in equipment used and monitoring style. Observer variability could simply arise from one observer looking at a different field of view than the other observer, as when one observer is looking through a spotting scope while the other is noting flyovers. The IOV's are most useful in highlighting the reasons for observer differences, such that they can be minimized in subsequent monitoring sessions.

#### 5.4.4 Mortalities

Mortality search transects covered 191.7 km (28.1 hours) by boat and 172.7 km (82.5 hours) by foot (Tables 5.17 and 5.18, Figure 5.4).





David Name	# Days	Bo	oat	Wa	alk	Total		
Pond Name	Searched	h	km	h	km	h	km	
Extraction Waste Water Pond East	15			2.3	7.9	2.3	7.9	
Millennium API Surge Pond	15			2.3	3.6	2.3	3.6	
Mine North Gate Sump	15			2.0	2.1	2.0	2.1	
PAW Pond	16			3.3	8.0	3.3	8.0	
Pond 1A	16	3.8	8.7	0.8	6.4	4.7	15.1	
Pond 2/3	16	4.1	14.9	9.0	19.2	13.1	34.1	
Pond 6	17	2.7	3.7	2.9	5.6	5.6	9.3	
Pond 7	16	3.6	27.4	2.2	7.7	5.8	35.1	
Pond 8A	15			2.1	4.2	2.1	4.2	
Pond 8B	14	5.8	81.9	2.2	1.0	8.0	82.9	
Pond B East	15			6.5	6.8	6.5	6.8	
Pond F	15			3.3	9.0	3.3	9.0	
Sand Dump 8	15			14.7	14.6	14.7	14.6	
South Tailings Pond	16	8.1	55.1	4.5	15.8	12.6	70.9	
Upgrader Ponds A, B, D	16			4.1	9.2	4.1	9.2	
Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage	14			2.1	3.5	2.1	3.5	
DDA-1*	15			2.0	4.5	2.0	4.5	
Mist Pond*	15			2.7	7.0	2.7	7.0	
North Booster Pump House Sump*	15			1.8	3.3	1.8	3.3	
South Booster Pump House Sump*	15			2.0	2.9	2.0	2.9	
System 4 Sump*	15			2.2	7.4	2.2	7.4	
System 5 Sump*	15			2.5	9.1	2.5	9.1	
System 7 Sump*	15			2.6	11.7	2.6	11.7	
Upper Wood Creek*	15			2.4	2.2	2.4	2.2	
Total	366	28.1	191.7	82.5	172.7	110.6	364.4	

#### Table 5.17: Mortality Search Effort at Suncor Base Mine in 2014<sup>1</sup>

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Includes route-based and focused transects; for each search, either distance OR area counted towards effort.

\* Ponds not included in the OSBCMP.





Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Mortality Search	Incidental	Total
Extraction Waste Water Pond East			
Millennium API Surge Pond			
Mine North Gate Sump			
PAW Pond			
Pond 1A	1		1
Pond 2/3		2	2
Pond 6		6	6
Pond 7		1	1
Pond 8A			
Pond 8B			
Pond B East			
Pond F			
Sand Dump 8	5	3	8
South Tailings Pond		1	1
Upgrader Ponds A, B, D			
Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage			
DDA-1*			
Mist Pond*			
North Booster Pump House Sump*			
South Booster Pump House Sump*			
System 4 Sump*			
System 5 Sump*			
System 7 Sump*			
Upper Wood Creek*			
Total	6	13	19

#### Table 5.18: Number of Mortalities by Pond at Suncor Base Mine in April to October 2014

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds.
\* Ponds not included in the OSBCMP.







Figure 5.4: Relationship Between Pond Area (over water), Mortality Search Effort, and Mortality Search Results





In total, six mortalities were detected during scheduled searches, all oiled greater than 50% (Table 5.18, Appendix 5.D.). Five mortalities were recorded during searches at Sand Dump 8: two Unknown Waterbirds, one juvenile Unknown Gull, 1 Unknown Duck and one Savannah Sparrow. All but the sparrow (later euthanized) were found dead. Pond 1A also had one mortality (an Unknown Gull) recorded during a scheduled boat search. Gulls and non-target guilds represented 67% and 33% of mortalities found during scheduled searches, respectively.

A further 13 pond-associated mortalities were observed incidentally (Appendix 5.D.). Most incidental mortalities were found alive and oiled, and were euthanized. Species in the diving guild accounted for the majority of the incidental mortalities at 82% while both dabblers and waders accounted for 9% each (Table 5.19, Figure 5.5). Mortalities were observed in all months from June to October.

Spacios/Spacios Group <sup>2</sup>	Contacted	d Bitumen <sup>1</sup>	Mort	Mortality					
Species/Species Gloup	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental					
	Waterbirds								
Pied-billed Grebe	1			1					
Unknown Gull			2						
Unknown Waterfowl			2						
Unknown Duck			1	2					
American Coot				2					
Ring-necked Duck				2					
Bufflehead				1					
Canvasback				1					
Green-winged Teal				1					
Unknown Diver				1					
Unknown Diving Duck				1					
Unknown Shorebird				1					
Non-target Guilds									
Savannah Sparrow			1						
Total	1	0	6	13					

## Table 5.19: Number of Observations of Oiling and Mortalities,by Species, at Suncor Base Mine in 2014

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days or also observed as mortalities, and thus be counted multiple

times (e.g., Pied-billed Grebe found in the bird survey is the same bird found in the incidental mortality).

<sup>2</sup> Pink shading: Species of Conservation Concern.

Sand Dump 8 had a majority of the mortalities at 42% of the total, and Pond 6 represented 32% of the mortalities (Table 5.18).

Detections of mortalities do not appear to be correlated with the number of landings throughout the year, nor were they correlated with pond area (Table 5.20, Figures 5.4 and 5.6). The presence of habitat attractants (Table 5.21), particularly at Crane Lake and Weir 1 South Mine Drainage Pond appears to be associated with the higher number of landed bird observations at these ponds.







\* Incidental observations Note: Species with unknown designations are not included

Figure 5.5: Proportion of each Guild for Birds that Flew Over or Landed at Process-affected Ponds, Contacted Bitumen, or Died at Suncor Base Mine in 2014





			Mean # Landed Waterbirds per Survey				# Spe Lan	ecies ded	# Observations of Oiled Birds		# Mortalities	
Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Pond Area (over water; ha)	% Days with Floating Bitumen Present	Dabblers	Divers	Waders	Gulls	Total <sup>2</sup>	Conservation Concern <sup>3</sup>	Per Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental
South Tailings Pond	794.41	98	0.14	0.12	0	0	7	4	0	0	0	1
Pond 8B	713.42	99	0.05	0.66	0	<0.01	8	2	0	0	0	0
Pond 7	479.82	99	0.01	0.04	<0.01	0.01	9	2	0	0	0	1
Pond 6	269.41	98	0	<0.01	0.01	0	4	1	0	0	0	6
Pond 2/3	249.36	100	0	<0.01	0	0	4	1	0.003	0	0	2
Sand Dump 8	58.14	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3
Pond 1A	51.39	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Pond 8A	33.67	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upgrader Ponds A, B, D	8.82	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Extraction Waste Water Pond East	4.79	100	0	0	0.01	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
PAW Pond	3.68	14	11.16	12.81	1.48	0.07	25	2	0	0	0	0
Mine North Gate Sump	3.04	0	0.01	0.27	0.33	0.02	9	0	0	0	0	0
Pond B East	1.83	98	0	0.01	0.01	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Pond F	1.64	0	0	0.01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage	1.57	22	2.35	1.60	0.04	0	20	1	0	0	0	0
Millennium API Surge Pond	0.90	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
System 7 Sump*	10.80	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	0
System 5 Sump*	3.77	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	0
Upper Wood Creek*	1.03	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	0
Mist Pond*	0.97	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	0
DDA-1*	0.92	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	0
System 4 Sump*	0.46	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	0
South Booster Pump House Sump*	0.43	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	0
North Booster Pump House Sump*	0.18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0	0	0
All Process-affected Ponds			0.86	0.97	0.12	0.01	48	10	<0.001	0	6	13
Crane Lake	18.72	0	6.22	27.25	0	8.91	26	4	0	0	N/A	0
Weir 1 South Mine Drainage	5.75	0	0.02	1.51	0	0.01	14	2	0	0	N/A	0
All Freshwater Ponds			3.12	14.38	0	4.46	29	5	0	0	N/A	0

#### Table 5.20: Summary of Bird Survey, Mortality and Incidental Results by Pond at Suncor Base Mine in 2014

#### Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds.
 <sup>2</sup> During bird surveys.
 <sup>3</sup> Includes incidental observations.
 \* Ponds not included in the OSBCMP.







\*Individual birds may be observed repeatedly during consecutive days

Figure 5.6: Timing of Bird Landings, Oiling, and Mortalities in Spring (top) and Fall (bottom) 2014 at Suncor Base Mine





Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Potential Attractants
PAW Pond	Adjacent to natural wetland
Pond 6	Small portion of perimeter is vegetated
Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage	Part of perimeter is vegetated (~ half), small amounts of emergent vegetation
Crane Lake	Perimeter is vegetated, lower industrial activity
Weir 1 South Mine Drainage	Perimeter is vegetated

## Table 5.21: Summary of Potential Attractants by Pondat Suncor Base Mine in 2014

Note:

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds.

#### 5.4.5 Species of Conservation Concern

Target guild species of conservation concern detected at or near process-affected ponds, primarily included Lesser Scaup, Green-winged Teal, American White Pelican, Black Tern, and Northern Pintail (Appendix 5.C). Those detected during monitoring surveys were at Pond 8B (616 detections), PAW Pond (500), Crane Lake (276), Pond 7 (156), South Tailings Pond (74), Weir 1 South Mine Drainage (69), Pond 6 (30), Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage (15), Pond 2/3 (11), Millennium API Surge Pond (4), Mine North Gate Sump (4), Pond 1A (3), and Pond 8A (2).

All species of conservation concern recorded as live incidentals were found at Pond 8B (118 observations) and the South Tailings Pond (5) (Appendix 5.C). Lesser Scaup, Northern Pintail, and Sandhill Crane were the three species of conservation concern found during these incidentals.

Two birds of conservation concern were captured and euthanized: a greater than 50% oiled Green-winged Teal found as an incidental observation on September 2 and a Pied-billed Grebe found during a bird survey on September 3 (Appendices 5.C, 5.D).

#### 5.5 Discussion

#### **Bird Deterrents**

The recommended industry-standard for cannon placement on tailings ponds is a density of 0.08 cannons per hectare of pond (Golder 2000). In recent years, cannons have been applied at a much higher average density of 0.125 cannons per hectare (Ronconi and St. Clair 2006); Suncor has, therefore, targeted an average deterrent density of 0.125 cannons per hectare of open water. Prior to the 2014 monitoring season, bird scare cannons were re-positioned at Pond 6 and Pond 8A to provide a more even distribution, while meeting the deterrent density target.

Crane Lake, a freshwater pond with no deterrents had a mean of 42.7 birds per survey (Table 5.13), the highest for any Suncor pond in the monitoring program. Weir 1 South Mine Drainage, another freshwater pond on-site with no deterrents, had a mean of 1.72 birds per survey, and was in close proximity to process-affected ponds with deterrents. All process-





affected ponds, with deterrents, had lower numbers of landed birds per survey than were observed at Crane Lake. The presence of deterrents, coupled with the absence of habitat, at process-affected ponds appear to correlate well with observed numbers of landed birds.

#### **Bird Contacts**

During the standardized bird surveys in 2014, 5,431 birds were observed contacting processaffected ponds, compared to the 3,343 observed in 2013. This increase in the number of landed birds may be due to a number of factors, including adjustments made in scheduling of surveys, and annual variations in migrating and resident ducks in the area. As expected, landed bird numbers peaked during the spring and fall migration periods (Figure 5.6).

Resident birds in particular, are likely to be counted numerous times throughout the season, adding to the total landed detections (e.g., the family of Bufflehead at PAW Pond could have been counted over multiple surveys). Nesting habitat was available at Crane Lake (freshwater), Weir 1 South Mine Drainage (freshwater) and Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage. The four remaining process-affected ponds with broods had neighboring ponds with nesting habitat that may have served as an attractant.

The majority of contacts on process-affected water were birds of target guilds; 5,305 of the 5,431 detections (97.6%). Similar to 2013, the most common target guild was divers (Bufflehead, Ring- necked Duck, Lesser Scaup), followed by dabblers (American Wigeon, Mallard and Green-winged Teal), and were predominantly observed at PAW Pond and Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage, the low risk industrial runoff ponds (88% of total landings recorded). Divers and dabblers were attracted to the natural wetland adjacent to PAW Pond, which provided suitable habitat (Table 5.21). PAW Pond's close proximity to this freshwater pond was a likely attractant to nearby birds. A lack of vegetation and beach make PAW Pond unsuitable habitat for any guild. The partially vegetated perimeter and emergent vegetation present at Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage may be potential attractants for both divers and dabblers.

The large size of the South Tailings Pond, Pond 8B, and Pond 7 may act as an avian attractant, but they did not have as many birds landed per survey as Crane Lake (freshwater), PAW Pond, and Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage (Figure 5.2). South Tailings Pond, Pond 8B, and Pond 7 had no vegetation and few gently sloping beaches, and present a low risk for oiling (Table 5.9). Several of the remaining smaller process-affected ponds where few birds were observed may have been associated with small pond sizes, limited vegetation, lack of beaches, close proximity of industrial and human activity, and/or presence of deterrents. The highest risk ponds, those with higher bitumen coverage and mortalities had the fewest observed landings (Tables 5.9 and 5.12).

Crane Lake had more birds per survey than other ponds on-site (Figure 5.2), likely a result of the presence of attractants including vegetation cover, bays, islands, and food (e.g., invertebrates, fish, vegetation), deep open water for diving birds, lower human activity and the absence of deterrents. Ultimately, all ponds on site had some level of attraction for birds, due to the proximity of nearby suitable habitat, presence of vegetation or a gently sloping beach.





#### **Oiled Birds and Mortalities**

In the 2014 season, Suncor documented 19 bird mortalities, which occurred across six of its process-affected ponds. This is a 47% reduction compared to the 36 mortalities in 2013 and a 72% reduction compared to the 67 bird mortalities in 2012. Effort was focused on hazing birds at risk of oiling with a success rate of 88%. The hazing crew considered birds successfully hazed if they flew off from the pond (out of sight) and did not return. Of the 19 mortalities, 11 were found alive and euthanized, and two oiled birds could not be captured and were assumed to have died (Appendix 5.D). In total, 16 out of the 19 birds were confirmed as greater than 50% oiled. Individuals that came into contact with bitumen often attempted to preen and free themselves, leading to increased bitumen coverage on the body.

Individuals from target guilds accounted for 95% of the observed mortalities, including those from scheduled searches and as incidental observations. Of the target guilds, 50% were divers (one Canvasback, one Bufflehead, one Pied- billed Grebe, two Ring-necked Duck, two American Coot, one Unknown Diver, and one Unknown Diving Duck), 28% were target guilds with unknown designations (three Unknown Ducks, two Unknown Waterfowl), 11% were Gulls (two Unknown Gulls), 5.5% were dabblers (one Green-winged Teal), and 5.5% were waders (one unknown shorebird) (Table 5.19). A Savannah sparrow, a non-target species, was found oiled at Sand Dump 8.

During bird surveys, eight species of conservation concern were observed landing on processaffected ponds. Approximately 18% of all recorded landings on process-affected water were species of conservation concern, of which individuals of two species were observed oiled. These included two incidental mortalities, a Green-winged Teal and a Pied-billed Grebe. The Pied-billed Grebe was the only oiled bird observed during a formal bird survey during 2014. Consequently, the mean number of oiled bird detections per survey was very low at 0.003 on Pond 2/3 (Table 5.14, Figure 5.3). Northern Pintail and Sandhill Crane were two additional species of conservation concern that were recorded as incidental observations, but these birds were not oiled.

On average, Sand Dump 8 possessed the highest coverage of bitumen, and also had the most associated mortalities (8, 42% of the total). Sand Dump 8 had no obvious attractants for birds, and three mortalities occurring at this pond may be associated with weather events (e.g., hail, heavy rain, high winds). Four of the other mortality-associated ponds also had no noticeable attractants. Pond 6 had six incidental mortalities; this may be associated with its partially vegetated perimeter.

Detections of mortalities were not necessarily correlated with any particular time of the year, the number of landings throughout the year, nor pond area (Figures 5.4 and 5.6). Only six of the 19 mortalities were found during systematic searches. The other mortalities were found during hazing, monitoring surveys, or other routine work. In 2013, the trend was similar, 12 mortalities were located during searches while 24 were found incidentally (Suncor 2013). Walking covered less distance than boat searches, but was used more often as a tool for more extensive mortality searches and accounted for 83% of all search-based mortalities.





Route-based search transects were readjusted in early spring to address areas of high risk to birds which, increased the detection probability of finding oiled or dead birds. Even with realignment of search patterns to improve coverage and detection probability, very few bird mortalities were observed during formal searches.

#### **Oiled Birds and Mortalities: Post-Monitoring Season**

The largest landing event occurred in November following a storm after the fall monitoring period (Appendix 5.E). It is believed that a relatively rare combination of weather conditions forced birds to land on Pond 2/3, Pond 6, Pond 7, Pond 8B and the South Tailings Pond. The majority of the approximately 200 landed birds did not come into contact with bitumen. Six were either oiled and euthanized or found dead, all found on foot at Pond 2/3. Three Ring-necked and two Unknown Diving ducks were recovered on November 4 and 1 Ring-necked Duck was collected on November 5. All deterrents were in operation during this landing event.

#### Inter- observer Variability (IOV)

There were few bird observations documented during the IOV surveys on process-affected ponds at Suncor in 2014. In the IOV's that were conducted and during which birds were observed, variability (RPD) varied from 0 to 200%. The larger RPD values were associated with small differences between observers when few birds were present to observe.

#### Adaptations and Recommendations

Suncor made adaptations to ensure all observers and mortality search crew members followed the 2014 OSBCMP protocols (St. Clair et al. 2014). To establish a standard survey start time, both observers worked the same 12-hour shifts, whereas shift times in 2013 were staggered. To maintain the standard, start time will remain the same for 2015.

Some survey stations at Pond 6 and the South Tailings Pond were moved to be within 500 m of the pond surface, thus increasing the total survey area over water. Survey locations were also adjusted at Pond 2/3, Sand Dump 8, and Upgrader Ponds A, B, D. Survey stations may be resituated in 2015 if required due to site activities.

Adjustments also included better spatial distribution of bird scare cannons on Pond 6 and Pond 8A as part of the bird deterrent program before the 2014 monitoring season commenced. SDU cannons were changed from mechanical to electric to provide greater consistency in cannon operations. No changes to deterrents are planned for 2015.

Vegetation in Pond B East and at the Southeast corner of the Tailings Pond was removed prior to April 16, 2014, reducing vegetated shore from 15% and 8% in 2013, respectively, to less than 1% each (Table 5.9). In early spring of 2015, vegetation presence will be assessed for each pond, and where necessary, vegetation control measures taken.





Additionally, Suncor has requested non-process-affected ponds, such as mine drainage sumps and industrial run-off ponds be removed from the bird contact surveys due to the associated low risk of oiling. These ponds will continue to be actively searched for mortalities and maintain an adequate amount of deterrents. If approval is granted prior to the 2015 monitoring season, bird contact surveys will not continue on PAW Pond, Mine North Gate Sump, and Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage. Crane Lake is recommended as the only freshwater pond for inclusion in Suncor's monitoring program in 2015.

#### 5.6 Documents Cited

- Alberta Sustainable Resource Development. (2010) The general status of Alberta wild species 2010. Alberta Sustainable Resource Development, Fish and Wildlife Division, Edmonton, AB. http://esrd.alberta.ca/fish-wildlife/species-at-risk/albertas-species-at-risk-strategy/general-status-of-alberta-wild-species-2010/default.aspx.
- COSEWIC (2014) Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. Government of Canada. http://www.cosepac.gc.ca/eng/sct5/index\_e.cfm
- Golder (Golder Associates Ltd). (2000) Oil Sands Tailings Pond Bird Deterrent Systems –A Review of Research and Current Practices. Prepared for: Suncor Energy Inc., Syncrude Canada Ltd. And Albian Sands Energy Inc. 42 pp.
- Harris, R.E. and Davis R.A. (1998) Evaluation of the Efficacy of Products and Techniques for Airport Bird Control. Prepared by LGL Limited for Transport Canada. LGL Report TA2193. 104 pp.
- Ronconi R.A. (2011) Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Plan for 2011. Calgary and Fort McMurray, Alberta; Prepared for Albian Sands Energy Ltd., Canadian Natural Resources Limited, Imperial Oil, and Suncor Energy Inc. 32 pp.
- Ronconi, R.A. and St. Clair C.C. (2006) Efficacy of a radar-activated on-demand system for deterring waterfowl from oil sands tailings ponds. Journal of Applied Ecology. 43:111-119.
- St. Clair C.C., Loots S., McCallum C., Ronconi R.A. (2013) 2013 Oil Sands Bird Monitoring Plan. Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta. Prepared for Oil Sands Operators and Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development. April 2013, 45 pp.
- St. Clair C.C., Loots S., Ronconi R.A. (2012) 2012 Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Plan; Prepared for Shell Canada Energy Ltd., Canadian Natural Resources Limited, Imperial Oil, Suncor Energy Inc., Syncrude Canada Ltd., Alberta Environment and Water, Alberta Sustainable Resource Development, and Research on Avian Protection Project, University of Alberta; Edmonton, Alberta, April 2011, 34 pp.
- St. Clair C.C., Loots S., Ronconi R.A. (2014) 2014 Protocol: Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program. Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta. Prepared for Oil Sands Operators and Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development. April 2014, 50 pp.





5.7 Appendices 5.A to 5.E





#### Appendix 5.A Location of Deterrents, Containment Booms, and Survey Stations at Suncor Base Mine Ponds in 2014

\* indicates ponds not included in the OSBCMP



## Figure 5A.1 Location of Deterrents, Containment Booms,





#### Figure 5A.2 Location of Deterrents, Containment Booms, and Survey Stations at Millennium API Surge Pond B East, Upgrader Ponds A, B, D and Weir 10 Mid Plant Drainage in 2014









#### Figure 5A.3 Location of Deterrents, Containment Booms, and Survey Stations at Pond 2/3 and Crane Lake (Freshwater) in 2014







#### Figure 5A.4 Location of Deterrents, Containment Booms, and Survey Stations at Pond 1A and Weir 1 South Mine Drainage (Freshwater) in 2014







#### Figure 5A.5 Location of Deterrents, Containment Booms, and Survey Stations at Pond 7 and Pond F in 2014







#### Figure 5A.6 Location of Deterrents, Containment Booms, and Survey Stations at Extraction Waste Water Pond East, Sand Dump 8 and Mist Pond\* in 2014





#### Figure 5A.7 Location of Deterrents, Containment Booms, and Survey Stations at Pond 8A, Pond 8B, DDA-1\*, North Booster Pump House Sump\*, South Booster Pump House Sump\*, System 4 Sump\*, System 5 Sump\*, System 7 Sump, and Upper Wood Creek\* in 2014









#### Figure 5A.8 Location of Deterrents, Containment Booms, and Survey Stations at PAW Pond and South Tailings Pond in 2014













	Lan	ded <sup>2</sup>	Flew Over <sup>2</sup>	Cont Bitu	acted men <sup>2</sup>	Mortality		
Species/Species Group <sup>1</sup>	Bird Survey	Incidental <sup>3</sup>	Bird Survey	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental	
	V	Vaterbirds	5					
American Wigeon	915							
Bufflehead	881		6				1	
Mallard	615		15					
Ring-necked Duck	420						2	
Lesser Scaup	415	111	10					
Green-winged Teal	384						1	
Common Goldeneye	359		3					
Ruddy Duck	297							
Redhead	189		3					
Lesser Yellowlegs	158							
Canada Goose	120		467					
Blue-winged Teal	101							
Canvasback	91						1	
Northern Shoveler	83							
American White Pelican	48							
Killdeer	37		12					
Semipalmated Sandpiper	34							
Unknown Dabbling Duck	28							
Spotted Sandpiper	24							
Solitary Sandpiper	17		1					
Bonaparte's Gull	15		2					
American Coot	14						2	
Unknown Sandpiper	13							
Greater Yellowlegs	8							
Unknown Duck	7		95			1	2	
Black Tern	5		9					
Greater Scaup	5							
Least Sandpiper	4		16					
Pectoral Sandpiper	4							
Unknown Diving Duck	2						1	
Ring-billed Gull	2		185					
Semipalmated Plover	2							
Surf Scoter	2							
Pied-billed Grebe	1			1			1	
Common Tern	1		6					
Baird's Sandpiper	1							
Black-bellied Plover	1							
Red-necked Grebe	1							
Wilson's Phalarope	1							
Unknown Gull			3			2		

#### Appendix 5.C: Number of Bird Observations by Species at Suncor Base Mine Process-affected ponds in 2014





	Lan	ded <sup>2</sup>	Flew Over <sup>2</sup>	Cont Bitu	Contacted Bitumen <sup>2</sup>		ality
Species/Species Group <sup>1</sup>	Bird Survey	Incidental <sup>3</sup>	Bird Survey	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental
Unknown Waterfowl						2	
Unknown Shorebird			4				1
Unknown Diver							1
California Gull			52				
Double-crested Cormorant			2				
Northern Pintail		10					
Sandhill Crane		2					
	Non	-target Gu	ilds				
Barn Swallow	34		320				
Red-winged Blackbird	30		78				
Common Grackle	26		60				
Snow Bunting	16		5				
Common Raven	9		225				
Rusty Blackbird	8		11				
Black-billed Magpie	3		44				
Chipping Sparrow	2						
Dark-eyed Junco	2						
American Kestrel	1		1				
Brown-headed Cowbird	1						
Eastern Kingbird	1						
Yellow Warbler	1						
Savannah Sparrow			4			1	
Bank Swallow			166				
Tree Swallow			57				
Cliff Swallow			47				
Unknown Pecking Bird			39				
Unknown Swallow			34				
Unknown Bird			25				
American Robin			6				
American Crow			5				
Unknown Blackbird			4				
Golden Eagle			1				
Northern Harrier			1				
Red-tailed Hawk			1				
Unknown Raptor			1				

#### Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Pink shading: Species of Conservation Concern.

<sup>2</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times (e.g., Pied-billed Grebe found in the bird survey is the same bird found in the incidental mortality).

<sup>3</sup> Only for Species of Conservation Concern.





Date	Species/Species Group	Pond Name (Survey Station ID)	Location Description	% Oiled	Outcome	Context of Detection	Method of Detection	Potential Reason for Mortality/Oiling
June 4, 2014	Canvasback	Sand Dump 8	Stuck in the middle of cell	>50	Not recovered, Assumed dead	Incidental	On foot	Weather event
June 20, 2014	Unknown Waterfowl	Sand Dump 8		>50	Found dead	Mortality search	On foot	Weather event
June 20, 2014	Unknown Waterfowl	Sand Dump 8		>50	Found dead	Mortality search	On foot	Weather event
May 1, 2014	Bufflehead	South Tailings Pond	Near the barge	>0	Not recovered, Assumed dead	Incidental	On foot	Unknown
May 25, 2014	Unknown Diver	Pond 6		>50	Captured and euthanized	Incidental	Vehicle	Unknown
August 4, 2014	Unknown Shorebird	Pond 7	On shore	25	Found dead	Incidental	Vehicle	Unknown
August 5, 2014	Unknown Gull	Pond 1A		70	Found dead	Mortality search	On foot	Visibility reduced, smoke
August 15, 2014	Unknown Gull	Sand Dump 8	On backside of the barge	60	Found dead	Mortality search	On foot	Unknown
August 28, 2014	Unknown Duck	Sand Dump 8		>50	Found dead	Mortality search	On foot	Unknown
August 28, 2014	Savannah Sparrow	Sand Dump 8		>50	Captured and euthanized	Mortality search	On foot	Unknown
September 2, 2014	Green- winged Teal	Pond 6	In emergent vegetation	>50	Captured and euthanized	Incidental	Vehicle	Unknown
September 3, 2014	Pied- billed Grebe	Pond 2/3	On shore	>50	Captured and euthanized	Incidental	Detected during Bird Survey	Unknown
September 3, 2014	Ring- necked Duck	Pond 6	On shore	>50	Captured and euthanized	Incidental	On foot	Unknown
September 4, 2014	Ring- necked Duck	Pond 6	On shore	>50	Captured and euthanized	Incidental	On foot	Unknown
September 9, 2014	Unknown Duck	Sand Dump 8		>50	Captured and euthanized	Incidental	On foot	Unknown
October 2, 2014	Unknown Duck	Pond 2/3	On shore	>50	Found dead	Incidental	On foot	Unknown
October 5, 2014	American Coot	Pond 6		40	Captured and euthanized	Incidental	Vehicle	Unknown
October 8, 2014	Unknown Diving Duck	Sand Dump 8		>50	Found dead	Incidental	On foot	Unknown
October 8, 2014	American Coot	Pond 6		>50	Captured and euthanized	Incidental	On foot	Unknown

#### Appendix 5.D: Bird Oiling and Mortality Events at Suncor Base Mine in April–October 2014

Note:

<sup>1</sup> Pink shading: Species of Conservation Concern.





# Appendix 5.E: Incidental Bird Oiling and Mortality Events at Suncor Base Mine Post-monitoring Program (after October 31, 2014)

Date	Species/Species Group	Pond Name (Survey Station ID)	Location Description	% Oiled	Outcome	Context of Detection	Method of Detection	Potential Reason for Mortality/Oiling
November 4, 2014	Ring-necked Duck	Pond 2/3	Floating on open water	>50	Captured and euthanized	Incidental	On foot	Weather event
November 4, 2014	Ring-necked Duck	Pond 2/3	Floating on open water	>50	Captured and euthanized	Incidental	On foot	Weather event
November 4, 2014	Ring-necked Duck	Pond 2/3	Floating on open water	>50	Captured and euthanized	Incidental	On foot	Weather event
November 4, 2014	Unknown Diving Duck	Pond 2/3	On shore	>50	Found Dead	Incidental	On foot	Weather event
November 4, 2014	Unknown Diving Duck	Pond 2/3	On shore	>0	Found Dead	Incidental	On foot	Weather event
November 5, 2014	Ring-necked Duck	Pond 2/3	On shore	>0	Found Dead	Incidental	On foot	Weather event





### OIL SANDS BIRD CONTACT MONITORING PROGRAM 2014 REGIONAL REPORT

Syncrude Canada Ltd.



March 15, 2015

Alberta Energy Regulator EPEA Monitoring & Evaluation Suite 402, 4999-98th Ave NW Edmonton, Alberta T6B 2X3

Dear Sir/ Madam

### AEPEA 26-02 Syncrude Canada Ltd. Aurora North Mine and Mildred Lake Mine

Please find enclosed Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program report as part of clause 6.1.77(b) of Syncrude Canada Ltd. AEPEA Approval 26-02 (as amended).

Please contact me at <u>Gorman.Courtney@syncrude.com</u> if you have any questions or concerns regarding the content of this report.

Sincerely,

Country Gorman

Courtney Gorman Syncrude Canada Ltd.

<u>GL</u>	.OSSA	RY		6-II					
<u>6.</u>	<u>SYN(</u>	SYNCRUDE CANADA LIMITED (MILDRED & AURORA)							
	6.1	SUMM	ARY	6-1					
		6.1.1	BIRD LANDINGS AND MORTALITIES AT PROCESS-AFFECTED PONDS	6-1					
		6.1.2	BIRD LANDINGS AT A FRESHWATER POND	6-2					
		6.1.3	STANDARDIZED MONITORING	6-2					
		6.1.4	SPECIES OF CONSERVATION CONCERN	6-3					
		6.1.5	ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT	6-4					
	6.2	Intro	DUCTION	6-4					
		6.2.1	SITE	6-4					
		6.2.2	Personnel	6-6					
		6.2.3	MANAGEMENT OF AVIAN ATTRACTANTS AND CONTROL OF HAZARDS	6-6					
		6.2.4	DETERRENTS	6-6					
		6.2.5	HAZING PROCEDURES	6-10					
	6.3	Метн	ODS	6-10					
		6.3.1	POND CHARACTERISTICS	6-10					
		6.3.2	BIRD SURVEYS	6-10					
		6.3.3	INTER-OBSERVER VARIABILITY (IOV)	6-11					
		6.3.4	MORTALITY SEARCHES	6-12					
		6.3.5	INCIDENTAL OBSERVATIONS AND REPORTING	6-12					
	6.4	RESU	LTS	6-12					
		6.4.1	POND CHARACTERISTICS	6-12					
		6.4.2	BIRD OBSERVATIONS	6-15					
		6.4.3	INTER-OBSERVER VARIABILITY	6-24					
		6.4.4	Mortalities	6-25					
		6.4.5	SPECIES OF CONSERVATION CONCERN	6-33					
	6.5	Discu	ISSION	6-33					
	6.6	Docu	MENTS CITED	6-35					
	6.7	APPE	NDICES	6-36					

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

#### GLOSSARY

Note: Terms and definitions were updated for clarity. Further, four terms were modified as follows. The term **species of conservation concern** is used in place of **species at risk** to avoid confusion with the Alberta "At Risk" designation. Gull species are included in the **target guilds (waterbirds)** instead of **non-target guilds** because they are among the birds most likely to come in contact with ponds, as indicated by their natural history and OSBCMP findings from previous years. Finally, for the purposes of this report and for consistency, **incidental observations** are limited to a specific subset of the data collected in the field, in order to focus on information relevant to the program objectives.

AHD	Acoustic Hailing Device; powerful directional speaker, including Long Range Acoustic Device (LRAD) and HyperSpike models, typically activated by a bird detection radar linked through wireless signal. May be combined with a visual deterrent (e.g., laser).
ATV	All-terrain vehicle, including amphibious vehicles (e.g., Argo).
Bird, Contacted Bitumen; or Oiled	Bird with 5-100% of its body surface oiled, usually when some feathers on the underside or breast are matted or speckled with a black sticky substance. Behaviour may provide clues, as some birds obsessively attempt to preen without successfully removing the substance, and the substance may be visible on the bill.
Bird, Flew Over (during a survey)	Bird that flew below 100 m of elevation over the <b>survey area</b> , within the survey period. Birds that both flew over and landed were recorded as landed only.
Bird, Landed (during a survey)	Bird that was in contact with a <b>pond</b> , within 500 m of the <b>survey station</b> , within the survey period.
Bird. Oiled	Cas "bird contracted bitumen"
	See bird, contacted bitumen .
Bird Survey	Conducted by observers from a <b>survey station</b> ; identification and count of birds that <b>landed</b> within the <b>survey area</b> during the <b>survey period</b> , and birds that <b>flew over</b> , along with the collection of other information (e.g., weather conditions, visibility, bird oiling).
Bird Survey Brood	See <b>bird</b> , <b>contacted bitumen</b> . Conducted by observers from a <b>survey station</b> ; identification and count of birds that <b>landed</b> within the <b>survey area</b> during the <b>survey period</b> , and birds that <b>flew over</b> , along with the collection of other information (e.g., weather conditions, visibility, bird oiling). One or a group of <b>chicks</b> , with a parent usually nearby.
Bird Survey Brood Chick	See <b>bird</b> , <b>contacted bitumen</b> . Conducted by observers from a <b>survey station</b> ; identification and count of birds that <b>landed</b> within the <b>survey area</b> during the <b>survey period</b> , and birds that <b>flew over</b> , along with the collection of other information (e.g., weather conditions, visibility, bird oiling). One or a group of <b>chicks</b> , with a parent usually nearby. Young local bird that has not yet developed the ability to fly.

Guild, Non-target	Species that peck, fly, glean, stoop/depredate, or scavenge (except gulls) as their primary means of foraging (Appendix A). Includes passerines, raptors, grouse, and woodpeckers.
Guild, Target; or Waterbird	Species that wade, dabble, or dive in water as their primary means of foraging (Appendix A). The program targets these birds because they have a greater likelihood of becoming in contact with ponds. Includes ducks, geese, shorebirds, grebes, loons, cranes, cormorants, swans, pelicans, coots, rails, gulls, terns, herons, and kingfishers.
ha	Hectare; 1 ha = 2.47 acres, or 100 x 100 m; 100 ha = 1 km <sup>2</sup> .
Incidental Observation	Bird detected in April–October outside a <b>bird survey</b> or <b>mortality search</b> that was 1) <b>oiled</b> , dead, or euthanized, or 2) a <b>species of conservation concern</b> in contact with a <b>process-affected pond</b> .
Island	Structure on a <b>pond</b> , surrounded by water, where birds may stand; may be permanent or temporary, natural or artificial, floating or fixed. Includes mats of floating logs or muskeg.
Monitoring	Bird surveys and mortality searches.
Mortality	Bird of any species found dead or euthanized in association with <b>process-affected ponds</b> , either during a <b>mortality search</b> or as an <b>incidental observation</b> .
Mortality Search	Search at a <b>pond</b> or section of a pond's surface or <b>shoreline</b> for dead or dying birds. Searches were conducted by boat, truck, or walking.
OSBCMP	Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program
Pond	Open-air body of water or water storage facility, including its contents, <b>shore</b> , and <b>islands</b> ; may be permanent or temporary.
Pond, Freshwater	<b>Pond</b> (including its contents, <b>shore</b> , and <b>islands</b> ) containing groundwater, rainwater or runoff water unaffected by the mining process or plant operations.
Pond, Process- affected	<b>Pond</b> (including its contents, <b>shore</b> , and <b>islands</b> ) containing water and substances that have been used in or affected by the mining process or plant operations, including tailings, runoff and recycled water. Bitumen may be present (floating or sinking) or absent.
Shore	An area along <b>shorelines</b> that may be reached by changing water levels or effluent.
Shoreline	Perimeter, expressed in metres (m) or kilometres (km), along which the pond's water meets land.

Species of Conservation Concern	Species designated as Endangered, Threatened, or Special Concern under the Canadian <i>Species at Risk Act</i> , COSEWIC or the Alberta <i>Wildlife Act</i> , or listed within Alberta as At Risk, May Be at Risk, or Sensitive (Appendix A).
Survey Area	Area comprising the pond's surface, <b>shores</b> and <b>islands</b> within 500 m of the <b>survey station</b> .
Survey Period	Pre-determined amount of time during which <b>bird surveys</b> were conducted. Surveys were 10 min for stations at ponds smaller than 150 ha and 30 min for stations at ponds of 150 ha or larger.
Survey Station	A fixed location near the edge of a <b>pond</b> , where <b>bird surveys</b> were conducted at regular intervals.
Waterbird	See "guild, target".

### 6. SYNCRUDE CANADA LIMITED (MILDRED & AURORA)

#### 6.1 Summary

#### 6.1.1 Bird landings and mortalities at process-affected ponds

Bird survey and mortality search effort throughout the 2014 season for all process affected ponds are shown in Table 6.1. Twelve process affected ponds were surveyed approximately 3,500 times and searched for mortalities approximately 240 times.

Bird Surveys									
# Ponds Surveyed	12								
# 10-min Surveys Conducted	936								
# 30-min Surveys Conducted (range:	2 561								
10-30 min, mean: 29.9)	2,301								
Mortality Searches									
# Ponds Searched	12								
# Searches	239 (114 focused and 125 transect searches)								
Search Method	Boat	Walk	Truck	Total					
Total Time Searched	68.8 h	5.2 h	27.9 h	101.9 h					
Distance/Area Secreted <sup>1</sup>	1,573 km	112 km	80 km	1,654 km					
Distance/Area Searcheu	1,714 ha	0 ha	1,314 ha	3,140 ha					

#### Table 6.1: Monitoring effort at process-affected ponds at Mildred & Aurora in 2014

<sup>1</sup>For each search, either distance OR area counted towards effort

Bird observations, numbers of species from bird surveys, and mortality searches are shown in Table 6.2. The majority of species observed were non-target species, such as ravens. Most birds and species observed in mortality searches were found incidentally.

#### Table 6.2: Bird observations at process-affected ponds at Mildred & Aurora in 2014

	Waterbirds						Non-target Guilds					
			Contacted Bitumen		Mortality				Contacted Bitumen		Mortality	
	Landed	Flew Over	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental	Landed	Flew over	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental
# Birds <sup>1</sup>	1,311	1,504	60	0	1	42	741	4,537	23	0	0	1
# Species	31	18	11	0	1	20	23	27	2	0	0	1

<sup>1</sup> Individual live birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times
#### 6.1.2 Bird landings at a freshwater pond

One freshwater pond was monitored in the 2014 season as in prior years of the program; the Mildred Lake Reservoir. Table 6.3 shows the pond was monitored approximately 50 times throughout the season. As per the OSBCMP protocol, freshwater ponds are only monitored twice weekly.

### Table 6.3: Monitoring effort at a Mildred Lake Reservoir in 2014

Bird Surveys						
# Ponds Surveyed	1					
# 10-min Surveys Conducted	0					
# 30-min Surveys Conducted	51					

A summary of birds observed and species detected at the freshwater pond are in Table 6.4.

		V	/aterbirc	ls			Non-	target G	uilds	
			Con Bite	tacted umen				Cont Bitu	acted men	
	Landed	Flew Over	Bird Survey	Incidental	<b>Mortality</b> (Incidental)	Landed	Flew over	Bird Survey	Incidental	<b>Mortality</b> (Incidental)
# Birds <sup>1</sup>	30	106	0	0	0	147	764	0	0	0
# Species	19	7	0	0	0	20	18	0	0	0

#### Table 6.4: Bird observations at Mildred Lake Reservoir in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Individual live birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times

# 6.1.3 Standardized Monitoring

Bird contact monitoring field work of the Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Plan was completed under contract with by Terracon Geotechnique. A team of six people monitored all ponds every morning as required in the OSBCMP, three monitoring at Mildred Lake site and one at Aurora North site. Daily monitoring began at 6 AM, or later if sunrise occurred after 6 AM. Monitoring continued throughout the day until all ponds were recorded (typically the monitoring was completed in the morning). Saturdays were used as Syncrude's Comparison days. These days were used for additional training, making up missed stations of the week prior, and/or Inter-Observer Variation (IOV's) monitoring, as per the OSBCMP.

Mortality searches were conducted by Syncrude employees with some contractor additions. As per the OSBCMP, both transect and focused searches were completed on each pond bi-weekly. Mortality searches were conducted primarily by boat. In instances where no boat access was available or other operational constraints to boat work arose, a combination of truck and walking searches were completed. A new pond began in spring 2014, North Mine South Pit- West (NMSPW) with low initial pond area. BET staff attended to the pond on 34 visits during the year from April 22 to October 31.

Mortalities from these searches would be recorded in the incidental mortality data if found. The method used to document route-based coverage was by following a pre-planned documented route covering large areas of the pond with some limitations on boat access.

### 6.1.4 Species of Conservation Concern

A summary of species listed as conservation concern by either federal or provincial government species of concern lists are shown in Table 6.5. In total there were 797 observations and 6 mortalities of species of conservation concern throughout the 2014 monitoring season.

# Table 6.5: Number of observations of birds of conservation concern at process-affected pondsat Mildred & Aurora in 2014

	Lan	ded <sup>1</sup>	Flew Over <sup>1</sup>	Conta Bitur	acted nen¹	Mortality		
Species	Bird Survey	Incidental	Bird Survey	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental	
	V	Vaterbirds	;					
Lesser Scaup	14		2	8		1		
Horned Grebe	8							
Northern Pintail	3			2			1	
Green-winged Teal	2							
Sandhill Crane	1		38				1	
Piping Plover	1		2					
American White Pelican							1	
Pied-billed Grebe							1	
White-winged Scoter							1	
Great Blue Heron			68	1 <sup>2</sup>				
American Bittern			2					
	Non-	target Gu	ilds					
Barn Swallow	74		184					
Sharp-tailed Grouse	7		7					
American Kestrel	4		56					
Northern Harrier	3		36					
Bank Swallow	1		282					
Canada Warbler	1							
Golden Eagle			1					

<sup>1</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times

<sup>2</sup> In interview in January 2015, observer states this was a data entry error as the bird did not land in survey area. The observation is unchanged in the data so as to provide a more conservative approach.

#### 6.1.5 Adaptive Management

Throughout the 2014 bird season Syncrude implemented many adaptive management practices. Compared to 2013, more water deployed, radar-linked on-demand deterrents were used in favor of land based, random-interval firing deterrents, where applicable. Long-range acoustic Hyperspikes linked to the radar units were also in wider use this year across both Mildred Lake and Aurora North process ponds. Syncrude continued to limit amount of vegetation attractants around pond edges at the south side of the SWSS pond.

A distinct hazing technique was proposed (in the latest draft submission of Syncrude's Waterfowl Protection Plan) when hazing diving ducks off process affected ponds. When diving ducks were observed on the water surface, hazing is immediately initiated. If the initial short duration hazing attempt is unsuccessful, hazing is suspended. The hazing team leaves the area and checks back in 30 to 60 minutes. If the diving duck is still in the area, another hazing attempt is initiated. If the second attempt is not successful, the hazing team leaves again and check back in another 30 to 60 minutes. Usually the duck will fly away as soon as there is no pressure from hazing attempts. The hazing-suspension cycle is repeated until the duck is successfully hazed off the pond.

# 6.2 Introduction

#### 6.2.1 Site

Syncrude Canada Ltd. has two lease sites that are currently in operation, Mildred Lake lease and Aurora North lease. Mildred Lake is located approximately 30 km north of Fort McMurray, and Aurora North is located approximately 100 km north of Fort McMurray. There are 12 process affected water storage ponds in total, 9 ponds at Mildred Lake lease with a total area of 3300 ha, and 4 at Aurora North with a total area of 923 ha. There is one freshwater pond monitored at Mildred Lake lease, Mildred Lake Reservoir, which is used to store water imported from the Athabasca River. This pond has a total area of 7.5 ha.



Figure 6.1: Process-affected and freshwater ponds at Mildred & Aurora in 2014.

#### 6.2.2 Personnel

Personnel responsible for monitoring the ponds are trained before the season begins, using a training package from the University of Alberta. When new personnel are hired midway through the season, they undergo the specified training. New hires spend 3-5 days learning site rules and regulations, driving in the mine, and protocols for the OSBCMP Plan. They work with an experienced monitor for approximately three days training at specified monitoring locations before they are work on their own. Further on-the-job training and experienced is gained when the observers work together on comparison days, and routinely two observers participated in the observations at the Freshwater pond observations.

Syncrude's Mortality searches were conducted by a team of approximately 40 people along with their other duties as operators and maintainers of the bird deterrent systems. Qualified operators with previous experience of the program train new operators. New to site workers train for 3-5 days on learning site rules, and regulations and driving in the mine. Once this is completed, the new workers then receive approximately 12-18 days of training on specific BET duties that includes mortality searches. This training includes proper boat techniques, how to conduct mortality searches and bird identification using the training package from the University of Alberta. These new workers are then paired up with previously qualified operators for mortality searches practice.

#### 6.2.3 Management of avian attractants and control of hazards

Syncrude actively manages and controls avian attractants and hazards. Syncrude uses booms in an attempt to contain the bitumen slicks on the pond to fewer locations, although there are some limitations to their full effectiveness due to wind and wave action. Booms are deployed as soon as ponds are ice free, and are removed prior to ice coverage. They are moved as per operational requirements.

#### 6.2.4 Deterrents

Syncrude uses multiple methods of bird deterrents on process affected ponds. Accipiter<sup>™</sup> radar and controller systems are linked to falcon effigies and long-range acoustic devices. When a target is sensed within zones established on each pond, the long range acoustic devices and the falcon modules are activated. The long range acoustic devices project a predator noise, while the falcon effigies flap their wings, strobe lights flash and a high volume predator noise or other sound track deterrent noise is emitted. In addition to radar linked deterrents, conventional Zon<sup>™</sup> cannons are placed around process affected ponds. These cannons fire off at timed intervals. There are also human effigies (scarecrows) placed around process affected ponds which remain there all year.

As per Syncrude's Waterfowl Protection Plan (WPP), at least half of water deployed cannons will be placed within 15 days of the ice-free date and full deployment will be reached within 25 days of the ice free date for each process water pond. Stating around mid-October the primary deterrents that are water deployed will be gradually reduced with freezing ambient temperatures and the start of ice cover on ponds. Reduction of shore-deployed deterrents will follow. During the winter when most process

water pond areas are ice covered, a deterrent is placed on the shoreline at the locations of sustained open water.

Sometimes a deterrent will have to be moved due to operations. The coverage density of deterrents on a pond will remain the same. Refer to Appendix 6.A for an inventory and locations of deterrents for a typical day in 2014.

Deterrent Name	Description	Stimuli	Sound Intensity at 1 m (dB)	Activation Control	Placement	Number and Location
Falcon Rafts	Predator-like bird model on a raft. When activated, wings flap and predator call is played over speaker	Audio and Visual	>100	Radar	Floating and on land	ASB -29 AIP-15 AIPN-3 ANRCW-0 MLSB-24 EIP-8 WIP-34 SWIP-10 SWSS-42 NMSPW-21 RCW-0 EFF-2
Zon Cannons	Conventional propane fired cannon. Produced loud blast automatically and fired on a timed interval	Audio	>100	Timer	Floating and on land	ASB-49 AIP-22 AIPN-12 ANRCW-6 MLSB-100 EIP-13 WIP-61 SWIP-34 SWSS-106 NMSPW-12 RCW-4 EFF-2

#### Table 6.6: Avian deterrents deployed at Mildred & Aurora (as of Fall 2014)

Deterrent Name	Description	Stimuli	Sound Intensity at 1 m (dB)	Activation Control	Placement	Number and Location
Hyperspikes	Long- Range acoustic device play a loud noise (usually a predator call) over a spear system	Audio	>100	Radar	on land	ASB-11 AIP-5 AIPN-1 ANRCW-0 MLSB-20 EIP-7 WIP-8 SWIP-6 SWSS-14 NMSPW-0 RCW-0 EFF-0
Effigies	Human-like scarecrows	Visual	N/A	N/A	on land	ASB-121 AIP-119 AIPN-0 ANRCW-13 MLSB-129 EIP-119 WIP-77 SWIP-73 SWSS-56 NMSPW-0 RCW-6 EFF-4

Deterrent count date was July19, 2014

		ır(s)	Combined Audio & Visual Deterrents <sup>1</sup>			o & its¹	Audio-only Deterrents				Visual-only Deterrents				Total	
	ver	ada	Linke	ed to	N	ot	Linke	ed to	N	ot	Linke	ed to	Not	inkod		
Bond Namo	o) t	Ŗ	Rad	dar	Lin	ked	Ra	dar	Lin	ked	Ra	dar	NUL			
Fond Name	Pond Area water; ha)	Number of	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Floating	On Land	Units	Density (units/ha)
ASB	543.25	3	29	3	0	0	0	11	0	46	0	0	0	121	213	0.39
AIP	262.86	0	15	0	0	0	0	5	0	22	0	0	0	119	161	0.61
AIPN	87.97	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	12	0	0	0	0	16	0.18
ANRCW	7.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	13	19	2.50
MLSB	721.15	3	24	0	0	0	0	20	25	86	0	0	0	129	287	0.40
EIP	111.69	2	8	0	0	0	0	7	0	13	0	0	0	119	149	1.33
WIP	739.40	1	34	0	0	0	0	8	0	61	0	0	0	77	181	0.25
SWIP	266.66	0	10	0	0	00	0	6	9	25	0	0	0	73	123	0.46
SWSS	993.97	2	42	0	0	0	0	14	30	76	0	0	0	56	220	0.22
NMSPW	241.45	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	33	0.14
RCW	14.82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	6	10	0.71
EFF	5.80	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	4	8	1.40
Total	3996.52	11	183	8	0	0	0	72	64	365	0	0	0	717	1420	0.36

#### Table 6.7 Number of Avian Radars and Deterrents at Syncrude's Process Affected Ponds

<sup>1</sup> Combined deterrents count as one unit; individual components are described in Table 6.7

# 6.2.5 Hazing procedures

Syncrude's BET team was responsible for any and all hazing activities on process water ponds. If any birds are observed on ponds, including during structured monitoring times, then the observer calls into the BET (Bird and Environment Team) Radar Monitor. The Radar Monitor dispatches the nearest BET hazing crew immediately. The crew will then arrive on scene and asses the next course of action. Usually a boat is deployed and investigates the bird, and if applicable, initiates hazing procedures. Hazing procedures consist of firing off small pyrotechnic projectiles like screamers and bangers, discharge of air horn, or pursuit using a boat.

If the bird is a diving duck, a specified hazing procedure is initiated, which consists of immediately initiated hazing with boats and pyrotechniques. If the initial hazing attempt is unsuccessful, hazing is suspended. The hazing team leaves the area and checks back in 30-60 minutes. If the diving duck is still in the area, another hazing attempt is initiated. If the second attempt is not successful, the hazing team leaves again and check back in another 30-60 minutes. Usually the duck will fly away as soon as there is no pressure from hazing attempts. The hazing-suspension cycle is repeated until the duck is successfully hazed off the pond.

# 6.3 Methods

The OSBCMP protocol for 2014 was followed throughout the 2014 season. Any deviations in methods are described below.

#### 6.3.1 Pond Characteristics

Pond characteristics were derived from a satellite image measured in a Geographical Information System. The satellite images for Mildred Lake and Aurora used for the 2014 program were taken on September 3, 2013. Characteristics were derived from GIS and are shown in Tables 6.8 and 6.9.

#### 6.3.2 Bird Surveys

Bird monitoring surveys were completed every day as per OSBCMP protocol. Each monitoring station was monitored usually by one observer. Each ponds' monitoring stations were rotated on a schedule to prevent a station being monitored at the same time for every day of the program.

To complete daily monitoring, the monitors used Zeiss Conquest 10 x 42 binoculars and Bushnell/Bushmaster 20 x 60 x 60 Spotting Scopes, Tripod, 3G network capable tablets, and the Sibley Field Guide to Birds of North America.

Please refer to Appendix 6.A for pond maps showing survey stations at Mildred Lake and Aurora North leases.

The methodology described in the OSBCMP protocol 2014 expects timers of some type to be used when a significant break in monitoring occurred to ensure monitoring time was kept to the specified 10 or 30 minutes duration. The use of a timer to allot for missed time due to interruptions in the observation period was at the discretion of the monitor.

#### 6.3.3 Inter-observer Variability (IOV)

The IOV comparison surveys are duplicate observations of the number of birds and the number of species recorded independently by two observers at the same location and at the same time. These duplicate observations provide a measure of repeatability and consistency of the observation data. The relative percent difference (RPD) in the duplicate observations is calculated according to the following formula:

$$\mathsf{RPD}_{\#\mathsf{birds}} = \frac{|x_1 - x_2|}{\bar{x}} *100$$

Where  $x_1$  is the number of birds from Observer 1,  $x_2$  is the number of birds from Observer 2, and  $\bar{x}$  is the mean of the number of birds from both observers. The mean number of birds provides the reference value against which the two individual observations are compared by assuming that the correct answer is likely between Observer 1 and Observer 2.

For example, Observer 1 counted 12 birds and Observer 2 counted 13 birds. Therefore the RPD<sub>#birds</sub> is:

$$\mathsf{RPD}_{\#\mathsf{birds}} = \frac{|12 - 13|}{12.5} *100 = 8\%$$

The same calculation should be completed for the number of species counted by each observer.

An RPD<sub>#birds</sub> and an RPD<sub>#species</sub> of less than 10% is considered optimum, up to 25% may be acceptable, but greater than 25% would suggest that additional training to improve consistency might be required. These cutoff values are generally based on a subjective evaluation that considers the type of data being analyzed and the amount of variability that would be expected or acceptable to the program. As such, there is no standard means by which a definitive percent cutoff can be determined. The results of the IOV analyses will be reviewed to evaluate consistency, determine what cutoff values may be more appropriate, and to also help identify what other factors might be responsible for observer variability.

IOV's were conducted on Syncrude's Comparison days. They are duplicate observations of the number of birds and the number of species recorded independently by two observers at the same location and at the same time. These duplicate observations provide a measure of repeatability and consistency of the observation data.

#### 6.3.4 Mortality Searches

Mortality searches were completed regularly as described in the OSBCMP protocol. Route transects included a perimeter route with transects being searched within the perimeter area. This covered most areas of pond that is able to be reached by boat. Any areas that were not able to be reached by boat were accessed as close as possible and searched with binoculars. Focused search areas were determined based off of areas where previous activity was observed, either birds observed landed in the pond, or oiled birds were retrieved previously. All searches were performed by at least two people. Route and focused based searches were completed consecutively and all ponds were completed once every two weeks.

To perform searches operators used boats, trucks, binoculars, data sheets, GPS, nets, bags, and labels.

#### 6.3.5 Incidental Observations and Reporting

Incidental observations consisted of any species of concern that was observed in contact with processaffected ponds. These observations were recorded within and outside the 500m barrier, and anytime within or outside the 30 minute or 10 minute observation session.

#### 6.4 Results

#### 6.4.1 **Pond Characteristics**

In the 2014 season, 13 ponds were monitored for bird activity. Of the 13 ponds, 12 contained process affected water, and 1 pond contained freshwater from the Athabasca River. The freshwater pond, Mildred Lake Reservoir, was located at the Mildred Lake lease site Ponds characteristics can be seen in Table 6.9.

Over the 2014 summer, the newly developed NMSPW pond grew in surface area considerably, while most other ponds had relatively constant surface area.

Syncrude stores coke on a beach on the west side of MLSB. This area is not a water area and is not recorded in the surface area of water. It is beach made of coke with a typical grain size like sand, although in some satellite images and air photos it can appear to be bitumen or water.

		Survey		Emer-	Shore	eline (m)
Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Survey Station ID	Area (over water; ha)	Island (ha)	gent Veg. (ha)	Vege- tated	Non-veg.
	AIP_1	28.49	0	0	0	1478.70
Aurora In-pit	AIP_2	27.92	0	0	0	1765.50
	Total (2 Stations)	56.41	0	0	0	891.20
Aurora In-pit North	AIPN	26.80	0	0	0	4135.40
Aurora North Recycle Water	ANRCW	7.50	0	0	0	1500.95
	ASB_1	31.24	0	0	1144.48	0
Aurora Settling	ASB_2	28.82	0	0	838.30	0
Basin	ASB_3	37.08	0	0	1003.15	278.43
	Total (3 Stations)	97.14	0	0	0	1084.00
Effluent	EFF	5.80	0	0	2985.93	278.43
East In-pit	EIP	23.66	0	0	0	11.29
	MLSB_1	36.70	0	0	0	11.69
Mildred Lake	MLSB_2	15.17	0	0	0	22.98
Settling Basin	MLSB_3	3.50	0	0	0	818.60
	Total (3 Stations)	55.37	0	0	0	585.64
NMSPW	NMSPW	13.80	0	0	0	1561.41
Recycle Water	RCW	10.55	0	0	0	2965.65
	SWIP_1	14.48	0	0	0	849.12
Southwest In-pit	SWIP_2	29.78	0	0	1083.62	423.36
	Total (2 Stations)	44.26	0	0	353.42	947.20
	SWSS_1	2.84	0	0	0	1092.13
Southwest Sands	SWSS_2	4.02	0	0	0	1155.31
Storage	SWSS_3	37.22	0	0	0	999.21
	Total (3 Stations)	44.08	0	0	0	3246.65
	WIP_1	11.76	0	0	0	1037.26
	WIP_2	13.10	0	0	0	977.77
West In-pit	WIP_3	25.89	0	0	0	2015.03
	WIP_4*	14.35	0	0	0	1437.57
	Total (3 Stations)	36.40	0	0	0	1237.70
Mildred Lake Reservoir	MLR	27.37	0	0	1383.90	0

 Table 6.8: Characteristics of survey stations monitored at Mildred & Aurora in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater pond. \* Alternative Survey Station (not included in total).

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Pond	Bitur	men Cover	Pond Area	Island	Emergent	Shoreline (m)	
(Year of Origin)	Content	% <sup>2</sup> : Mode (Range)	Area <sup>3</sup> (ha): Mean (Min-Max)*	(over water; ha)	(ha)	Veg. (ha)	Vegetated	Non-veg.
Aurora In-pit 2010	process- affected	6-15 (1-5 to 51-75)	2.64 (2.64-2.64)	721.15	0	0	0	16106.36
Aurora In-pit North 2012	process- affected	6-15 (0 to 76-100)	32.13 (32.13-32.13)	111.69	0	0	0	5978.7
Aurora North Recycle Water 2001	process- affected	1-5 (0 to 1-25)	0 (0-0)	739.4	0	0	12459.12	2356.06
Aurora Settling Basin 2001	process- affected	1-5 (0 to 26-50)	6.67 (6.67-6.67)	266.66	0	0	0	8033.02
Effluent 1977	process- affected	26-50 (1-5 to 76- 100)	4.31 (4.31-4.31)	993.97	0	0	4736.32	10706.5
East In-pit 1999	process- affected	1-5 (0 to 26-50)	0 (0-0)	14.82	0	0	776.85	1554.98
Mildred Lake Settling Basin 1977	process- affected	1-5 (1-5 to 76- 100)	33.78 (33.78-33.78)	5.8	0	0	353.42	947.2
NMSPW 2013	process- affected	51-75 (0 to 76-100)	**	241.45	0	0	0	7614.06
Recycle Water 1977	process- affected	1-5 (1-5 to 51-75)	6.56 (6.56-6.56)	543.25	0	0	0	10398.89
Southwest In-pit 2002	process- affected	6-15 (0 to 26-50)	21.79 (21.79-21.79)	262.86	0	0	0	7888
Southwest Sands Storage 1995	process- affected	1-5 (0 to 26-50)	24.43 (24.43-24.43)	87.97	0	0	0	4481.1
West In-pit 2001	process- affected	1-5 (0 to 1-25)	0.5 (0.5-0.5)	7.5	0	0	0	1237.7
Mildred Lake Reservoir	freshwater	0	0	156.43	0	0.76	8181.09	0

Table 6.9: Characteristics of ponds monitored at Mildred & Aurora in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater pond. <sup>2</sup> Estimated during bird surveys. <sup>3</sup> Estimated from satellite imagery. \* Syncrude used 1 satellite map for 2014 \*\* In 2014 satellite map, there is no water for NMSPW pond on the day of the satellite image

#### 6.4.2 Bird Observations

Bird observations began April 16<sup>th</sup> and continued until July 6<sup>th</sup> for the spring migration season. The fall migration season was observed from July 25<sup>th</sup> to October 31<sup>st</sup>. Approximately 3500 bird surveys were conducted throughout the season, surveying a total 1275 ha daily. Mildred Lake Reservoir, the freshwater pond, had 29 ha surveyed 51 times throughout the season. This is less frequent than daily monitoring sessions as the OSBCMP protocol requires freshwater ponds to be monitored twice weekly. All ponds were monitored with a high frequency throughout the season (see Table 6.10 and Table 6.11), with almost all ponds having all required stations monitored every day.

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Survey Duration (min)	Survey Station ID	Survey Area (over water; ha)	# Surveys Conducted in 2014
Aurora la pit	20	AIP_1	28.49	154
Autora m-pit	30	AIP_2	27.92	153
Aurora In-pit North	10	AIPN	26.8	155
Aurora North Recycle Water	10	ANRCW	7.5	155
		ASB_1	31.24	154
Aurora Settling Basin	30	ASB_2	28.82	155
		ASB_3	37.08	154
Effluent	10	EFF	5.8	154
East In-pit	10	EIP	23.66	156
		MLSB_1	36.7	153
Mildred Lake Settling Basin	30	MLSB_2	15017	159
		MLSB_3	3.5	156
NMSPW	10	NMSPW	13.8	159
Recycle Water	10	RCW	10.55	157
Southwoot In pit	20	SWIP_1	14.48	163
Southwest m-pit	30	SWIP_2	29.78	158
		SWSS_1	2.84	153
Southwest Sands Storage	30*	SWSS_2	4.02	155
		SWSS_3	37.22	160
		WIP_1	11.76	163
Mont In nit	20**	WIP_2	13.1	159
	30	WIP_3	25.89	160
		WIP_4	14.35	1
Mildred Lake Reservoir	30	MLR	27.37	51

#### Table 6.10: Bird survey effort by station at Mildred & Aurora in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater pond

\* Mean: 29.98 min

\*\* Mean: 29.64 min

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	# Survey Stations	Survey Area (over water; ha)	Survey Area as % of Pond Area (over water; ha)	Duration of Surveys (min)	Scheduled Monitoring Frequency (days/week)	# Surveys Conducted in 2014	% Days with all scheduled surveys conducted
Aurora In-pit	2	56.41	21.46	30	6	307	99
Aurora In-pit North	1	26.80	30.46	10	6	155	100
Aurora North Recycle Water	1	7.50	100.00	10	6	155	100
Aurora Settling Basin	3	97.14	17.88	30	6	463	100
Effluent	1	5.80	100.00	10	6	154	99
East In-pit	1	23.66	21.18	10	6	156	101
Mildred Lake Settling Basin	3	55.37	7.68	30	6	468	101
NMSPW	1	13.80	5.72	10	6	159	103
Recycle Water	1	10.55	71.19	10	6	157	101
Southwest In-pit	2	44.26	16.60	30	6	321	104
Southwest Sands Storage	3	44.08	4.43	30*	6	468	101
West In-pit	3	36.40	4.92	30**	6	483	104
Mildred Lake Reservoir	1	27.37	17.50	30	2	51	98

# Table 6.11: Bird survey effort by pond at Mildred & Aurora in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater pond
\* Range: 20-30 min, Mean: 29.98 min
\*\* Range: 10-30 min, Mean: 29.64 min

The monitoring results from the 2014 season varied among Process-Affected ponds and also varied within guild observed. Observations of the PA ponds show the majority of 'target' species that were observed were dabbling ducks. The highest occurrences of dabbling ducks were observed landing at the West In-Pit pond, and flying over at the Southwest Sands Storage pond, more than any other target species. There was also a noted increase in landed Gulls and Waders at MLSB 3, over all other monitoring stations and PA ponds. Non target species were most commonly observed in almost all PA monitoring sessions. Please refer to Table 6.12, Table 6.13 and Table 6.14 for numbers of landed birds observed throughout the season.

The most commonly landed bird species observed and recorded was Unknown Duck. Unknown Ducks were observed landed on process affected ponds 245 times. The average distance for landed Unknown Ducks approached the observation limit as outlined in the Plan. Most Unknown Duck observers report of no colour ID, far away, and poor light. The next most common landed bird was Unknown White Headed Gull at 129 times. Northern Shoveler was the identifiable species that accounted for 102 landings in process affected water. Unknown ducks were observed to be contacted bitumen 16 times, while Northern Shovelers were observed to be contacted bitumen 8 times. Please see Appendix 6.C for number of bird observations by species at Syncrude process affected ponds

	Dabb	olers	Div	ers	Wad	ders	Gu	lls	Non-t	arget	Tot	al <sup>3</sup>
Pond Name <sup>2</sup>	Landed	Flew Over										
Aurora In-pit	24	80	31	1	0	14	0	3	96	323	208	425
Aurora In-pit North	1	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	6	73	12	76
Aurora North Recycle Water	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	99	11	100
Aurora Settling Basin	35	140	191	2	16	2	12	8	77	549	475	712
Effluent	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	40	2	42
East In-pit	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	33	109	33	112
Mildred Lake Settling Basin	0	134	0	3	139	34	177	44	160	402	485	664
NMSPW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	17
Recycle Water	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	100	9	101
Southwest In-pit	1	25	1	0	1	47	7	27	42	723	52	842
Southwest Sands Storage	25	311	34	25	36	42	7	22	89	622	208	1,046
West In-pit	263	143	54	20	6	77	1	100	217	1,480	557	1,904
Total (Process-affected Ponds)	349	836	315	51	198	222	204	204	741	4,537	2,052	6,041
Mildred Lake Reservoir	74	19	86	10	12	3	70	30	147	764	447	870

# Table 6.12: Number of bird observations by pond and guild at Mildred & Aurora in 2014<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times
 <sup>2</sup> Blue shading: freshwater pond
 <sup>3</sup> Includes unknown duck species (which may be dabblers or divers)

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Survey Station ID	Dabblers	Divers	Waders	Gulls	Non-target Guilds	All Guilds <sup>2</sup>
	AIP_1	0.04	0.15	0	0	0.62	1.11
Aurora In-pit	AIP_2	0.12	0.05	0	0	0	0.24
	Mean across surveys	0.08	0.10	0	0	0.31	0.68
Aurora In-pit North	AIPN	0.01	0.03	0	0	0.04	0.08
Aurora North Recycle Water	ANRCW	0	0	0	0	0.07	0.07
	ASB_1	0.10	0.84	0.03	0.08	0.07	1.13
Aurora Settling Basin	ASB_2	0.10	0.26	0.08	0	0.14	1.36
Autora octaing basin	ASB_3	0.03	0.13	0	0	0.29	0.58
	Mean across surveys	0.08	0.41	0.03	0.03	0.17	1.03
Effluent	EFF	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01
East In-pit	EIP	0	0	0	0	0.21	0.21
	MLSB_1	0	0	0	0	0.33	0.33
Mildred Lake Settling Basin	MLSB_2	0	0	0.07	0.01	0.58	0.66
Mildred Lake Setting Dasin	MLSB_3	0	0	0.82	1.12	0.12	2.12
	Mean across surveys	0	0	0.30	0.38	0.34	1.04
NMSPW	NMSPW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recycle Water	RCW	0	0	0	0	0.05	0.06
	SWIP_1	0.01	0	0	0.01	0.13	0.15
Southwest In-pit	SWIP_2	0	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.13	0.18
	Mean across surveys	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.02	0.13	0.16
	SWSS_1	0.08	0.01	0.06	0	0.36	0.60
Southwest Sands Storage	SWSS_2	0.01	0	0.07	0.03	0.05	0.17
Southwest Sands Storage	SWSS_3	0.07	0.21	0.10	0.02	0.16	0.56
	Mean across surveys	0.05	0.07	0.08	0.01	0.19	0.44
	WIP_1	1.58	0.24	0.03	0.01	0.90	2.82
	WIP_2	0.03	0.09	0	0	0.33	0.49
West In-pit	WIP_3	0	0	0.01	0	0.12	0.13
	WIP_4*	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mean across surveys	0.54	0.11	0.01	<0.01	0.45	1.15
All Process-affected Ponds	Mean across ponds	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.16	0.41
Mildred Lake Reservoir	MLR	1.45	1.69	0.24	1.37	2.88	8.76

# Table 6.13: Mean number of landed birds per survey at Mildred & Aurora in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater pond. <sup>2</sup> Includes unknown duck species (which may be dabblers or divers).

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Survey Station ID	Dabblers	Divers	Waders	Gulls	Non-target Guilds	All Guilds <sup>2</sup>
	AIP_1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aurora In-pit	AIP_2	0.013	0	0	0	0	0.013
	Mean across surveys	0.007	0	0	0	0	0.007
Aurora In-pit North	AIPN	0.006	0	0	0	0	0.006
Aurora North Recycle Water	ANRCW	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ASB_1	0.019	0	0	0	0	0.026
Aurora Sattling Basin	ASB_2	0	0	0.006	0	0	0.013
Autora Settiing Basin	ASB_3	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mean across surveys	0.006	0	0.002	0	0	0.013
Effluent	EFF	0	0	0	0	0	0
East In-pit	EIP	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mildred Lake Settling Basin	MLSB_1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	MLSB_2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	MLSB_3	0	0	0	0	0.045	0.090
	Mean across surveys	0	0	0	0	0.015	0.030
NMSPW	NMSPW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recycle Water	RCW	0	0	0	0	0	0.006
	SWIP_1	0	0	0.006	0	0	0.006
Southwest In-pit	SWIP_2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mean across surveys	0	0	0.003	0	0	0
	SWSS_1	0	0	0	0	0	0.003
Southwoot Sanda Storago	SWSS_2	0.013	0	0	0.006	0	0.039
Southwest Sands Storage	SWSS_3	0	0	0	0	0.100	0.100
	Mean across surveys	0.004	0	0	0.002	0.034	0.053
	WIP_1	0.129	0.074	0	0	0	0.202
	WIP_2	0	0	0	0	0	0
West In-pit	WIP_3	0	0	0	0	0	0
	WIP_4*	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mean across surveys	0.043	0.025	0	0	0	0.068
All Process-affected Ponds	Mean across ponds	0.006	0.002	0	0	0.004	0.016
Mildred Lake Reservoir	MLR	0	0	0	0	0	0

# Table 6.14: Mean number of oiled birds per survey at Mildred & Aurora in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater pond. <sup>2</sup> Includes unknown duck species (which may be dabblers or divers)



Freshwater Pond.

Figure 6.2: Mean number of landed waterbirds per survey at Mildred & Aurora in 2014.



\* Freshwater Pond.

Figure 6.3: Mean number of oiled waterbirds per survey at Mildred & Aurora in 2014.

As Per Table 6.15 below, there were reports of 3 brood observations. Two of these observations at West In-Pit were possibly a repeat sighting of the same brood as they occurred within 2 days and at the same location. The West In-Pit pond is in a process of reclamation and has potential nesting habitat in the vicinity, more so than the other process water ponds. Tall grasses and small freshwater ponds in the immediate area allow for suitable nesting habitat. The other brood was observed at Aurora East-Pit Northeast (AIP), which would have far less suitable habitat for nesting.

# Table 6.15: Brood observations by species at process-affected ponds at Mildred & Aurora in2014

Species/Species Group	# Brood Observations <sup>1</sup>
UNK Dabbler Duck	3

<sup>1</sup> Each brood may contain one to multiple chicks; broods may be observed repeatedly and thus be counted multiple times

#### 6.4.3 Inter-observer Variability

There were a total of 57 IOVs completed throughout the season. IOV's that included all monitors at some point during the season. 48 of these IOVs had accurate numbers of species count, and the observers had the same data. There were 35 instances during the 57 IOVs where a bird was spotted by one observer and not the other, and 2 instances during the 57 IOVs where a bird was spotted by both observers but the number of species was counted incorrectly. For a significant number of the IOV's, neither observer observed any birds.

		Lan	ded	Flew Over				
Comparison Survey	Survey Station ID	RPD: Number of Individual Birds	RPD: Number of Avian Species	RPD: Number of Individual Birds	RPD: Number of Avian Species			
1	AIP1	-	-	0%	0%			
2	EFF	-	-	200%	200%			
3	EIP	-	-	0%	0%			
4	EIP	-	-	200%	200%			
5	MLSB2	-	-	0%	0%			
6	MLSB2	-	-	200%	200%			
7	SWIP1	-	-	0%	0%			
8	SWIP1	-	-	200%	200%			
9	SWIP2	-	-	200%	200%			
10	SWSS3	-	-	0%	0%			
11	WIP1	0%	0%	-	-			
12	WIP1		-	0%	0%			
13	WIP1	-	-	0%	0%			
14	WIP1	-	-	200%	200%			
15	WIP1	-	-	200%	200%			
16	WIP2	-	-	0%	0%			
17	WIP2	-	-	200%	200%			
18	WIP2	-	-	200%	200%			
19	WIP3	-	-	200%	200%			
20	WIP3	-	-	0%	0%			
21	WIP3	-	-	200%	200%			
22	WIP3	-	-	200%	200%			
23	WIP3	-	-	200%	200%			
Mean		0%	0%	100%	100%			

# Table 6.16: Inter-observer variability in terms of relative percent difference (RPD) at Mildred & Aurora in 2014

#### 6.4.4 Mortalities

A total of 3140 hours over 139 days were spent performing mortality searches on 12 different processaffected ponds on both Mildred Lake and Aurora lease sites. Most effort was on boat searches, completing both route based and focused based transects of the ponds. Please refer to Table 6.17.

Formal mortality searches accounted for only 1 oiled duck mortality out of 47 oiled mortalities on ponds. The mortality was observed during a focused search of MLSB it was a live Lesser Scaup that was more than 50% oiled. Almost all mortalities were incidental observations reported by our BET mortality team, or operators working in the area, or other Syncrude workers and contractors. Oiled ducks occurred throughout the year, starting in April. Most of the oiled ducks were found alive and had to be euthanized by site staff, under the direction of the Alberta Government. Most oiled ducks found were >50% oiled.

MLSB was the process affected water pond that accounted for the most oiled ducks, followed by Southwest Sands Storage and Aurora East-Pit Northeast. Half of the oilings in MLSB occurred on the north end of the pond, and was an area of focused searches. Some oilings for 2014 occurred in sumps around the lease, including the 690 Pumphouse Sump and East 45 Dump Sump. Consideration is to be made on closing the 690 Pumphouse Sump and the East 45 Dump Sump, adding bitumen elimination controls, or adding them to the to the monitoring prior to the 2015 program.

Please see Appendix 6 D for mortality event detail.

Pond Name	# Days	Boat			Walk				Truck	ζ.	Total			
	Searched	h	km	ha	h	km	ha	h	km	ha	h	km	ha	
Aurora In-pit	17	7.8	136	102	0.6	0	30	1.0	11	55	9.4	147	187	
Aurora In-pit North	12	1.2	0	99	1.3	0	41	4.0	0	840	6.5	0	980	
Aurora North Recycle Water	12	0	0	0	1.0	0	5	3.6	0	76	4.6	0	80	
Aurora Settling Basin	14	14.0	299	407	0.5	0	21	0.3	0	4	14.7	299	432	
Effluent	13	0.0	0	0	0.8	0	5	5.4	0	77	6.1	0	83	
East In-pit	11	5.1	31	51	0.2	0	2	1.5	3	0	6.8	34	54	
Mildred Lake Settling Basin	10	12.0	228	279	0	0	0	0	0	0	12.0	228	279	
NMSPW	1	0.2	0	240	0	0	3	0	0	0	0.2	0	243	
Recycle Water	13	0	0	0	0.8	0	5	7.3	0	184	8.1	0	189	
Southwest In-pit	11	5.8	123	103	0	0	0	0.0	0	0	5.8	123	103	
Southwest Sands Storage	13	11.9	360	315	0	0	0	3.4	66	51	15.3	426	366	
West In-pit	12	10.8	397	118	0	0	0	1.5	0	27	12.3	397	145	
Total		1,714	5.2	0	112	27.9	80	1,314	101.9	1,654	3,140	1,714	5.2	

# Table 6.17: Mortality search effort at Mildred & Aurora in 2014<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Includes route-based and focused transects; for each search, either distance OR area counted towards effort

Pond Name <sup>1</sup>	Mortality Search	Incidental	Total
Aurora In-pit	0	6	6
Aurora In-pit North	0	0	0
Aurora North Recycle Water	0	0	0
Aurora Settling Basin	0	4	4
Effluent	0	3	3
East In-pit	0	0	0
Mildred Lake Settling Basin	1	7	8
NMSPW	0	0	0
Recycle Water	0	1	1
Southwest In-pit	0	0	0
Southwest Sands Storage	0	6	6
West In-Pit	0	6	6
690 Pumphouse Sump*	N/A	3	3
East 45 Dump Sump*	N/A	10	10
Total (Process- affected Ponds)	1	46	47
Mildred Lake Reservoir	N/A	0	0

#### Table 6.18: Number of mortalities by pond at Mildred & Aurora in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater ponds \* Ponds not included in the OSBCMP

2014											
	Contacted	<b>Bitumen</b> <sup>1</sup>	Mortality								
Species/Species Group	Bird Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental							
	Waterb	birds									
Lesser Scaup	8		1								
Northern Shoveler	8										
American Wigeon	6			1							
Mallard	5			7							
Blue-winged Teal	5			1							
American Coot	2			5							
Northern Pintail	2			1							
Gadwall	2										
Ring-necked Duck	2										
Snow Goose	1			2							
Great Blue Heron	1										
Unknown Duck				5							
Common Goldeneye				4							
Canada Goose				3							
Long-tailed Duck				2							
Unknown Gull				2							
American White Pelican				1							
Canvasback				1							
Common Merganser				1							
Eared Grebe				1							
Greater White-fronted Goose				1							
Pied-billed Grebe				1							
Green Winged Teal				1							
Ruddy Duck				1							
Sandhill Crane				1							
Unknown Shorebird				1							
White-winged Scoter				1							
White- rumped Sandpiper				1							
Non-target Guilds											
Snow Bunting	15										
Common Raven	2			1							
Total	59	0	1	46							

# Table 6.19: Number of observations of oiling and mortalities, by species, at Mildred & Aurora in2014

<sup>1</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days or also observed as mortalities, and thus be counted multiple times



Figure 6.4: Relationship between pond area (over water in ha), mortality search effort, and mortality search results



\* Incidental observations

\*\* Excludes 5 unknown ducks

Figure 6.5: Proportion of each guild for birds that flew over or landed at process-affected ponds, contacted bitumen, or died at Mildred & Aurora in 2014.



\*Individual birds may be observed repeatedly during consecutive days

Figure 6.6: Timing of bird landings, oiling, and mortalities in spring (top) and fall (bottom) 2014 at Mildred & Aurora, including freshwater ponds.

	Pond		% Days	Mean # Landed Waterbirds per Survey				# Sp Lan	ecies Ided	# Obs vation Oiled E	ser- s of Birds	‡ Morta	‡ alities
Pond Name <sup>1</sup> (over water; ha)	Area (over water; ha)	Potential Attractants	with Floating Bitumen Present	Dabblers	Divers	Waders	Gulls	Total <sup>2</sup>	Conservation Concern <sup>3</sup>	Per Survey	Incidental	Mortality Search	Incidental
Aurora In-pit	262.86	Shore	100	0.08	0.10	0	0	13	1	0.007	0	0	6
Aurora In-pit North	87.97	Shore	99	0.01	0.03	0	0	4	0	0.006	0	0	0
Aurora North Recycle Water	7.50	None	68	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0
Aurora Settling Basin	543.25	Shore	98	0.08	0.41	0.04	0.03	25	5	0.013	0	0	4
Effluent	5.80	Shore, perimeter vegetation	100	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
East In-pit	111.69	Shore	96	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0
Mildred Lake Settling Basin	721.15	Shore, coke beach	100	0	0	0.30	0.38	6	1	0.030	0	1	7
NMSPW	241.45	None	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recycle Water	14.82	Shore, perimeter vegetation	100	0	0	0	0	5	0	0.006	0	0	1
Southwest In-pit	266.66	shore	99	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.02	6	0	0.003	0	0	0
Southwest Sands Storage	993.97	Shore, perimeter vegetation	99	0.05	0.07	0.08	0.02	15	3	0.053	0	0	6
West In-pit	739.4	Perimeter vegetation, cove	96	0.55	0.11	0.01	<0.01	30	6	0.068	0	0	6
690 Pumphouse Sump*	N/A	Perimeter vegetation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	3
East 45 Sump Sump*	N/A	Perimeter vegetation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	10
All Process-affected Ponds	3996.52			0.06	0.06	0.04	0.04	54	12	0.016	0	1	43
Mildred Lake Reservoir	156.43	Shore, perimeter vegetation	0	1.45	1.69	0.24	1.37	39	8	0	0	N/A	0

# Table 6.20 Summary of bird survey, mortality and incidental results by pond at Mildred & Aurora in 2014

<sup>1</sup> Blue shading: freshwater pond. <sup>2</sup> During bird surveys. <sup>3</sup> Includes live incidental observations. \* Ponds not included in the OSBCMP.

#### 6.4.5 Species of Conservation Concern

Throughout the monitoring, 12 species of Conservation Concern were observed landed in process affected water (4) or landed on vegetation on shore/water (8). The 4 species to contact process affected water, Northern Pintail, Green Winged Teal, Horned Grebe and Lesser Scaup, only contacted water a total of 9 times in total over the monitoring season.

6 Species of Special concern were observed as oiled. A Lesser Scaup was found on a focused search mortality search. All others were found incidentally, they include; Sandhill Crane, White winged Scoter, American White Pelican, Pied- Billed Grebe, and a Northern Pintail.

#### 6.5 Discussion

All process affected ponds had bird deterrents placed on and/or around them at a density specified in the WPP or higher. The freshwater pond, Mildred Lake Reservoir, did not have any bird deterrents placed on or around the pond. Deterrents were moved around the pond areas throughout the season in order to maintain tailings operations.

Throughout the 2014 season, 6,041 birds were observed flying over process affected ponds, while 2,052 birds were observed landing on process water, beaches or vegetation near process water. Of landed birds, dabbling ducks account for 17% of landed species, while diving ducks account for 15%. Gulls and waders are both 10% each of all sightings and non-targets are 36% for the 2014 monitoring season. Unknown ducks make up the remainder. In 2013 monitoring season, dabbling ducks were 11% of all landed observations, diving ducks were 17%, waders were 12% and gulls were grouped in a non-target category at 59%. This data shows similarities from year to year, however some slight variations of data were observed. In 2014, a substantial decrease in non-target species was observed as well as an increase of dabbling ducks. The decrease of non-target bird observations could be due to the inclusion of gull species into the non-target category in 2013 and the removal of gulls from the non-target category to a target species for the 2014 season.

One potential bias for data in the Syncrude program has come to light for one monitoring station located on the coke beach storage area of the MLSB pond. This appears attractive to wader and gull species, and accounts for almost all of MLSB landings (a non-bitumen area). For prior years this station did not contain coke beach within the monitoring radius; the coke beaching encroached over a significant portion of the monitoring radius in 2014. In 2014, there were increased observations of landed waders and gulls on MLSB over the prior year, mostly at Station 3 compared to 2013 observations. In 2013, waders were reported observed landing 19 times at MLSB, compared to 139 waders observed landed in 2014. This could be attributed to the presence of the coke beach storage area that encroached on Station 3 in 2014. The coke beach had a high presence of wader and gull guilds observed landed at this station at 128 observations and 175 observations, respectively. The area surrounding the station it is not a bitumen covered beach, or bitumen mat, it does not pose an immediate threat to oiling. No mortalities were reported from either guild in that location, as can be seen in Appendix 6.D.

Overall monitoring results in 2014 were comparable to 2013 results. Total landed bird observations for 2014 were 2052 on process ponds, and in 2013 there were 1789 observations of birds landed on process affected water. Target species landing on process affected water in 2013 reported 1044 landings, and 1311 in 2014. One significant explanation of this difference in year over year target guild landings comes from observations at the MLSB coke beach storage area. Approximately 300 additional observations of the target guild landings for this monitoring site on MLSB relate to this.

Mortality searches in 2014 were conducted as stated in the OSBCMP plan. Previously in 2013, monitoring was conducted with a much higher frequency. In 2014, with 3140 hours over 139 days of searches, mortality results show 1 bird found using a transect based search method. Almost all oilings reported in this program are found from equipment or tailings operators who are completing work adjacent to a tailings area and happen to observe an oiled bird, not during the structured mortality searches. Incidentally found mortalities accounted for 46 of 47 oiled mortalities reported in the 2014 season and 43 of 47 oiled mortalities in the 2013 season.

Nearly all oiled birds that were recovered from all ponds on both lease sites were found alive and were oiled by more than 50%, with some as much as 90-100% oiled. Most of the oiled birds were reported as incidentals by BET personnel working in the area, or other personnel who work in tailings areas or on the ponds. When reports of birds on process affected ponds are called in to the BET control room, BET personnel are dispatched immediately. They will then asses the bird for guild and oiling level, and then assess the area to determine if it is safe to attempt to haze it by boat (or if it is possible by land). If the bird has no oil, and is a dabbling duck, hazing by boat is preferred, and the BET personnel approach the birds and launch small pyrotechniques. If the ducks do not immediately disperse, then chasing with the boat is initiated, being mindful of bitumen mats and obstructions on ponds, such as booms or deterrents. This continues until the ducks leave the area. If it is a diving duck, hazing is initiated and then stops to allow for the birds to fly away, as opposed to diving, escaping immediate danger. This cycle continues until the bird leaves. If a bird is determined to be oiled, a plan will be formulated to retrieve it.. Some oiled birds are irretrievable when the location is not accessible by boat or by land (e.g. if it is too shallow, or inside a boom).

Oiled bird numbers were similar with prior year's data. For the 2014 monitoring plan period, 47 oiled birds were reported from contact with PA ponds, this is comparable to 44 oiled birds resulting from contact with PA ponds reported in 2013.

The number of oiled bird losses in 2013 at the MLSB pond were 19 in total, the most mortality of the Syncrude process affected ponds for that year. For 2014, the MLSB pond accounted for 8 losses, substantially less than 2013. This appears to be due to shifts in locations of deterrents, and possibly a shift in the beach habitat type causing the area to be less attractive to dabblers and diving ducks.

The pond with the greatest recorded amount of surface bitumen visible was North Mine South-Pit West (NMSPW). This pond was reported by the observers, often to have 50% or more bitumen visible on the surface. The pond is new to the monitoring program this year and is getting a fresh supply of tailings. This pond is expected to be bigger and require more monitoring locations for subsequent monitoring years. There were no recorded landings of any birds on NMSPW for the monitoring season. This could be due to the un-attractiveness of the pond due to deterrents, no vegetation and high levels of activity in the area. No designated mortality searches were completed on the pond. However documented visits

and searches were completed when the pond was serviced for cannons, approximately once every seven days. There were no mortalities reported from NMSPW during the monitoring season.

The numbers of bird contacts with process affected ponds for species of conservation concern were considerably less than observations of their fly overs. For target species, there were 112 observations of flying over process affected ponds, with 29 observations of landed birds in PA ponds. Of non-target species of concern 90 observations were made of landing, with 566 observations of flying over. These species of conservation concern that are on the non-target guild in the program are at a low risk of oiling as they do not frequent water. On the designated focused mortality searches a single bird, a Lesser Scaup, was found (on MLSB).

Some birds that are observed repetitively are thought to be resident species. In particular, ravens, magpies, swallows, sparrows and some gulls are believed to be resident species. Some observations of species were repetitively observed in the same area over a series of days. The same number of birds in the exact same area and in some cases nesting behaviors and actual nests were observed. For example Barn Swallows had built nests on pond barges and dredges which were within the 500m survey radius. These swallows were observed flying around in the beginning of the season with nesting materials, and entering and exiting the same location of the barge. They were continued to be seen most days until presumably the chicks had fledged. These birds were then counted in each observation and counted towards our observed bird results.

Inter-observer variability sessions were completed over the 2014 season. At least two sessions were completed by each observer. For most of the IOVs completed the observers had matching observations; however it should be noted that many of these IOVs were completed without either observer observing any birds. Most differences in species observed were a case of one monitor observing a single bird and the other monitor not observing that same bird. This most commonly occurred with Ravens being observed flying over the survey area and being detected or recorded by one monitor and not by the other.

#### 6.6 Documents Cited

St. Clair CC, Loots S, Ronconi RA (2014)- 2014 Protocol Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program. Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta. Prepared for Oil Sands Operators and Alberta ESRD.

# 6.7 Appendices

#### Appendix 6.A

Location of deterrents, containment booms and survey stations at Mildred & Aurora ponds in 2014






Appendix 6.B: Relationship between the mean number of landed waterbirds per survey and hour after sunrise at Mildred & Aurora in 2014

Appendix 6.C: Number of bird observations by species at Mildred & Aurora process-affected ponds in 2014

	Landed <sup>2</sup>		Flew Over <sup>2</sup>	Contacted Bitumen <sup>2</sup>		Mortality	
Species/Species Group <sup>1</sup>	Bird	Incidental <sup>3</sup>	Bird Survey	Bird	Incidental	Mortality	Incidental
	Survey	meidentai	Dird Ourvey	Survey	meidentai	Search	incidental
	- ·	W	aterbirds				_
Unknown Duck	245		191	16			5
Unknown White-headed Gull	129		140				
Northern Shoveler	102		4	8			
Unknown Grebe	102						
Unknown Dabbling Duck	82		4				
Unknown Diving Duck	79						
Mallard	76		38	5			7
Unknown Shorebird	75		60	1			1
Unknown Plover	70		6				
Unknown Gull	57		54				2
Common Goldeneye	48		34				4
Canada Goose	26		658				3
Greater White-fronted Goose	23		41				1
Semipalmated Sandpiper	20						
Unknown Sandpiper	19		39				
Ring-necked Duck	17			2			
Bonaparte's Gull	15						
Lesser Scaup	14		2	8		1	
American Wigeon	14			6			1
American Coot	13			2			5
Blue-winged Teal	10			5			1
Unknown Diver	10						
Eared Grebe	8						1
Cackling Goose	8		8				
Horned Grebe	8						
Lesser Yellowlegs	4		4				
Bufflehead	4						
Unknown Yellowlegs	4						
Northern Pintail	3			2			1
Barrow's Goldeneye	3						
Ruddy Duck	3						
Gadwall	2			2			
Common Loon	2		6				
Greater Scaup	2						
Green-winged Teal	2						
Herring Gull	2						
Semipalmated Plover	2						
Unknown Scaup	2						
Snow Goose	1		11	1			2
Unknown Black-headed Gull	1		8	1			
Sandhill Crane	1		38				1
Piping Plover	1		2				
Solitary Sandpiper	1						
White-rumped Sandpiper	1						
Great Blue Heron			68	1			
Long-tailed Duck							2
American White Pelican							1
Canvasback							1

Common Merganser						1
Pied-billed Grebe						1
White-winged Scoter						1
Unknown Goose			34			
Unknown Swan			28			
Unknown Dabbler			10			
Double-crested Cormorant			6			
Linknown Tern			<u> </u>			
Amorican Bittorn			3			
Franklin's Gull			<u></u>			
Killdoor			1			
Rindeel Bing billed Cull			1			
Ring-Dilled Guli			1			
Unknown Calidris Sandpiper			1			
Unknown Wader		Nau 4				[
	450	NON-t	arget Guilds	<b>.</b>	1	4
Common Raven	156		664	2		1
Unknown Swallow	94		1143	6		
Barn Swallow	74		184			
American Pipit	73		221			
Snow Bunting	55		531	15		
Black-billed Magpie	49		157			
Red-winged Blackbird	35		128			
Unknown Sparrow	34		85			
American Crow	31		163			
Unknown Passerine	20		478			
Clay-colored Sparrow	16		11			
Cliff Swallow	15		119			
Horned Lark	14		10			
Song Sparrow	14		2			
Brewer's Blackbird	11		14			
American Robin	8		1			
Ruffed Grouse	7		1			1
Sharp-tailed Grouse	7		7			-
Unknown Pecking Bird	5		18			
American Kestrel	4		56			
Tree Swallow	4		10			
Savannah Sparrow	4					
Northern Harrier	3		36			
White throated Sparrow	3		50			
Linknown Gleaner	2		100			
Bank Swallow	2		282			
Morlin	1		202			
Canada Warblor	1		1			
	1		70			
			/0			
European Staning			9			
			6			
			4			
Black-capped Chickadee			2			
Blackpoll Warbler			2		 	
Golden Eagle			1			
Snowy Owl			1			

<sup>1</sup>Pink shading: Species of Conservation Concern <sup>2</sup> Individual birds may be observed on multiple days and thus be counted multiple times <sup>3</sup> Only for Species of Conservation Concern

Date	Species/Species Group	Pond Name (Survey Station ID)	Location Description	% Outcome Context of Detection		Method of Detection	Potential Reason for Mortality/Oiling	
19-Apr	Common Goldeneye	Effluent Pond	Unknown	100	Found Dead	Reported by workers in area	Boat	Unknown
19-Apr	Common Goldeneye	Effluent Pond	Unknown	100	Captured and euthanized	Reported by workers in area	Boat	Unknown
1-May	Northern Pintail	MLSB	North end of pond	80	Captured and euthanized	Reported by workers in area	Boat	Unknown
5-May	Canvasback	MLSB	North end of pond	100	Captured and euthanized	Reported by workers in area	Boat	Unknown
9-May	American Wigeon	SWSS	Near boat dock	60	Captured and euthanized	Reported by workers in area	Foot	Unknown
9-May	Long Tailed Duck	MLSB	North end of pond	100	Reported, unable to retrieve	Reported by workers in area	Truck	Unknown
9-May	Long Tailed Duck	MLSB	North end of pond	70	Captured and euthanized	Reported by workers in area	Boat	Unknown
14-May	White Rumped Sandpiper	ASB	NW corner	100	Found Dead	Reported by workers in area	Boat	Unknown
25-May	Common Goldeneye	AEPNE	Floating on surface	100	Captured and euthanized	Reported by workers in area	boat	Unknown
26-May	American Coot	AEPNE	On Shore	80	Captured and euthanized	Reported by workers in area	On foot	Unknown
27-May	Green Winged Teal	MLSB	Near Q-Pit	10	Found Dead	Reported by workers in area	Truck	Unknown
2-Jun	Eared Grebe	AEPNE	Unknown	90	Captured and euthanized	Reported by workers in area	Boat	Unknown
27-Jun	Blue Winged Teal	ASB	SE Corner	80	Captured and euthanized	Reported by workers in area	On Foot	Unknown
2-Jul	Sandhill Crane	SWSS	On shore	50	Captured and euthanized	Reported by workers in area	Truck	Unknown
3-Jul	Raven	SWSS	Unknown	60	Captured and euthanized	Reported by workers in area	On Foot	Unknown
5-Jul	Unknown duck	690 Sump	Unknown	90	Captured and euthanized	Reported by workers in area	Truck	Unknown

#### Appendix 6.D: Bird mortality events at Mildred & Aurora in April–October 2014

Date	Species/Species	Pond Name	Location	%	Outcome		Method of	Potential Reason
	Group	(Survey	Description	Oiled		Context of	Detection	for Mortality/Oiling
		Station ID)				Detection		
			Unknown	90	Captured and	Reported by	Truck	Unknown
5-Jul	Unknown duck	690 Sump			euthanized	workers in area		
			Unknown	90	Captured and	Reported by	Truck	Unknown
5-Jul	Unknown duck	690 Sump			euthanized	workers in area		
			Unknown	98	Captured and	Reported by	Boat	Unknown
28-Jul	American Pelican	ASB			euthanized	workers in area		
		45 Dump	Unknown	100	Found Dead	Reported by	Truck	Unknown
31-Jul	Mallard	Sump				workers in area		
		45 Dump	Unknown	100	Found Dead	Reported by	Truck	Unknown
31-Jul	Mallard	Sump				workers in area		
		45 Dump	Unknown	100	Found Dead	Reported by	Truck	Unknown
31-Jul	Mallard	Sump				workers in area		
		45 Dump	Unknown	100	Found Dead	Reported by	Truck	Unknown
31-Jul	Mallard	Sump				workers in area		
		45 Dump	Unknown	100	Captured and	Reported by	Truck	Unknown
31-Jul	Mallard	Sump			euthanized	workers in area		
		45 Dump	Unknown	100	Captured and	Reported by	Truck	Unknown
31-Jul	Unknown shorebird	Sump			euthanized	workers in area		
01001		Cump	Seepage pond	70	Unable to retrieve	Reported by	Truck	Unknown
8-Aug	Canada Goose	SWSS				workers in area		
			Seepage pond	50	Unable to retrieve	Reported by	Truck	Unknown
8-Aug	Canada Goose	SWSS				workers in area		
			Seepage pond	50	Unable to retrieve	Reported by	Truck	Unknown
8-Aug	Canada Goose	SWSS				workers in area		
		45 Dump	Unknown	100	Captured and	Reported by	Truck	Unknown
10-Aug	Mallard	Sump			euthanized	workers in area		
ŭ		45 Dump	Unknown	100	Captured and	Reported by	Truck	Unknown
10-Aua	Mallard	Sump			euthanized	workers in area		
			Shore	100	Captured and	During bird survey	Binoculars	Unknown
12-Aug	White Winged Scoter	RCW			euthanized			

#### Appendix 6.D: Bird mortality events at Mildred & Aurora in April–October 2014 (Continued)

Date	Species/Species	Pond Name	Location	%	Outcome		Method of	Potential Reason
	Group	(Survey	Description	Oiled		Context of	Detection	for Mortality/Oiling
		Station ID)				Detection		
		45 Dump	Unknown	97	Captured and	Reported by	Truck	Unknown
20-Aug	Unknown duck	Sump			euthanized	workers in area		
Ŭ		45 Dump	Unknown	100	Found dead	Reported by	Truck	Unknown
20-Aug	Unknown duck	Sump				workers in area		
Ŭ		•	North side	100	Captured and	Reported by	On Foot	Unknown
25-Aug	Pied Billed Grebe	Effluent pond			euthanized	workers in area		
			AIP 2	100	Captured and	During Bird Survey	Binoculars	Unknown
14-Sep	Unknown gull	AEPNE			euthanized			
			AIP 2	100	Captured and	During Bird Survey	Binoculars	Unknown
14-Sep	Unknown gull	AEPNE			euthanized			
			In cove	70	Captured and	During Bird Survey	Binoculars	Unknown
15-Sep	Ruddy Duck	WIP			euthanized			
	Greater White-		On shore	90	Captured and	Reported by	On foot	Unknown
19-Sep	Fronted Goose	AEPNE	-		euthanized	workers in area		
			On roadway	60	Captured and	Reported by	Truck	Unknown
19-Sep	Snow Goose	MLSB	near pond		euthanized	workers in area		
		100	Floating on	40	Captured and	During Bird Survey	Binoculars	Unknown
30-Sep	Snow Goose	ASB	surface		euthanized		-	
			On shore near	100	Captured and	Reported by	Boat	Unknown
1-Oct	Lesser Scaup	MLSB	boat dock	1.00	euthanized	workers in area		
			On shore	100	Captured and	Reported by	On foot	Unknown
5-Oct	American Coot	WIP			euthanized	workers in area		
			On shore	100	Captured and	Reported by	On foot	Unknown
5-Oct	American Coot	WIP			euthanized	workers in area		
			On shore	100	Captured and	Reported by	On foot	Unknown
5-Oct	American Coot	WIP			euthanized	workers in area	0.4.4	
2.0.1			On road near	30	Captured and	Reported by	On foot	Unknown
8-Oct	Common Goldeneye	WIP	pond	=-	euthanized	workers in area	0.4.4	
44.0.1			East shore	70	Captured and	Reported by	On foot	Unknown
14-Uct	Common Merganser	IVILSB		400	eutnanized	workers in area	6 '	
47.0.1			North end	100	Captured and	Reported by	Boat	Unknown
17-Oct	American Coot	IVVIP			euthanized	workers in area		

#### Appendix 6.D: Bird mortality events at Mildred & Aurora in April–October 2014 (Continued)

## Appendix 6.E: Incidental bird oiling and mortality events at Mildred & Aurora post-monitoring program (after Oct 31, 2014)

Subsequent to the end of the 2014 Monitoring Program, losses were incurred and are documented below. There were 79 total losses from Nov 4 to 7th 2014. Of these losses, 4 were found dead, and 75 were found alive. Permission was sought and received from the Alberta Government to euthanize those 75 oiled birds found alive. Bird losses occurred at 3 ponds; West In-Pit (74 losses), North Mine South Pit- West (1 loss), and Aurora East Pit- Northeast (4 losses). Species that were found oiled stemming from this period were Lesser Scaup (66 mortalities), American Coot (7 mortalities), Gadwall (1 mortality), Mallard (2 mortalities), Red-Necked Grebe (1 mortality) Canvasback (1 mortality) and an Unknown species (1 mortality). Birds were recovered over 4 days, November 4<sup>th</sup> -7<sup>th</sup>. No more birds were recovered after the 7<sup>th</sup>, even with extensive searches of ponds for the next 3 days. The loss breakdown is as follows, on November 4<sup>th</sup> seven birds were recovered, on November 5<sup>th</sup> thirty-one birds recovered, on November 6<sup>th</sup> thirty-three birds recovered, and on November 7<sup>th</sup> eight birds recovered.

Date Bird Found	Time	Pond	Species	Bird State
4-Nov	1720 hrs	WIP	American Coot	Alive, 90-100% oiled
4-Nov	1720 hrs	WIP	American Coot	Alive, 90-100% oiled
4-Nov	1720 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive, 90-100% oiled
4-Nov	1720 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive, 90-100% oiled
4-Nov	1720 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive, 90-100% oiled
4-Nov	1720 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive, 90-100% oiled
4-Nov	1720 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive, 90-100% oiled
5-Nov	1240 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1240 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1240 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1240 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1240 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1240 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1240 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1240 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1240 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1240 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1240 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1320 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1320 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1320 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1320 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1355 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1355 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1355 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1355 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1355 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1355 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1355 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1355 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1520 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Dead 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1520 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1520 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled

# Appendix 6.E: Incidental bird oiling and mortality events at Mildred & Aurora post-monitoring program (after Oct 31, 2014) (Continued)

Date Bird Found	Time	Pond	Species	Bird State
5-Nov	1520 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1520 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1520 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1520 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
5-Nov	1650 hrs	WIP	American Coot	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	0955 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Dead 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	0955 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Dead 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	0955 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Dead 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	0955 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	0955 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	0955 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	0955 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	0955 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	0955 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	0955 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1200 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1200 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1200 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1200 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1200 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1200 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1200 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1200 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1020 hrs	NMSPW	American Coot	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1200 hrs	WIP	American Coot	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1200 hrs	WIP	American Coot	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1200 hrs	WIP	American Coot	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1200 hrs	WIP	Gadwall	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1150 hrs	AEPNE	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1150 hrs	AEPNE	Mallard	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1150 hrs	AEPNE	Mallard	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1150 hrs	AEPNE	Unknown Duck	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1615 hrs	WIP	Red Necked Grebe	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1615 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-Nov	1615 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-NOV	1615 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-NOV	1640 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
6-NOV	1640 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
7-Nov	1100 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Dead 90-100% Oiled
7-Nov	1100 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
7-INOV	1100 nrs		Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Olled
7-INOV	1100 nrs		Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Olled
7-INOV	1610 nrs			Alive 40% Olled
7-INOV	1610 hrs	WIP	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
7-INOV	1610 hrs		Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled
7-Nov	1610 hrs	NIN NIN N	Lesser Scaup	Alive 90-100% Oiled



### OIL SANDS BIRD CONTACT MONITORING PROGRAM 2014 ANNUAL REPORT

7. REGIONAL DISCUSSION

Prepared for:

Canadian Natural Resources Limited, Imperial Oil Canada Limited, Shell Canada Energy, Suncor Energy Inc., Syncrude Canada Limited

March 13, 2015

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

#### PAGE

7.0	REGIO	ONAL RE	SULTS AND DISCUSSION	7-1
	7.1	Bird Sur	veys, Oiled Bird Observations, and Avian Mortalities	7-1
		7.1.1	Bird Surveys	7-1
		7.1.2	Relationship between Landed and Flyover Bird Survey Observations	7-4
		7.1.3	Oiled Birds and Bird Mortalities	7-7
	7.2	Influenc	e of Weather on Bird Contact, Oiling and Mortality Observations	7-8
	7.3	Deterre	nt Systems	7-1
	7.4	Relation	ship Between Bird Contact Numbers and Pond Size and Distance	ł
		to Athab	basca River	7-1
		7.4.1	Bird Contact Numbers and Pond Size	7-1
		7.4.2	Influence of the Athabasca River	7-3
		7.4.3	Pond Characteristics	7-3
	7.5	Inter-Ob	server Variation	7-5
	7.6	Freshwa	ater Ponds	7-7
	7.7	Recomr	nendations for Protocol Revision	7-7
		7.7.1	Bird Survey Sampling Unit	7-7
		7.7.2	Habitat Unit Definitions	7-7
		7.7.3	Mortality Search Procedure	7-8
		7.7.4	Effort Allocation to Freshwater Pond Observations	7-10
		7.7.5	Weather Data	7-10
		7.7.6	Inter-observer Variability	7-10
		7.7.7	Data Management	7-11
		7.7.8	Hypothesis-driven Monitoring	7-11
	7.8	Conclus	ions	7-12
	7.9	Docume	ents Cited	7-13



#### TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

PAGE

#### LIST OF TABLES

Table 7.1:	Observations of Landed Birds in, and Birds Flying over, Survey Areas During the 2014 Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program*	.7-1
Table 7.2:	Mean Number of Landed Birds (per Survey) at Process-affected and Freshwater Ponds during the Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program in 2014.	.7-2
Table 7.3:	Species of Conservation Concern Observations during Bird Surveys in 2014	.7-3
Table 7.4:	Observations of Oiled Birds and Bird Mortalities During the Bird Surveys, Mortality Searches and as Incidental Observations in the 2014 Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program	.7-7
Table 7.5:	Inter-Observer Variation (Relative Percent Difference) in the Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program in 2014*	.7-6
Table 7.6:	Effort and Oiled/Dead Bird Observations in Syncrude's 2013 Enhanced Mortality Search Program*	.7-9

#### LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 7.1:	The Timing of Landings of Birds of the Target Guilds in the Spring (Top Panel) and Fall (Bottom Panel) Migration Seasons	7-2
Figure 7.2:	Relationship between Flyover Observations and Landed Bird	
	Observations, with all Zero Observations Included, on Process-affected	
	Ponds (top panel) and Freshwater Ponds (bottom panel) in the 2014 Oil	
	Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program	7-5
Figure 7.3:	Relationship between Flyover Observations and Landed Bird	
	Observations, with all Zero Observations Excluded, on Process-affected	
	Ponds (top panel) and Freshwater Ponds (bottom panel) in the 2014 Oil	
	Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program	7-6
Figure 7.4:	Weather (Maximum and Minimum Temperatures, Precipitation) and	
	Possible Bird Landing Events (≥250 Total Landed Bird Observations) on	
	Process-affected Ponds during the 2014 Oil Sands Bird Contact	
	Monitoring Program	7-9
Figure 7.5:	Relationship Between the Number of Landed Waterbirds Observed	
-	During Bird Surveys and Process-affected Pond Area Over Water in the	
	2014 Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program	7-2
Figure 7.6:	Relationship Between the Number of Landed Waterbirds Observed	
•	During Bird Surveys and Freshwater Pond Area Over Water in the 2014	
	Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program	7-2



#### 7.0 REGIONAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 7.1 Bird Surveys, Oiled Bird Observations, and Avian Mortalities

#### 7.1.1 Bird Surveys

There was a total of 51,049 bird observations in the 2014 OSBCMP, 24,858 of which were landed within, and 26,191 were observed flying over (within 100 m altitude) the survey areas (Table 7.1). Observations of bird contacts were elevated in May, concurrent with the expectation of spring migration activity (Figure 7.1, top panel). However, there is little to no indication of a peak of observations in the fall migration period (Figure 7.1, bottom panel). Comparisons, including those among sites and between process-affected and freshwater ponds, are limited to qualitative commentary, as none of the data in Table 7.1 are normalized for effort.

				Target	Guilds			Non-		Sito
Operator	Pond Type	Dabbles	Dives	Unk. Duck	Wades	Gull	Total	target Guilds	Total	Total
			Lande	d Bird C	Observatio	ns				
Canadian	Process-affected	1,959	2,633	130	1,564	125	6,411	534	6,945	7 065
Natural	Freshwater	266	575	9	39	98	981	39	1,020	7,905
Imporial	Process-affected	113	509	92	571	196	1,481	586	2,067	2 0 2 0
Impenai	Freshwater	406	421	56	150	190	1,223	538	1,761	3,828
Sholl	Process-affected	202	808	8	659	126	1,803	259	2,062	2 /07
Shell	Freshwater	232	153	0	3	25	413	22	435	2,497
Supcor	Process-affected	2,246	2,731	7	304	17	5,305	134	5,439	8 069
Suncor	Freshwater	346	1,752	0	0	491	2,589	41	2,630	8,009
Syporudo	Process-affected	349	315	245	198	204	1,311	741	2,052	2 7 2,499
Syncrude	Freshwater	74	86	58	12	70	300	147	447	
Total	Process-affected	4,869	6,996	482	3,296	668	16,311	2,254	18,565	
Landed Birds	Freshwater	1,324	2,987	123	198	874	5,506	787	6,293	24,858
			Flye	over Ob	servations	i				
Canadian	Process-affected	961	25	288	635	60	1,969	4,208	6,177	6 477
Natural	Freshwater	140	9	8	2	16	175	125	300	0,477
Imporial	Process-affected	2,608	61	44	202	229	3,144	2,380	5,524	6 716
Impenai	Freshwater	278	16	53	49	68	464	728	1,192	0,710
Sholl	Process-affected	1,271	92	23	752	172	2,310	1,256	3,566	2 750
Shell	Freshwater	81	28	1	23	16	149	44	193	3,759
Supeor	Process-affected	482	39	95	33	242	891	1,135	2,026	2 220
Suncor	Freshwater	9	129	0	4	60	202	100	302	2,320
Superude	Process-affected	836	51	191	222	204	1,504	4,537	6,041	6 011
Syncrude	Freshwater	19	10	44	3	30	106	764	870	0,911
Total	Process-affected	6,158	268	641	1,844	907	9,818	13,516	23,334	26 101
Flyovers	Freshwater	527	192	106	81	190	1,096	1,761	2,857	20,191
	Totals	12,878	10,443	1,352	5,419	2,639	32,731	15,277	51,0	49

#### Table 7.1: Observations of Landed Birds in, and Birds Flying over, Survey Areas during the 2014 Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program\*

Note:

\* Observations are not corrected for survey effort.





Figure 7.1: The Timing of Landings of Birds of the Target Guilds in the Spring (Top Panel) and Fall (Bottom Panel) Migration Seasons

Bird observation numbers are highly variable across the sites, for both landed bird and flyover observations. This variation can be partially removed by normalizing for survey effort. The mean numbers of landed bird observations during bird surveys at each of process-affected and freshwater ponds at each site is presented in Table 7.2.

Operator	Mean Number of Landed Birds (per survey)						
Operator	Process-affected Ponds	Freshwater Ponds					
Canadian Natural	2.26	19.62					
Imperial Oil	0.60	8.72					
Shell	1.08	8.37					
Suncor	1.99	22.14					
Syncrude	0.41	8.76					
Average	1.27	13.52					

### Table 7.2: Mean Number of Landed Birds (per Survey) at Process-affected and Freshwater Ponds during the Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program in 2014



Differences in process-affected pond characteristics among sites are also likely responsible for the differences in landed bird numbers per survey, ranging from 0.41 at Syncrude to 2.26 at Canadian Natural. More landed birds per survey were observed at freshwater ponds than at process-affected ponds, an approximate 10-fold difference likely indicative of the greater presence of attractive habitat at freshwater ponds, and possibly, an effect of deterrent systems on process-affected ponds. The magnitude of the difference varied among sites, from an 8-fold difference (Shell) to a 21-fold difference at Syncrude. Such differences are likely attributable to a number of factors related to specific pond characteristics (both process-affected and freshwater) and the locations established for survey stations at the ponds, and deterrent placement relative to survey station location at process-affected ponds, among others.

Dabbling and diving ducks were nearly equally represented in the dataset (25% and 20% of observations, respectively), with 3% of observations being of ducks not identified to guild (Table 7.1). Waders (11%) and gulls (5%) comprise the remainder of the observations associated with target guilds. Non-target guild observations represent 30% of the total number of observations in the 2014 database.

After normalization for survey effort, observations at freshwater ponds (74 landed birds and 33 flyovers per survey, respectively) were higher than observed at process-affected ponds (23 landed birds and 29 flyovers per survey, respectively). It's likely that the magnitude of the difference between pond types would be larger with the removal of small process-affected pond data from the comparison, such that bird observations at freshwater compensation lakes were compared more directly to those obtained at the tailings ponds.

Of the 51,049 bird observations across all sites, 5,728 (11% of observations) were of birds of species of conservation concern (Table 7.3). Of the 2,130 observations of landed species of conservation concern, 1,896 (89.0%) were species in the target guilds. Within the 3,598 observations of flyover species of conservation concern, 350 (9.7%) were species in the target guilds. Bank Swallows (564 observations) and Barn Swallows (2,446 observations) together represented the majority (3,010 flyover observations, 83.7% of the total) of the species of conservation concern flyover observations in 2014. A focus on landed birds appropriately captures observations of species of concern at risk of oiling as a consequence of contact with process-affected ponds. Flyover data contain far fewer observations of species of concern.

Observation Type	Total	Target Guild			
Observation Type	Observations	Total	%		
Landed	2,130	1,896	89.0		
Flyover	3,598	350	9.7		
Totals	5,728	2,246	39.2		

## Table 7.3: Species of Conservation Concern Observationsduring Bird Surveys in 2014



#### 7.1.2 Relationship between Landed and Flyover Bird Survey Observations

Flyover data has been collected in the monitoring program assuming a relationship exists between the numbers of birds flying over ponds and the numbers of birds landed, that flyovers are an indicator of the probability of bird contact with process-affected ponds, that flyovers represent an indicator of oiling and/or mortality risk, or both. The 2014 data were examined to determine if such a relationship existed between the two data sets. Non-target birds were excluded from this analysis, and the target bird data were examined in two ways: 1) with all observations where zero birds were present included, and 2) with all observations where zero birds were present excluded. The data in each case were not normally distributed. Log-transformation did not improve the data distributions and a linear relationship could not be found between the datasets due to the presence of outliers. In many cases, birds were recorded as landed but there were no flyovers, or birds were recorded flying over but there were no birds landed.

In 2014, 16,311 of the season total of 18,565 (88%) landed bird observations on processaffected ponds were of target guild species, while target guild species comprised less than half of the flyover observations (42%; 9,818 of 23,334 flyover observations) on these same ponds (Table 7.1). Landed bird observations clearly focus on species most at risk of contact with bitumen on process-affected ponds, while flyover observations are dominated by non-target guild species; the relationship between numbers and species of landed and flyover birds is at best very weak. Thus, flyovers are not representative of migratory pressure or deterrent effectiveness. Furthermore, flyover data are typically more variable than landed bird observation data, given that the birds are moving and harder to identify and count, and that conditions and activities beyond the survey area may influence the numbers of observations of birds flying over.

A correlation analysis was not possible on these data due to violations of statistical assumptions for non-parametric analyses. A visual representation of the waterbird data, including zero birds present, on freshwater and process-water ponds is depicted in Figures 7.2 and 7.3, respectively. No relationships between landed and flyover observations are evident. A correlation analysis by guild is not possible, for the same reasons discussed above. Complex regression modelling would potentially determine if a relationship between flyover and landings exist. Other factors to be considered in such analyses should include detectability of birds with increasing distance, constraints of the survey area within which flyovers and landed birds are being recorded, habitats within the survey area, weather, deterrent operation immediately prior to and during the survey, consideration of the presence of summer resident birds, and perhaps others.

Prior to determining if such analyses are worth conducting, the value of the flyover data should be considered in the context of whether the data provides value in answering the question of how many birds are contacting process-water ponds. The assumption that a relationship exists may not be biologically reasonable. For example, geese are commonly recorded as flyovers in the dataset and dabbling ducks are more commonly recorded as landed, therefore an analyses of the number of target guild birds flying over the survey area (geese) is unlikely to be representative of the number of target guild birds landed on the pond (dabbling ducks).





Figure 7.2: Relationship between Flyover Observations and Landed Bird Observations, with all Zero Observations Included, on Process-affected Ponds (top panel) and Freshwater Ponds (bottom panel) in the 2014 Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program





Figure 7.3: Relationship between Flyover Observations and Landed Bird Observations, with all Zero Observations Excluded, on Process-affected Ponds (top panel) and Freshwater Ponds (bottom panel) in the 2014 Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program



A requirement, therefore, would be to conduct analyses of the relationship(s) between landed and flyover observations on a species-by-species basis. Furthermore, most birds migrate at night and the majority of landed birds observed are likely not part of the flocks observed flying over a pond during an observation period. Thus, the two observations may be independent of each other; landed birds are not consistently representative of flyovers and vice versa.

#### 7.1.3 Oiled Birds and Bird Mortalities

Reporting the total numbers of oiled birds and bird mortalities requires some method of standardization for search effort, by and across operators. However, a report of an incidental oiled or dead bird observation has no associated search effort, since it is a random event that occurs during other activities on site. Nevertheless, the observations of oiled and dead birds are important, whether detected during the standardized components of the program (bird survey, mortality search) or incidentally. While incidental observations are not pooled within the standardized database, evaluation of incidental bird oiling and mortality observations in the examination of the data OSBCMP contributes to meeting program objectives.

A total of 485 observations of live oiled birds were recorded during 2014 (Table 7.4), the majority of which (94%) were detected during the bird survey component of the program. The remainder (6%) was of oiled birds reported incidentally. These equate to approximately 3.1 observations of oiled birds per day of monitoring, 2.9 oiled bird observations per day arising from the bird survey component of the program (0.2 oiled bird observations per day were reported incidentally). There is no apparent correlation of the numbers of oiled birds reported with the numbers of landed bird observations during bird surveys.

Operator	Target Guilds						Non target		
	Dabbles	Dives	Unknown Duck	Wades	Gull	Total	Guilds	Total	
Oiled Bird Observations									
Canadian Natural	11	3	0	90	37	141	0	141	
Imperial	23	10	26	80	10	149	5	154	
Shell	13	7	2	84	0	106	0	106	
Suncor	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Syncrude	29	12	16	2	1	60	23	83	
Oiled Bird Totals	69	29	44	239	47	428	28	485	
Bird Mortalities									
Canadian Natural	4	20	2	0	5	31	0	31	
Imperial	19	6	3	2	10	40	4	44	
Shell	12	16	3	0	1	32	1	33	
Suncor	1	9	5	1	2	18	1	19	
Syncrude	16	19	5	2	2	44	1	45	
Total	52	70	18	5	20	165	7	172	

#### Table 7.4: Observations of Oiled Birds and Bird Mortalities during the Bird Surveys, Mortality Searches and as Incidental Observations in the 2014 Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program



A total of 172 bird mortalities were reported in April to October 2014 (Table 7.4), 13 (8%; 0.08 mortalities/day) from mortality searches and 159 (92%; 1.1 mortalities/day) from incidental observations. There is no apparent correlation of bird mortality numbers with the numbers of landed bird observations during bird surveys.

The very low number of bird mortalities observed during the mortality searches (13, or 8% of the total number of mortalities) relative to the significant level of effort allocated to this component of the program, indicates that the protocol should be revised to allocate appropriate effort to areas and times when mortalities are most likely to occur.

#### 7.2 Influence of Weather on Bird Contact, Oiling and Mortality Observations

The landing and subsequent oiling and mortality of birds in April 2008, October 2010, and most recently, in early November 2014, illustrate the effect that specific adverse weather conditions occurring during bird migration can have on the numbers of birds forced to land, and appearing on ponds in the oil sands region. The weather leading up to and during the mass landings in 2008 and 2010 shared some common attributes – precipitation, strong and variable winds, and dense cloud cover (St. Clair et al. 2011). Rapidly decreasing temperatures are also likely to play a role, as in the snow storm of April 2008, as this could cause freezing of precipitation on flight feathers, forcing the birds to land.

To evaluate the relationship between landed bird observations and weather variables, days during which a total of 250 or more birds of target guilds were observed landed on process-affected ponds were extracted from the database. This number represents target guild bird landings on 5% of the survey days, and 21% of the total number of target guild bird landings observed on process-affected ponds. Thus, a total of 250 observations of target guild bird landings on a single day across all sites is taken as a reasonable indicator of a possible landing event. The total number of landings on process-affected ponds is used instead of a mean number of landed birds per survey, since a large number of birds landing at one site (a possible mass landing at that site) might go unnoticed if few landed birds were observed at the other sites. Variability in the numbers of birds landing at each site during a landing event was apparent in the 2008 and 2010 landing events.

Total landed target guild observations of 250 or more on process-affected ponds on a day occurred nine times during the season (Figure 7.4), five in the spring, and four in the fall monitoring periods. There are no apparent, consistent combinations of maximum temperature, minimum temperature, the rate of increase or decrease in either maximum or minimum temperatures, and precipitation that correlate with total of 250 or more target guild bird landing observations.

In an attempt to determine the relative importance of meteorological factors that contribute to the requirement for birds to land, a preliminary statistical analysis was performed using SAS software 9.3 (SAS 2008. SAS/STAT® 9.3 User's Guide. SAS Institute Inc.). Bird landings were analyzed using generalized linear models (GENMOD procedure in SAS). Generalized linear models handle complex regression analyses and violations of assumptions of normality, independence, and equal variance more easily than general linear models.





Figure 7.4: Weather (Maximum and Minimum Temperatures, Precipitation) and Possible Bird Landing Events (≥250 Total Landed Bird Observations) on Process-affected Ponds during the 2014 Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program



Landing data for each day were log-transformed to achieve a near-normal distribution. The weather model contained daily values for maximum temperature (°C), minimum temperature (°C), change in maximum temperature (°C), change in minimum temperature (°C), total precipitation (mm), and maximum wind gust (km/hr) as fixed effects.

Maximum temperature ( $\chi^2$  = 9.70, *p* = 0.0018), minimum temperature ( $\chi^2$  = 5.05, *p* = 0.0246), and daily change in maximum temperature ( $\chi^2$  = 4.52, *p* = 0.0335) were significant predictors of bird landings. Daily change in minimum temperature, total precipitation and maximum wind gusts were not significant.

Other weather factors, such as atmospheric pressure, the presence of cloud cover, and groundlevel fog have been suggested as contributors to landing events. A statistical evaluation of the relative importance of weather components would be appropriate. However, the weather measured at ground level at a regional meteorological station such as that operated by Environment Canada cannot be truly representative of the conditions that migrating birds are encountering at the altitudes at which they fly. Meteorological observations collected during the bird surveys do not explain bird landings. About 67% of bird landings in 2014 were reported under calm or light wind conditions, 88% of bird landings occurred during no precipitation, and 97% were reported when visibility was clear.

### 7.3 Deterrent Systems

Each operator has implemented a comprehensive deterrent system, including passive (effigy) and numerous active systems. Active systems are operated either independently, such as cannons that fire at intervals, or are activated "on-demand", such as deterrents that activate upon receipt of a radio signal produced automatically by a computer-driven radar detection system. The specific technologies vary across the sites; details are presented in the individual operator sections.

To date, an examination of the effectiveness of individual deterrents, or the networks of deterrents at the sites, has not been possible. Data from the 2014 program do not address this gap, as none of the monitoring activities were constructed in a manner that would allow linkage of observation data to deterrent operations. A method of developing a linkage between deterrent systems and bird contact observations would advance the program toward meeting the fifth objective of the OSBCMP. This is an area for further discussion.

## 7.4 Relationship Between Bird Contact Numbers and Pond Size and Distance to Athabasca River

### 7.4.1 Bird Contact Numbers and Pond Size

There is no apparent relationship between the number of waterbirds landing within survey areas and the surface area of water of the pond, whether the pond contains process-affected water and has deterrents (Figure 7.5) or freshwater and no deterrents (Figure 7.6). This may not be surprising, given that there is no means to appropriately extrapolate observed numbers to estimate landed bird numbers over the entire surfaces of the ponds. In other words, the survey area defines the unit of sampling (not the pond area).







Figure 7.5: Relationship Between the Number of Landed Waterbirds Observed During Bird Surveys and Process-affected Pond Area Over Water in the 2014 Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program



Figure 7.6: Relationship Between the Number of Landed Waterbirds Observed During Bird Surveys and Freshwater Pond Area Over Water in the 2014 Oil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program



As estimates of bird contacts on ponds as a whole is an objective of the OSBCMP, a realignment of survey locations to ensure random or stratified random sampling of larger ponds is necessary for appropriate extrapolation. Alternatively, surveying the entire pond would be required.

### 7.4.2 Influence of the Athabasca River

Convergence of four migratory flyways in northeastern Alberta and the proximity of oil sands developments to the Peace-Athabasca Delta has led to the hypothesis that the Athabasca River may define migratory bird movement through the region (St. Clair et al. 2014). In previous OSBCMP reports, an assessment of the role that the river plays in migration pathways has been examined through evaluation of bird contact and flyover observations relative to the distance of the ponds from the river. The hypothesis is that, all else being equal, the Athabasca River defines a flyway or convergence of flyways, and that a greater number of landings and flyovers would be observed at ponds closer to the river than would be observed more distant from the river. No data on bird numbers, whether landed or flying over at varying altitudes, are available from the Athabasca River in the vicinity of the mines that would allow for an examination of the importance of this segment of the river in influencing waterbird numbers at the mine sites.

The numbers of bird observations and flyovers observed at ponds at different distances from the Athabasca River is presented in Figures 7.7 and 7.8 for process-affected and freshwater ponds, respectively. These pond types were separately evaluated, since a relationship might be more apparent on freshwater ponds, where deterrents are not deployed. A relationship between bird contact observations and pond size is not apparent for either pond type.

#### 7.4.3 Pond Characteristics

While the above analyses are intended to provide some insight into bird behaviour, and potentially help guide deterrent deployment strategies (i.e., more deterrents on ponds closer to the river, if warranted), the underlying assumption that all other factors are equal begs discussion. Of the other factors, pond and surrounding habitat features likely dominate the attractiveness of the ponds to birds. It is also worth challenging the assumptions that the migratory flyways in spring and fall are the same, are rigidly defined by the orientation and course of the river, and that the flyways are so narrow that a pond beside the river would be visible to a migrating bird, while ponds just a little farther away would not. In the context of bird flight abilities and the altitude at which birds migrate, it is likely that all ponds in the OSBCMP are visible to most migrating birds. An alternate hypothesis is that habitats on and around a pond will have a greater potential to attract birds than would any influence arising from the distance of that pond from the Athabasca River.

As a preliminary test of this hypothesis, the relationship between pond characteristics and the mean number of landed waterbirds per survey at process-affected ponds was tested using SAS Software 9.3 (SAS 2008. SAS/STAT® 9.3 User's Guide. SAS Institute Inc.), using the generalized linear models (GENMOD) procedure. Generalized linear models handle complex regression analyses and violations of assumptions of normality, independence, and equal variance more easily than general linear models.





Figure 7.7: Relationship Between Mean Number of Landed Waterbirds on Process-affected Ponds and the Distance of the Process-affected Ponds from the Athabasca River



Figure 7.8: Relationship Between Mean Number of Landed Waterbirds on Freshwater Ponds and the Distance of the Freshwater Ponds from the Athabasca River



GIS analyses were used to define habitat features, and the mean number of observed waterbird landings per survey was extracted for each pond from the 2014 dataset. Because data were not normally distributed, and a log-transformation of bird landing observations could not achieve a normal distribution, the data were examined and the distribution that best fit the data was used in the statistical model (a negative binomial distribution with log-link function). Survey areas on ponds with more than one survey station were considered to be individual samples (i.e., not averaged). The pond characteristics model contained distance to the Athabasca River (km), pond area (ha), pond perimeter (m), length of non-vegetated shoreline (m), length of vegetated shoreline (m), islands (ha), and emergent vegetation (ha) as fixed effects. None of the pond characteristics that are not currently measured in the monitoring program likely influence bird landings.

The statistical model could not be applied to the freshwater ponds, due to the limited number of freshwater ponds in the program and the absence of a data distribution amenable to statistical analysis.

#### 7.5 Inter-Observer Variation

Inter-observer variation (IOV) was quantitatively assessed at four sites during 2014. As directed for 2014, the observations conducted by the two observers during an IOV were concurrent but independent, with the observers separated from each other by a few metres, and using separate sets of monitoring equipment. Relative percent difference (RPD) values ranged from 0% (no difference between observers) to 200% (Table 7.5). A general trend of greater RPD with fewer bird numbers being present occurred across all sites. This is not unexpected, as a one-bird difference in the counts between observers when few birds were present represents a greater RPD than does a one bird difference between two counts of large bird numbers. Differences between two observers is not unexpected in ecological field programs, as an observer focused on one aspect of monitoring (i.e., identifying a bird using the spotting scope) is likely to not observe something occurring in a different aspect (a bird flying over), while a second observer engaged differently may see the flyover. Observers at the Imperial site used IOV surveys as collaborative training exercises. Quantitative observations between observers were not recorded, with the focus instead resting on identifying and reducing in-field differences through comparison and discussion.

Notwithstanding the constraints associated with the IOV procedure as applied in 2014, some useful observations arise. First, the variations among observers do not appear substantive, and since most of the data acquired during formal surveys is the product of the two observers working as a team, the variances in the data (counts, species identifications) arising from observer variability are acceptable. Second, some differences between two observers likely originated from an element of the IOV procedure or the logistical execution of it. Such differences could arise from separate positioning of the two observers resulting in differences in the field of vision, from use of differences in counts during an IOV is a critical component of evaluation observer variation, and addressing it through procedural modifications should be considered in the 2015 protocol.



Sito	Survey Station	Laı	nded	Flye	Flyover		
Sile	Survey Station	Birds	Species	Birds	Species		
CNRL	PMP1	-	-	0	0		
	PMP1	_	_	67	67		
	PMP2	0	0	0	0		
	PMP2	-	_	0	0		
	PMP2	120	0	21	40		
	PMP2	_	_	200	200		
	PMP3	9	0	0	0		
	PMP4	111	0	200	200		
	PMP4	_	_	0	0		
	PMP4	_	_	67	0		
	PMP4	0	0	67	67		
	PMP4	200	200	_	_		
	PMP5	0	0	0	0		
	PMP5	40	0	167	120		
	PMP5	200	200	38	29		
	TMP1	200	86	200	200		
	TMP1	11	18	200	200		
Shell		0	0				
Shell	Innit 2	0	0	0	0		
		0	0	0	0		
	<u> </u>	25	50	200	200		
		25	50	200	200		
		0	0	200	200		
		0	0	0	0		
Supeer		0	0	0	0		
Suncor	Pollu23_2	_		0	0		
	Ponub_2	_	-	0	0		
		_	-	200	200		
	Pond6_1A	-	_	200	200		
	Pond7_1	-	-	0	0		
	Pond8B_1	12	67	-	-		
	Pond23_2	-	-	0	0		
	Pond6_1	-	-	200	200		
	Pond7_1	14	0	-	-		
	Pond6_1	-	-	67	0		
	Pond7_1	-	-	0	0		
	Pond8B_2	-	-	200	200		
	Pond23_1	-	-	0	0		
Syncrude	EFF	0	0	200	200		
	EIP	0	0	200	200		
	MLSB2	0	0	200	200		
	SWIP1	0	0	200	200		
	SWIP2	0	0	200	200		
	WIP1	0	0	200	200		
	WIP1	0	0	200	200		
	WIP2	0	0	200	200		
	WIP2	0	0	200	200		
	WIP3	0	0	200	200		
	WIP3	0	0	200	200		
	WIP3	0	0	200	200		
	WIP3	0	0	200	200		

## Table 7.5: Inter-Observer Variation (Relative Percent Difference) in theOil Sands Bird Contact Monitoring Program in 2014\*

Notes:

Relative Percent Differences were derived at four sites, with the fifth using the IOV procedure to reduce

variability among monitoring personnel at that site, the intended outcome of the procedure

– = No birds were observed by either observer.



#### 7.6 Freshwater Ponds

Freshwater ponds are included in the OSBCMP to provide data against which observations at process-affected ponds can be compared. This comparison is primarily intended to yield information on the effectiveness of deterrents, as ponds with deterrents would be expected to attract fewer birds than ponds without. Freshwater ponds without deterrents, in proximity to process-affected ponds with deterrents, might be expected to have even higher numbers, as birds are pushed from the process ponds to freshwater ponds nearby. Making these comparisons requires that process-affected and freshwater ponds be monitored in the same way, that differential effort be normalized either in the field or mathematically, and that the temporal distribution of effort be similar between the pond types. While the technique of monitoring is the same for both ponds, the effort allocation to freshwater ponds (10-minute surveys, twice per week) is less than that allocated to small process-affected ponds (10-minute surveys, one or six times per week, depending on the pond) and substantially less than to larger process-affected ponds (more than one survey location, 30-minute surveys, six times per week).

### 7.7 Recommendations for Protocol Revision

The review and data analyses presented above lead to recommendations for improvement of the protocol. Several recommendations were presented in the above sections, following discussion of elements of the program, and these are included in the items below.

### 7.7.1 Bird Survey Sampling Unit

The selection of survey locations is based strongly on logistical factors – predominantly crew safety and location accessibility. Consequently, survey stations are established where they can be, with lesser consideration of the representativeness of the area surveyed in the context of the larger pond. Survey areas comprise different habitat types and qualities, and this varies substantially among survey areas within and among operator sites. These restrictions raise the fundamental question of statistical representativeness of the survey locations and areas. Without a network of survey stations that are statistically representative of the ponds at which these stations are meant to sample, it is inappropriate to extrapolate the observed landed bird numbers (and bird oilings and mortalities) to the larger pond surface. Establishment of more survey stations at accessible locations on larger ponds will not itself improve representative sampling, unless each station properly and within an acceptable statistical framework contributes to a representation of the larger pond surface. These barriers essentially negate the ability to achieve the first and second objectives of the OSBCMP, and significant amendments to the OSBCMP protocol are required to address this monitoring design deficiency.

### 7.7.2 Habitat Unit Definitions

There is a very high level of variability among survey stations and in the habitats present within the survey areas. Definitions used to date to define habitat features on which landed birds are observed during surveys have not precisely delineated the habitat to the degree necessary to correlate with observations of landed bird numbers and mortalities. A consideration for improvement of the OSBCMP protocol will be to develop a set of standard habitat definitions



and identify these within each survey area as viewed from each survey station, consistently across all sites. This would allow for a greater ability to correlate observations of bird numbers and species with habitats present in the survey areas.

While this will make the data more consistent within and across sites, it is unlikely to address the issue of non-representative sampling. However, better definition of bird-habitat associations at the mine sites may be beneficial in advising on adjustment of deterrent placements, habitat management, and/or hazing priorities.

#### 7.7.3 Mortality Search Procedure

Mortality searches yielded the recovery of 13 dead or euthanized birds. Search effort was reported in number of hours spent searching, and variously reported in distance searched and/or area searched. Spatial effort cannot be integrated into a single effort metric, however, the effort expended across the five sites on mortality searches was substantial: 1,714 km, 9,688 ha and 114 hours. The few dead birds found during these formal searches may be the result of: 1) few birds dying; 2) the residence time of a dead bird on the pond surface is less than the interval between searches (two weeks); and/or 3) the methods used are not able to identify dead birds.

Landed waterbirds observed at process-affected ponds during the bird surveys totalled 16,311, while there were 165 observations of dead birds on and around these ponds. These data, together with the few birds (13) found dead during the intensive mortality searches, indicate that relatively few birds die upon contact with bitumen on process-affected ponds.

This conclusion is supported by an evaluation of the intensive mortality search program conducted by Syncrude in 2013, which sought to address the questions of detectability, loss of dead birds (e.g., sinking) and total numbers of mortalities at process-affected ponds. The outcome of this intensive effort is presented in Table 7.6. During 373 searches, totalling 305.5 hours of search time, only three oiled or dead birds were observed (all in the spring), two on the AIP pond (one observed by each of the boat and truck methods), and the third by boat on the SWSS pond. In the spring, approximately three searches were conducted per day, an average interval between searches of about two days (all methods, all ponds). In the fall, an average of just over one survey was conducted per day, with an interval (all methods, all ponds) of approaching nine days between surveys. The results of the mortality search protocol applied from 2011 to 2014, as supplemented by Syncrude, has provided an indication that birds are dying on process-affected ponds at very low rates.

The observation of very few oiled/dead birds during formal mortality searches and the higher number of incidental observations of oiled/dead birds relative to the numbers observed during mortality search efforts, strongly indicate that a revision to the mortality search component of the protocol is warranted. This revision would address two aspects of the findings to-date: 1) the reduction of incidental observations of oiled and dead birds; and 2) a redistribution of effort from routine searches to a focus of effort in areas known or expected to cause bird oiling/death. Increasing the ability to associate mortality observations with search effort would allow an estimate of bird mortalities with confidence intervals at each mine site.



Syncrude Pond	Effort	Spring			Fall		Tetel
		Boat	Truck	Foot	Boat	Truck	lotai
Aurora Settling Basin	No.	7	13	7	12		39
	hh:mm	11:50	10:35	1:40	4:54		28:59
Aurora In-Pit	No.	8	9	8	11	2	38
	hh:mm	14:00	6:30	3:25	4:25	0:32	28:52
Aurora In-Pit North	No.	3	15	12	3	8	41
	hh:mm	2:30	9:15	3:20	0:38	2:12	17:55
Aurora North Desugla Mater	No.		12	8		11	31
Aurora North Recycle Water	hh:mm		3:05	0:55		2:21	6:21
Mildred Lake Effluent	No.		9	5		9	23
Mildred Lake Enluent	hh:mm		2:45	0:30	1:50		5:05
	No.		9	7	11		27
East In-Pit	hh:mm		11:55	5:05	2:42		19:42
Mildred Lake Cattling Desig	No.	6	10	3	12		31
Mildred Lake Settling Basin	hh:mm	20:00	25:30	2:30	4:13		52:13
Decycle Water	No.		12	10		8	30
Recycle Waler	hh:mm		4:36	2:15		2:13	9:04
Couth woot in Dit	No.	4	11	8	12		35
South-west In-Pit	hh:mm	9:30	12:05	3:40	5:16		30:31
Couth west Canda	No.	3	10	7	20		40
South-west Sands	hh:mm	6:30	25:49	7:55	12:26		52:40
	No.	4	12	8	14		38
vvest m-Pit	hh:mm	10:00	30:10	4:50	9:09		54:09
	No.	35	122	83	95	38	
Tatala	hh:mm	74:20	142:15	36:05	43:43	9:08	
iotais	No.		240			133	
	hh:mm	252:40			52	351:31	

## Table 7.6: Effort and Oiled/Dead Bird Observations in Syncrude's 2013Enhanced Mortality Search Program\*

#### Note:

\* Each highlighted cell (pink shading) indicates that a total of one bird was found during searches on the pond in the indicated season, by the indicated method.



#### 7.7.4 Effort Allocation to Freshwater Pond Observations

The inclusion of freshwater ponds in the program was intended to provide data on the activity of birds in the area, providing an indication of the numbers of birds available to land on process-affected ponds. Comparisons of landed bird observations between process-affected and freshwater ponds might also provide an indication of the effectiveness of deterrents.

However, comparison of data collected during 30-minute surveys, six times per week, from multiple survey stations on a large process-affected pond to data collected during 10-minute surveys twice per week from a single survey station on a freshwater pond has substantial limitations. Peaks in bird activity (landings, flyovers) occurring between surveys at freshwater pond could elevate the numbers of birds observed at process-affected ponds relative to those at freshwater ponds.

The OSBCMP data analysed to date clearly show that bird landings on the freshwater ponds at each operator site are higher than those observed at process-affected ponds. Landing data from freshwater ponds illustrate the effects of the presence of suitable habitat, the absence of deterrents, and the isolation from industrial and human activity. Continued monitoring of these ponds will not change this understanding. Objective 2 of the OSBCMP has been achieved; therefore, termination of monitoring at freshwater ponds may be appropriate in the revisions in the 2015 Protocol.

#### 7.7.5 Weather Data

Landing events appear to be driven by a combination of specific weather conditions and bird migration behaviours (e.g., night migration), and factors at the site level may be involved. Understanding the relative importance of individual components of weather (temperature, wind, humidity, precipitation, barometric pressure, etc.) will require at a minimum the collection and analysis of weather data obtained in the vicinity of the site(s) at which landing event(s) occur.

#### 7.7.6 Inter-observer Variability

In the absence of knowledge, or an ability to acquire the knowledge, of the true number of birds within the survey area (and flying over), calculation of inter-observer variability is compromised. The significant benefit from the procedure used in 2014 is the ability to evaluate the observation data immediately following an IOV observation session. This evaluation can be immediately beneficial, as observers calibrate their monitoring methods among themselves, leading to a more consistent application of the protocol requirements.

For this reason, retention of an IOV procedure is considered appropriate in the 2015 protocol, however, it will be focussed on the identification of factors at a site that contribute to variability among observers and on development of methods to address the effects of these factors. Without an ability to know the true number of birds in a survey area, the calculated values for inter-observer variability do not contribute to addressing the variability, nor can the variability estimate be used to improve the ability to extrapolate observed bird numbers beyond the survey area. Other mechanisms (e.g., training programs) may be more valuable in reducing intra-site and inter-site variability.



### 7.7.7 Data Management

The OSBCMP is data-intensive, with crews at each of the five sites collecting and transmitting data on a daily basis through the monitoring season. At intervals through the season data are extracted from the database and returned to field personnel for QA/QC, correcting errors and clarifying data entries. A QA/QC process also occurs at the end of the season, in which the entire dataset for a site is checked, again returning it to the field crews to address questions of consistency and potential error. This is an onerous task on all parties, and the time required to complete data verification delays the start of data analyses, compressing the time needed to analyse, interpret and report key data.

Collection, verification and reporting of data on non-target guilds, primarily flyovers of terrestrial species, consumes a significant amount of time, while not contributing to the overall program objectives of defining and reducing waterbird contact with process-affected and the mortalities that occur on these ponds. The reporting of over 3,000 observations on Bank and Barn swallows as flyovers during the bird surveys illustrates this point; these observations do not provide any information or guidance to site operators that would improve deterrent deployment or other site management actions targeting reduced contacts and mortalities.

With four years of OSBCMP operation and experience, it is timely to review the data that are collected at each survey station, and validate their continued collection or remove them from the program. Meteorological observations are easily obtained in the field, however, the processing of these data and the inability to correlate these data with bird landings, represent a significant time investment. Reducing data collection to those items of importance in understanding the reasons for bird contacts, oilings and mortalities would lead to significant efficiencies in the program overall.

Once refined to focus on the data required to support achievement of program objectives, efforts to develop and implement real-time QA/QC procedures would be appropriate. Crews would be able to collect, review and correct their data in a single day, improving both the quality and efficiency of the QA/QC process.

### 7.7.8 Hypothesis-driven Monitoring

The current protocol states five objectives, and defines a suite of data elements to be collected that are expected to address these objectives. However, the links between the objectives and these data elements are not precisely defined, resulting in attempts each year to analyse the data in various ways to garner kernels of information that hopefully, when all analyses are complete, allow a conclusion to be drawn that addresses one or more of the objectives. This approach is labour-intensive, and to-date, has not provided an understanding of the larger picture as articulated by program objectives. Nevertheless, a substantial amount has been learned about bird numbers interacting with ponds on mine sites, challenges in the execution of a bird contact/mortality monitoring program defined, and findings to-date are critical in setting the stage for improving the program.



A refinement of the OSBCMP protocol to guide monitoring based on an explicit hypothesisdriven approach is recommended. The data collected to-date suggest that less than 1% of birds that land on process-water will die as a consequence of contact with bitumen. However, this number cannot be validated using the current monitoring approach. The following hypotheses (null, alternate) encompassing each of the bird contact and mortality components of the program are proposed as the basis of a revision to the OSBCMP protocol:

- Null Hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>): The number of bird mortalities that occur on oil sands process-water ponds is less than 1% of the number of birds that land on these ponds.
- Alternate Hypothesis (H<sub>A</sub>): More bird mortalities are occurring on oil sands processwater ponds than are currently reported.

From these hypotheses, two questions can be derived, and the data necessary (and only those data) to analyse each question collected. These questions are:

- 1. <u>What is the number of birds that land on process-water ponds?</u> The current monitoring approach does not include representative sampling of process-water ponds and therefore, extrapolation to a number of birds that land on these ponds is not possible.
- 2. <u>What is the number of bird mortalities that occur on process-water ponds?</u> The majority of bird mortalities are found incidentally, which does not allow for a calculation of total number of bird mortalities or estimation of mortality numbers based on survey effort.

The ultimate objectives from the OSBCMP are to reduce the number of birds that land on process-water ponds and have zero bird mortalities. The purpose of the waterfowl monitoring program is to inform on-site industry managers to achieve this objective. However, a number of additional questions remain that prevent the program from meeting its objectives, and in particular providing direction on adaptive management for bird deterrent programs.

- Why are birds landing on process-water ponds?
- How do we prevent birds from landing on process-water ponds?
- What is the fate of oiled, live birds?

From these questions, the data requirements can be defined and revisions made to the monitoring protocol. Such revisions would focus on improving the detectability of landed birds, oiled-live birds, and bird mortalities, and improve the statistical means to estimate these numbers across a pond. Companion research studies would determine the effectiveness of deterrents and inform the management of bird attractants.

### 7.8 Conclusions

The number of landed bird observations in 2014 (24,858 in total, 18,565 at process-affected ponds) is similar to the number of observed in 2013 (23,602 in total, 18,161 at process-affected ponds) (St. Clair et al. 2014). The protocol for recording bird contacts was relatively similar in 2013 and 2014, and although there were changes in pond numbers and other measures of



effort between years, in the context of the overall program this consistency in numbers is sufficient to conclude that regionally, bird numbers as expressed in observed contacts remained relatively constant.

The number of observed flyovers in 2014 (26,191 in total, 23,334 at process-affected ponds) was lower than observed in 2013 (32,452 in total, 26,489 at process-affected ponds). However, the composition of landed birds in 2014 (88% from target guilds) substantially differed from that of flyover birds (42% target guilds), suggesting that there is little relationship between birds landed within the survey areas and those flying over.

In 2013, 157 mortalities were reported relative to 18,161 bird contacts on process-affected ponds. In 2014, 172 mortalities were reported relative to 18,565 bird contacts on process-affected ponds. The mortality numbers are low relative to the numbers of birds present, and appear consistent between years.

The relative contribution of attractive habitats on ponds, pond distance from the Athabasca River, and components of weather (temperature, precipitation, wind) were examined statistically, and some elements of weather (temperature) were found to correlate with observed bird contacts. However, limitations in the design of the monitoring program reduced the ability to comprehensively assess the role of habitat, weather, and other factors on bird contacts.

The landing event in November 2014 adds credence to the hypothesis that birds are not landing on process or freshwater ponds at constant, high rates, nor are birds being oiled at high rates. It appears to be a specific combination of migratory behaviour and weather events that result in these landing events.

An hypothesis driven approach is recommended as the basis of a review and revision of the protocol, improving its ability to direct data collection and analysis in a manner that better applies monitoring resources to addressing program objectives and the needs of government and industry participants.

#### 7.9 Documents Cited

- St. Clair C.C., Habib T., Shore B. (2011) Spatial and Temporal Correlates of Mass Bird Mortality in Oil Sands Tailings Ponds. Prepared for Alberta Environment. Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada T6G 2E9. 61 pp.
- St. Clair C.C., Loots S., Ronconi R.A. (2014) Final Report of the Research on Avian Protection Project (2010–2014). Research on Avian Protection Project, Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton; Prepared for Alberta Justice; 95 p.

