

Artificial light may change flight patterns of bats near bridges along urban waterways

Kévin Barré, Kamiel Spoelstra, Yves Bas, Samuel Challéat, Ros Kiri Ing, Clémentine Azam, Georges Zissis, Dany Lapostolle, Christian Kerbiriou, Isabelle Le Viol

▶ To cite this version:

Kévin Barré, Kamiel Spoelstra, Yves Bas, Samuel Challéat, Ros Kiri Ing, et al.. Artificial light may change flight patterns of bats near bridges along urban waterways. Animal Conservation, 2021, 24 (2), pp.259-267. 10.1111/acv.12635 . hal-02914600

HAL Id: hal-02914600 https://hal.science/hal-02914600

Submitted on 12 Aug 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1

Artificial light may change flight patterns of bats near bridges

2 along urban waterways

3

4 Kévin Barré^{1, 2}, Kamiel Spoelstra³, Yves Bas^{1,4}, Samuel Challéat⁵, Ros Kiri Ing⁶, Clémentine

5 Azam⁷, Georges Zissis⁸, Dany Lapostolle⁹, Christian Kerbiriou^{1, 2*}, Isabelle Le Viol^{1,2*}

6

7 ¹ Centre d'Ecologie et des Sciences de la Conservation (CESCO), Muséum national d'Histoire

- 8 naturelle, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Sorbonne Université, CP 135, 57 rue
- 9 Cuvier, 75005 Paris, France
- ² Centre d'Ecologie et des Sciences de la Conservation (CESCO), Muséum national d'Histoire
- 11 naturelle, Station de Biologie Marine, 1 place de la Croix, 29900 Concarneau, France
- ³ Department of Animal Ecology, Netherlands Institute of Ecology (NIOO-KNAW), PO Box
- 13 50, 6700 AB Wageningen, The Netherlands
- ⁴ Centre d'Ecologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive, UMR 5175, CNRS, 1919 route de Mende,
- 15 34293 Montpellier, France
- ⁵ Géographie de l'Environnement (GÉODE), UMR 5602, CNRS, Université Toulouse 2 -
- 17 Jean Jaurès, 31058 Toulouse Cedex 9, France
- ⁶ Institut Langevin, UMR 7587 CNRS, Université Paris Diderot (Paris 7), 1 rue Jussieu,
- 19 75238 Paris, France
- ⁷ Union Internationale pour la Conservation de la Nature, Musée de l'Homme, 17 Place du
- 21 Trocadéro, 75016 Paris, France
- ⁸ Université Toulouse 3, LAPLACE, UMR-5213 CNRS-INPT-UT3, 31062 Toulouse, France
- ⁹ Théoriser et Modéliser pour Aménager (ThéMA), UMR 6049, CNRS, Université Bourgogne
- 24 Franche-Comté, 32 rue Mégevand, 25030 Besançon, France
- 25 * These authors share joint last authorship on this work.

- 26 Corresponding author:
- 27 Kévin Barré
- 28 kevin.barre@edu.mnhn.fr
- 29 +33 2 98 50 99 28
- 30
- 31 Running head: Waterway lighting changes bat flight patterns

33 Abstract

Artificial light at night (ALAN) is considered as a major threat to biodiversity, especially to 34 nocturnal species, as it reduces availability, quality and functionality of habitats. However, its 35 effects on the way species use landscape elements such as rivers are still largely understudied, 36 especially the effect of crossing infrastructure lighting on bridges. These elements are 37 nevertheless key commuting and foraging habitats in heavily urbanised landscapes for several 38 39 taxa such as bats that are particularly affected by ALAN. We studied the effects of the illumination of facades and undersides of bridges on the relative abundance of pipistrelle bats, 40 on their 3D distribution and their behavioural response (i.e. flight speed) close to bridges. We 41 42 set-up an innovative approach based on a microphone-array to reconstruct positions and flight trajectories in 3D. We studied the effect of lighting on bats in the close proximity of six 43 similar bridges, mostly differentiated by the presence or absence of lighting (3 lit and 3 unlit). 44 45 All bridges cross the same waterway, within a uniformly and highly urbanized agglomeration (Toulouse, France). We found that bat activity was 1.7 times lower in lit sites. Bats tended to 46 keep a larger distance, and to fly faster close to illuminated bridges. These results suggest that 47 bridge lighting strongly reduces habitat availability and likely connectivity for bats. In that 48 case, results call for switching off the illumination of such bridges crossing riverine 49 50 ecosystems to preserve their functionality as habitats and corridors for bats.

51

52 Key words: acoustic localisation, artificial light, Chiroptera, ecological corridor, flight
53 behaviour, light pollution, microphone array, river

55 **1. Introduction**

Among the most prevalent sources of change in biodiversity state, Artificial Light At Night
(ALAN) is increasingly recognized as a new threat (Koen et al., 2018). ALAN impacts a wide
range of taxa, from individual physiological response to ecosystem functioning, interactions
between species and regulatory processes (Bennie et al., 2018; Hölker et al., 2010; Knop et
al., 2017; Salinas-Ramos et al., 2020) at many spatiotemporal scales (Altermatt and Ebert,
2016; Gaston et al., 2017).

ALAN particularly affects nocturnal species such as bats. ALAN affects the availability, 62 quality and functionality of habitats for bats, by changing environmental conditions in which 63 64 bats interact with other taxa at different spatial scales: their prey, their predators, and likely 65 their competitors (Cravens et al., 2017; Jones and Rydell, 1994; Minnaar et al., 2015; Russo et al., 2019). First of all, it affects the abundance and the distribution of their prey, i) by 66 67 massively attracting insects around light sources at the streetlight scale ii) and by inducing a suspected vacuum cleaner effect in the surrounding dark areas (Eisenbeis, 2006; Perkin et al., 68 2014). ALAN also induces mortality and changes in community composition of insects 69 (Davies et al., 2012) in such a way that ALAN is suggested to be a major driver of large scale 70 71 decline in insects' populations (Fox, 2013; Frank, 1988) and consequently in bat prey 72 availability. By illuminating the scene, ALAN is also suggested to increase predation risk of bats by owls and other raptors (Jones and Rydell, 1994), and in turn bats increase their flight 73 speed (Polak et al., 2011). Bat species respond differently to these changes in interactions 74 75 with other taxa according to their flight type. Slow-flying species adapted to forage on insects in cluttered vegetation, such as Myotis spp., Plecotus spp. and Rhinolophus spp. avoid lit areas 76 77 (Clémentine Azam et al., 2015; Zeale et al., 2018), while fast-flying species adapted to hunt insects in open space, such as Pipistrellus spp., may appear to benefit locally from the 78 aggregated prey resources around streetlight (Clémentine Azam et al., 2015; Rydell, 1992), 79

although at a wider scale, ALAN negatively impacts their relative abundance (Azam et al.,
2016; Pauwels et al., 2019).

By reducing habitat availability and quality, ALAN was also suggested to decrease the 82 functional connectivity of landscapes for bats (Laforge et al., 2019) and can have dramatic 83 impacts on their relative abundance at a larger scale (Azam et al., 2016; Pauwels et al., 2019). 84 Linear landscape elements such as hedgerows and rivers play an essential role for bats 85 commuting between roosts and foraging patches (Akasaka et al., 2012; Lacoeuilhe et al., 86 2016; Pinaud et al., 2018; Smith and Racey, 2008). Such landscape elements also provide 87 dark corridors in dimly lighted situations (full moon or distant lighting) (Ancillotto et al., 88 89 2019; Zeale et al., 2018) and are specifically important in illuminated urban landscape. 90 ALAN is nevertheless worldwide increasing, in particular close to protected areas and biodiversity hotspots (Guetté et al., 2018), for security, use or aesthetic reasons. This lighting 91 92 hinders bats when crossing gaps in wooded linear corridors (Hale et al., 2015) and reduces the number of bat commuting along hedgerows (Zeale et al., 2018). Among linear landscape 93 elements, riverine ecosystems are key habitats for bats. Their riparian vegetation and water 94 surface are important foraging areas for many bat species and are recognized as determinants 95 96 to explain bat abundance across the landscape (Carrasco-Rueda and Loiselle, 2019; Downs 97 and Racey, 2006; Grindal et al., 1999; Lloyd et al., 2006; Lookingbill et al., 2010; Sirami et al., 2013). In highly urbanized areas rivers or waterways and their associated riparian 98 vegetation are often the only corridors still relatively dark, and are thus of high importance for 99 100 bat moving through such illuminated landscapes (Laforge et al., 2019; Lintott et al., 2015; Todd and Williamson, 2019). However, ecological consequences of the illumination of rivers 101 102 remain largely understudied (Jechow and Hölker, 2019). Only one study to our knowledge investigated the effect of ALAN on commuting bats by recording Daubenton's bats (Myotis 103 daubentonii) passing through culverts. In this study the bat activity was found to be 104

unaffected by the presence of light (Spoelstra et al., 2018). However, another study showed 105 106 that most bat species, including *Myotis* species, significantly reduced their number of drinking and activity above water in presence of artificial light (Russo et al., 2019, 2018, 2017). 107 However, studying bats using such activity metrics from acoustic recordings does not inform 108 on all behavioural changes (e.g. flight speed, spatial position). The development of 109 microphone arrays allows high-resolution localization of bats using their echolocation calls, 110 111 and hence tracking the animal's movement (Koblitz, 2018). Precise tracking of bats appears as an innovative and a promising method for assessing poorly studied impacts of light on 112 flight behaviour, such as flight speed and changes in flight path. 113 114 Here, we aim to assess how the illumination of bridges over waterways affects bat activity 115 and their flight behaviour along riverine ecosystems. We studied six bridges above a waterway in a highly urbanized area to assess the impact of facade and underbridge lighting 116 117 on bats. In addition to activity measurements, we used a microphone-array to record bat positions to construct 3D bat flight trajectories in order to calculate flight speeds. When 118 approaching a lighted structure across a riverine ecosystem, we hypothesize that bats have to 119 deal with a trade-off that includes the benefits of foraging and commuting along this corridor, 120 121 and the drawback of increased predation risk by exposure to light. In the case of bats limit the 122 risk of exposure to light (Jones and Rydell, 1994; Russo et al., 2018), we predict a decrease in passing bats through light cone and in approaches of individuals to lit bridges. Light sources 123 at riverine ecosystems could therefore form a barrier for moving along it (Hale et al., 2015). 124 125 In case bats do fly through light cone, they possibly try to minimize the risk of predation by increasing their flight speed (Polak et al., 2011). 126 127

128 2. Material and methods

129 *Study sites*

We carried out the study on three lit and three unlit bridges. These six bridges were across 130 two branches of a waterway with a comparable width (around 30 m) and stagnant water (i.e. 131 low current), at the centre of a highly urbanized area (in the city of Toulouse, France, N 43.60 132 E 1.43; Fig. S1). Among bridges studied, four were road bridges (two lit and two unlit) and 133 134 two were footbridges (one lit and one unlit). Bridges were chosen such that these were comparable in shape (height and width; Table 1 & Fig. S1) and surrounding vegetation (Fig. 135 S1). The lit bridges have been illuminated for many years, with all-year lighting of the facade 136 137 and underside from the sunset until 1:00 a.m., while unlit bridges had no illumination at all (Fig. S1). Since all the sites were located in very dense urban areas, we assumed that 138 background light from the surrounding city was comparable for all sites. Lit sites were on 139 average exposed to twice as much light than unlit sites: respectively 7.4 ± 1.4 lux for lit sites 140 and 3.6 ± 1.6 lux for unlit sites (Table 1; see Supporting information S1 for details about light 141 142 measurements).

143

144 Sampling design and 3D acoustic tracking

We studied the effect of bridge-illumination on bat activity, bat-bridge distance and associated
flight speed, through comparisons between lit and unlit sites. We therefore recorded and
localized bats in three dimensions on the three first hours starting from sunset during 6
consecutive nights between the 19th and 25th of June 2018 (Koblitz, 2018). Weather
conditions were highly stable and optimal throughout this sampling period (average
temperature: 24.5±1.5 °C, average wind:3.3±1.1 m/s, no rain and no cloud; Table S1).
Between consecutive nights, we alternated each night sampling near lit and unlit bridges.

152	To sample bats, we used an acoustic localisation system (hereafter named microphone array)
153	designed at the Institut Langevin by Ros Kiri Ing (see Supporting Information S2 for more
154	details about the system) (Ing et al., 2016), with a detection radius of about 20 m. Arrays
155	were placed as close as possible to the bridge where the nature of the ground allowed to install
156	the microphone array (i.e. 16.2, 11.7 and 10.5 m from lit bridges, and 10.5, 8.5 and 6 m from
157	unlit bridges). Consequently, the microphone array was placed at the same distance from
158	bridges for only one pair of lit/unlit bridges (i.e. 10.5 m), We accounted for these differences
159	in array-bridge distances in statistical analysis (see statistical analysis section).
160	Each position of bats was reconstructed in 3D using time differences of arrival (TDOA)
161	(Koblitz, 2018) of one echolocation call following the Ing et al. (2016) approach. While
162	relatively seldom used for bat studies, this innovative approach of acoustic localisation has
163	already proven its worth (Götze et al., 2020; Ing et al., 2016; Koblitz, 2018; Polak et al.,
164	2011). We chose to discard positions with a cumulated imprecision greater than one meter on
165	the three dimensions (i.e. the sum of the imprecision on each dimension). Spatial location of
166	bats around the microphone array then allowed the computation of the distance of each
167	emitted bat call to the bridge (see Supporting information S3 for more details on calculation).
168	We then computed flight speed (Equation 1) as follows:

169
$$V_i = \frac{\sqrt{(x_i - x_j)^2 + (y_i - y_j)^2 + (z_i - z_j)^2}}{t_i - t_j}$$
(Eq. 1)

where x, y and z represent distances to the microphone array for each of the three-dimension axis, and t is the time of call arrival to the microphone array of a given position i and its previous position j (see Supporting information S3 for more details).

Although the number of sampled sites was low due to technical constraints, the method usingmicrophone arrays allowed to measure a high number of positions with high precisions.

176 Assigning species to 3D positions and quantification of the number of passing bats

177 The microphone arrays continuously recorded the echolocation calls of passing bats which were stored in sound files (Ing et al., 2016). These files were divided in five-second files, a 178 sufficient interval for the average duration of a bat pass (Kerbiriou et al., 2019). Hereafter, a 179 bat pass was thus defined as a single or several echolocation calls within a five-second 180 interval. Only 0.6% of 5-second recordings contained more than one individual. Each five-181 182 second file was classified to the closest taxonomic level using Tadarida software (Bas et al., 2017). We also visually inspected sound files for feeding buzzes during each bat pass, i.e. 183 rapid sequences of short linear calls before the prey capture. 184 185 Because the identification at the species level can be problematic, we limited identification 186 level to the species group. We limited further analysis to the *Pipistrellus* group, which includes Pipistrellus kuhlii, Pipistrellus pipistrellus, Pipistrellus pygmaeus, and Pipistrellus 187 nathusii. The other bat species groups were absent or showed only a couple of passes 188 preventing any analyses. We subsequently linked the 3D bat position calculated for each call 189 to the species group assigned to it by Tadarida. See Supporting information S4 and R script 190

191 for more details about automated identification and assigning species to 3D positions.

192

193 *Statistical analysis*

194 We first compared bat activity between lit and unlit sites, using the number of bat passes

instead of the number of bat positions, because increasing flight speed reduces the number

and the precision of positions (Table 1).

197 To test for potential difference of bat-bridge distances between unlit and lit bridge sites, we
198 built a Linear Mixed Model (LMM, R package *TMB*) using the bat-bridge distance as the
199 response variable following a Gaussian error distribution (Fig. 1), and the lighting treatment
200 (i.e. lit or unlit bridge), the array-bridge distance, the square of the array-bridge distance, and

the interaction between both array-bridge distance variables and the lighting treatment as
fixed explanatory variables. We used the array-bridge distance as a covariate because lit sites
were sampled on average slightly closer to bridges than unlit sites due to field constraints
(Table 1; Fig. S2). We included the site as a random effect in models to account for the
spatial-temporal structure of the sampling design of recordings (i.e. several recordings per
site, one site sampled per night)

207 We then tested whether flight speed changed according to the distance to light. We performed LMM using the flight speed as the response variable associated with a Gaussian error 208 209 distribution (Fig. S3), the lighting treatment (i.e. lit or unlit bridge), the array-bridge distance, 210 the bat-bridge distance (i.e. for every position for which a flight speed was computed), the square of the bat-bridge distance as fixed explanatory variables. The square of the bat-bridge 211 distance was included as explanatory variable after visual inspection of their non-linear nature 212 213 in a Generalized Additive Mixed Model using the *gamm* function (R package *mgcv*). As flight speed is expected to vary with lighting (Polak et al., 2011), we also included two interaction 214 terms between the bat-bridge distance, respectively the square of the bat-bridge distance, and 215 the lighting treatment (i.e. lit or unlit bridge). Since flight speed was computed for positions 216 217 which were part of bat individual trajectories composed of several positions (see Supporting 218 Information S2 for trajectory reconstruction), we accounted for this individual nesting by adding a random effect on the trajectory identity. We also included the site as a second 219 random effect. Given that imprecisions of positions were positively correlated with their 220 221 distance to the microphone array and the flight speed (Pearson correlation tests: t=18.5, df=2185, p-value < 0.001 and t=17.2, df=1349, p-value < 0.001, respectively), we gave to the 222 response variable different weights according to their associated precision by adding a weight 223 term in LMMs (i.e. one per imprecision squared; Penone et al., 2013). We then selected for 224 models with the lowest AIC values, and with VIF values lower than 2 to avoid collinearity 225

issues (Zuur et al., 2010). We re-ran this model for road and footbridges separately to assess 226 227 the potential dependence of results to the type of bridge. Finally, because the microphone array was placed at the same distance from bridges for only one pair of lit/unlit bridges (i.e. 228 229 10.5 m), we focused a last model only on positions that were located between 10.4 to 13.5 m from bridges, i.e. that corresponded to the overlap of the 95% confidence interval of bat 230 distances from lit bridges and the 95% confidence interval of bat distances from unlit bridges 231 232 (see right panel of the Fig. 1). This model was identical to the previous ones but without the bat and array-bridge distance variables as it only focuses on a restricted range of distances, 233 where there is maximum confidence in the results by limiting the array-bridge distance bias. 234 235 Finally, it was not technically possible to measure light intensity with sufficient precision for each bat position due to the presence of the waterway. We therefore used the bat-bridge 236 distance variable assuming it could be a good proxy due to the relationship between the light 237 238 intensity and the distance to light. All analyses were performed using a significance threshold of 5% in the R statistical software (R Core Team, 2018). 239

241 **3. Results**

242

passes per site) while only 386 at lit sites (respectively 106, 136, 144 bat passes per site; Table 243 1), i.e.1.7 times less bat passes at lit compared to unlit sites. We also recorded four passes of 244 Myotis spp. and 12 passes of Nyctalus spp. The Pipistrellus group was composed of 73.1% 245 Pipistrellus kuhlii/nathusii, 26.4% Pipistrellus pipistrellus and 0.5% Pipistrellus pygmaeus. 246 247 Pipistrellus spp. emitted in total 21 feeding buzzes (i.e. during 2% of all passes), all at unlit sites (Table 1). We also recorded more 3D bat position at unlit sites (i.e. 2036) than at lit sites 248 249 (i.e. 151) (Table 1). 250 Bat positions were located significantly closer to unlit bridges than lit bridges (Table 2). At the 10.5 m array-bridge distance at which unlit and lit sites were both sampled, bats were in 251 average 1.6 m closer to unlit bridges than to lit bridges (Fig. 1). This difference tends to 252 253 become higher when sites are sampled closer to bridges (Fig. 1). Bats never approached lit bridges closer than 7.9 m while for unlit bridges they regularly flew along, over or under 254 bridges (Fig.2). 255

We recorded 644 bat passes of *Pipistrellus* spp. at unlit sites (respectively 179, 212, 253 bat

Table 1. Summary per site of study sites characteristics, sampling design and bat survey results.

Sites	Date	Lighting treatment	Bridge type (height – width in meters)	Array- bridge distance (m)	Light intensity ± SD (Lux)	Number of 3D positions	Number of 5 seconds bat passes (buzzes)	Average bat-bridge distance ± SD (m)	Average flight speed ± SD (m/s)	Average imprecision on positions ± SD (cm)
1	19/06/2018	Lit	Road bridge (7.2 – 29.7)	16.2	9.1 ± 8.8	107	144 (0)	15.7 ± 1.8	8.2 ± 1.3	54.1 ± 27.0
2	21/06/2018	Lit	Road bridge (5.5 – 17.8)	11.7	7.9 ± 8.2	26	106 (0)	10.7 ± 1.8	6.8 ± 2.0	48.2 ± 22.9
3	24/06/2018	Lit	Footbridge (6.0 -2.5)	10.5	5.3 ± 3.6	18	136 (0)	12.6 ± 1.5	8.5 ± 1.3	54.5 ± 22.0
4	20/06/2018	Unlit	Road bridge (5.7 – 22.8)	8.5	4.7 ± 8.8	779	179 (3)	7.1 ± 2.9	6.5 ± 2.3	16.0 ± 13.8
5	22/06/2018	Unlit	Road bridge (6.5 – 29.3)	10.5	4.9 ± 4.1	263	253 (10)	10.0 ± 2.1	5.7 ± 2.0	59.2 ± 27.7
6	25/06/2018	Unlit	Footbridge $(6.2 - 2.6)$	6.0	1.2 ± 0.3	994	212 (8)	5.7 ± 3.6	6.3 ± 2.4	12.3 ± 14.3
1+2+3	/	Lit	/	14.7	7.4 ± 1.4	151	386	14.5 ± 2.7	8.1 ± 1.5	53.1 ± 25.8
4+5+6	/	Unlit	/	7.5	3.6 ± 1.6	2036	644	6.8 ± 3.5	6.3 ± 2.3	19.8 ± 22.5

257

- 259 Table 2. Bridge lighting effects on bat-bridge distance and flight speed from linear mixed models, respectively
- 260 including the bat-bridge distance and the flight speed as response variables. Delta AIC are shown as a difference
- with respective null models.

Response variable	Explanatory variables	Estimate \pm SE	z value	p-value	$\Delta \operatorname{AIC}$
Bat-bridge distance	Intercept Unlit vs.lit bridge Array-bridge distance Array-bridge distance ² Unlit vs.lit bridge : Array-bridge distance Unlit vs.lit bridge : Array-bridge distance ²	$\begin{array}{c} 27.230 \pm 4.527 \\ -26.145 \pm 4.529 \\ -2.727 \pm 0.673 \\ 0.129 \pm 0.024 \\ 3.093 \pm 0.673 \\ -0.072 \pm 0.024 \end{array}$	6.015 -5.773 -4.055 5.315 4.593 -2.964	< 0.001 < 0.001 < 0.001 < 0.001 < 0.001 0.003	- 60
Flight speed	Intercept Unlit vs.lit bridge Bat-bridge distance Bat-bridge distance ² Array-bridge distance Unlit vs.lit bridge : Distance to the bridge Unlit vs.lit bridge : Distance to the bridge ²	$\begin{array}{c} -0.961 \pm 2.537 \\ 8.832 \pm 2.221 \\ 2.043 \pm 0.294 \\ -0.082 \pm 0.011 \\ -0.185 \pm 0.096 \\ -2.083 \pm 0.294 \\ 0.089 \pm 0.011 \end{array}$	-0.379 3.977 6.954 -7.573 -1.929 -7.088 8.250	$\begin{array}{c} 0.705 \\ < 0.001 \\ < 0.001 \\ < 0.001 \\ 0.054 \\ < 0.001 \\ < 0.001 \end{array}$	- 2565
Flight speed in the overlap between 95% confidence intervals of positions of lit and unlit sites	Intercept Unlit vs.lit bridge	$\begin{array}{c} 8.708 \pm 0.625 \\ \text{-}2.175 \pm 0.677 \end{array}$	13.930 -3.214	< 0.001 0.001	-5.5

²⁶²

Bats were overall flying significantly faster in nearby lit bridges compared to unlit bridges. 263 Flight speeds were for example 8.7 m/s for lit sites and 6.5 m/s for unlit sites on average 264 within the range of distances between 10.4 and 13.5 m from bridges (i.e. the range including 265 an overlap of 95% between bat positions from lit and bat positions from unlit bridges; Table 266 2; Fig. 2). The relationship between the flight speed and the bat-bridge distance was thus 267 found to strongly differ between unlit and lit bridges (Table 2; Fig.2): Flight speed was found 268 269 to significantly decrease when bats approached unlit bridges, while we found significant increasing of speeds when bats approached lit bridges (Table 2; Fig. 2). The array-bridge 270 271 distance was not found to significantly influence results about flight speeds (Table 2). Finally, bats responded the same to footbridges and road bridges (Figs. S4 & S5), the results were thus 272 273 independent of differences in usage, structure and lighting way.



275

Unlit bridges
 Lit bridges

Figure 1. Predicted average bat-bridge distances in unlit and lit sites according to the array-bridge distance of sampling. This interaction comes from the linear mixed model presented in Table 2. Vertical bars at the bottom show the three array-bridge distances sampled in unlit sites (black), and the three sampled in lit sites (grey). The representation on the right panel shows a theoretical top-view of bat localisations (filled circles) and average bat localisation (blank circles) according to the lighting type of bridges, and shown for the array-bridge distance of 10.5 m shared by two sampling sites. The light grey rectangles show the overlap of the 95% confidence interval of bat distances from lit bridges and the 95% confidence interval of bat distances from unlit bridges.





Figure 2. Predicted relationships between the flight speed and the bat-bridge distance for unlit (dark grey, left panel) and lit sites (light grey, right panel) and associated 95% confidence intervals from the linear mixed model presented in Table 2. The light grey rectangles and the focus on it in the middle panel show the overlap of the 95% confidence interval of bat distances from lit bridges and the 95% confidence interval of bat distances from unlit bridges, for which direct comparison is the most reliable. Solid dots in the middle panel show predicted average flight speeds in the overlap zone. Vertical dashed lines show the bridge location, and empty circles show raw data used in models.

292 **4. Discussion**

293 Results show that compared to unlit bridges, bats approaching illuminated bridges kept a greater distance, were less abundant, and increased flight speed instead of slowing down. 294 Although these results have to be taken with cautious given the number of sampled sites (i.e. 295 6 bridges) due to technical constraints, we think we can be confident in their accuracy thanks 296 to the innovative approach of 3D acoustic localisation which allowed to measure a high 297 298 number of positions (i.e. 2 187) with high precisions (i.e. 22.1±24.2 cm). In addition, we cannot exclude an effect of particular conditions in samples correlated to lit-unlit 299 300 characteristics of sites. However, the sampling was designed to control for environmental 301 conditions by selecting sites as similar as possible, and we found a bat activity always lower at unlit sites (i.e. 179, 212, 253 bat passes per site) than at lit sites (i.e. 106, 136, 144). Further 302 studies with a higher sample size to limit potential effects of inherent site characteristics 303 304 would therefore be necessary to confirm our results. These results are also consistent with previous studies showing that for this group (i.e. 305 Pipistrellus species), light at night can result in a decrease of bat activity (Azam et al., 2016), 306 can limit the presence of feeding buzzes (Kerbiriou et al., 2020), reduces the crossing 307 308 probability of gaps in wooded corridors within a city (Hale et al., 2015), and that flight speeds 309 are much higher in presence of light (Polak et al., 2011). Given the high importance of riverine corridors for bats in urbanized areas with little green 310 spaces (Lintott et al., 2015), our results suggest that bridge lighting reduces bat activity in an 311 312 important habitat and could potentially constitute a barrier for moving along waterways by preventing individuals from approaching and crossing bridges, and hence affect the functional 313 connectivity for bats in urban landscapes (Laforge et al., 2019; Pauwels et al., 2019). 314 The considerably lower number of bat passes found near illuminated bridges, and the increase 315 in flight speed in response to light is particularly interesting as *Pipistrellus* species are 316

commonly considered as light-tolerant when studied at a similar spatial scale (Clémentine 317 318 Azam et al., 2015; Azam et al., 2018; Spoelstra et al., 2017; Zeale et al., 2018). Indeed, as light sources used for street lighting massively attract insects (Wakefield et al., 2016), 319 Pipistrellus species often increase foraging activity around these and reduce their flight speed 320 (Grodzinski et al., 2009). We hypothesise that bats may increase flight speed when their fear 321 for predators outweighs the benefits of foraging at a specific location. The absence of feeding 322 323 buzzes (i.e. foraging) at lit sites is consistent with this hypothesis: individuals fly faster in highly lit environments reduce foraging behaviour (Grodzinski et al., 2009). This response has 324 been observed in other mammal taxa as well (Farnworth et al., 2019; Hof et al., 2012). We 325 326 finally show that bats decrease their flight speed while approaching unlit bridges. This is 327 presumably linked to the bridge that forces individuals to slow down to avoid it. Although we accounted for differences in sampling bat-bridge distances between unlit and lit 328 329 sites by adding the array-bridge distance as a covariate in models, the range of array-bridge distances shared by unlit and lit sites was narrow, which calls for caution in interpreting 330 results about bat-bridge distances for the whole lighting influence area. However, even though 331 we lack data between zero and seven meters from lit bridges (Fig. 2), flight speed response to 332 333 the distance to bridges and number of bat passes are different enough between lit and unlit 334 sites to be confident about these results. In our study, we were able to only explore the response of fast-flying species such as 335 *Pipistrellus* species often described as light-tolerant at the street light scale (Lacoeuilhe et al., 336 337 2014), but the response of other bat groups – such as slow-flying light-shy bats – that also rely

on aquatic corridors as we tested here will be highly interesting as well. Such negative effects

339 on *Pipistrellus* species thus raise numerous questions about less tolerant species, especially in

340 more rural landscapes where light-shy bats are regularly more abundant than in urban

341 landscape (Gili et al., 2020). In addition, *P. pipistrellus* and *P. pygmaeus* may respond

differently to light as these species are smaller than *P. kuhlii/nathusii* (Dietz et al., 2009), and
hence have different flight characteristics (e.g. Azam et al., 2018; C. Azam et al., 2015; Russo
et al., 2018). Further studies are needed to assess species-specific changes in flight patterns
due to artificial light.

Our results highlight that even for the most common bat species in urban habitat, which is considered as light-tolerant in direct response to light, we found a strong impact of light on the relative abundance near bridges, and on the spatial distribution and flight behaviour. The effects we report here call for keeping bridges dark to preserve the functionality of river corridors and to limit habitat loss for bats.

352 Acknowledgments

353 This work was supported by the Infrastructures de Transports Terrestres, Ecosystèmes et

354 Paysages (ITTECOP-MTES) program, including funding sources from the Agence de

1'Environnement et de la Maîtrise de l'Énergie (ADEME), the Fondation pour la Recherche

sur la Biodiversité (FRB) and the Club Infrastructures Linéaires et Biodiversité (CIL&B). We

are grateful towards Julie Pauwels and Charlotte Roemer which recently help to improve R

script allowing to reconstruct 3D bat trajectories. We also thank Danilo Russo and one

anonymous reviewer for their comments which improved our manuscript.

360

361 Author's contribution

362 K.B., I.L., C.K, R.K.I. and K.S. conceived the ideas and designed the methodology; K.B. and

363 S.C. collected the data, K.B. and Y.B. prepared the data and wrote R scripts; K.B, C.K. and

I.L. analysed the data; K.B., I.L., K.S, C.K, and Y.B. .led the writing of the manuscript. All

365 authors gave their final approval for publication.

366

367 Data availability

- 368 Data and R scripts used to prepare data are available at the following link
- 369 https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3929723.
- 370

372 **References**

- 373 Akasaka, T., Akasaka, M., Nakamura, F., 2012. Scale-independent significance of river and
- 374 riparian zones on three sympatric Myotis species in an agricultural landscape. Biol.

375 Conserv. 145, 15–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2011.08.017

- Altermatt, F., Ebert, D., 2016. Reduced flight-to-light behaviour of moth populations exposed
- to long-term urban light pollution. Biol. Lett. 12, 3–6.
- 378 https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2016.0111
- Ancillotto, L., Bosso, L., Salinas-Ramos, V.B., Russo, D., 2019. The importance of ponds for
- the conservation of bats in urban landscapes. Landsc. Urban Plan. 190, 103607.
- 381 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2019.103607
- Azam, C., Kerbiriou, C., Vernet, A., Julien, J.-F., Bas, Y., Plichard, L., Maratrat, J., Le Viol,
- I., 2015. Is part-night lighting an effective measure to limit the impacts of artificial

lighting on bats? Glob. Chang. Biol. 21. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13036

- Azam, Clémentine, Kerbiriou, C., Vernet, A., Julien, J.F., Bas, Y., Plichard, L., Maratrat, J.,
- Le Viol, I., 2015. Is part-night lighting an effective measure to limit the impacts of
- artificial lighting on bats? Glob. Chang. Biol. 21, 4333–4341.
- 388 https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13036
- Azam, C., Le Viol, I., Bas, Y., Zissis, G., Vernet, A., Julien, J.-F., Kerbiriou, C., 2018.
- Evidence for distance and illuminance thresholds in the effects of artificial lighting on
- bat activity. Landsc. Urban Plan. 175, 123–135.
- 392 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.02.011
- Azam, C., Le Viol, I., Julien, J.F., Bas, Y., Kerbiriou, C., 2016. Disentangling the relative
- effect of light pollution, impervious surfaces and intensive agriculture on bat activity

- 395 with a national-scale monitoring program. Landsc. Ecol. 31, 2471–2483.
- 396 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-016-0417-3
- Bas, Y., Bas, D., Julien, J., 2017. Tadarida : A Toolbox for Animal Detection on Acoustic
 Recordings. J. open Res. Softw. 5, 1–8. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5334/jors.154
- Bennie, J., Davies, T.W., Cruse, D., Inger, R., Gaston, K.J., 2018. Artificial light at night
- 400 causes top-down and bottom-up trophic effects on invertebrate populations. J. Appl.
- 401 Ecol. 55, 2698–2706. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13240
- 402 Carrasco-Rueda, F., Loiselle, B.A., 2019. Do riparian forest strips in modified forest
- 403 landscapes aid in conserving bat diversity? Ecol. Evol. 4192–4209.
- 404 https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.5048
- 405 Cravens, Z.M., Brown, V.A., Divoll, T.J., Boyles, J.G., Abdullah, E., Idris, A., Saparon, A.,
- 2017. Illuminating prey selection in an insectivorous bat community, exposed to artificial
 light at night. J. Appl. Ecol. 12, 3218–3221. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijlh.12426
- 408 Davies, T.W., Bennie, J., Gaston, K.J., 2012. Street lighting changes the composition of
- 409 invertebrate communities. Biol. Lett. 8, 764–767. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2012.0216
- 410 De Jong, M., Caro, S.P., Gienapp, P., Spoelstra, K., Visser, M.E., 2017. Early Birds by Light
- 411 at Night: Effects of Light Color and Intensity on Daily Activity Patterns in Blue Tits. J.
- 412 Biol. Rhythms 32, 323–333. https://doi.org/10.1177/0748730417719168
- 413 Dietz, C., VonHelversen, O., Nill, D., 2009. Bats ofBritain, Europe and Nortwest Africa:
 414 London: A&C Black Publishers.
- 415 Downs, N.C., Racey, P.A., 2006. The use by bats of habitat features in mixed farmland in
- 416 Scotland NICK. Acta chiropterologica 8, 169–185. https://doi.org/10.3161/1733-
- 417 5329(2006)8

- 418 Eisenbeis, G., 2006. Artificial night lighting and insects: attraction of insects to streetlamps in
- 419 a rural setting in Germany, in: Ecological Consequences of Artificial Night Lighting
- 420 (Eds C Rich, T Longcore), Washington, DC: Island Press. pp. 281–304.
- 421 https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511609763.016
- 422 Farnworth, B., Meitern, R., Innes, J., Waas, J.R., 2019. Increasing predation risk with light
- 423 reduces speed, exploration and visit duration of invasive ship rats (Rattus rattus). Sci.
- 424 Rep. 9, 3739. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-39711-3
- 425 Fox, R., 2013. The decline of moths in Great Britain: A review of possible causes. Insect
- 426 Conserv. Divers. 6, 5–19. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-4598.2012.00186.x
- 427 Frank, K.D., 1988. Impact of Outdoor Lighting on Moths. J. Lepid. Soc. 2, 63–93.
- 428 https://doi.org/10.1017/s0252921100003687
- 429 Gaston, K.J., Davies, T.W., Nedelec, S.L., Holt, L.A., 2017. Impacts of Artificial Light at
- 430 Night on Biological Timings. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 48, 49–68.
- 431 https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110316-022745
- 432 Gili, F., Newson, S.E., Gillings, S., Chamberlain, D.E., Border, J.A., 2020. Bats in urbanising
- 433 landscapes: habitat selection and recommendations for a sustainable future. Biol.
- 434 Conserv. 241, 108343. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.108343
- 435 Götze, S., Denzinger, A., Schnitzler, H., 2020. High frequency social calls indicate food
- 436 source defense in foraging Common pipistrelle bats. Sci. Rep. 10, 5764.
- 437 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-62743-z
- 438 Grindal, S.D., Morissette, J.L., Brigham, R.M., 1999. Concentration of bat activity in riparian
- habitats over an elevational gradient. Can. J. Zool. 77, 972–977.
- 440 https://doi.org/10.1139/z99-062

441	Grodzinski, U., Spiegel, O., Korine, C., Holderied, M.W., 2009. Context-dependent flight
442	speed: Evidence for energetically optimal flight speed in the bat Pipistrellus kuhlii? J.
443	Anim. Ecol. 78, 540–548. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2009.01526.x
444	Guetté, A., Godet, L., Juigner, M., Robin, M., 2018. Worldwide increase in Artificial Light At
445	Night around protected areas and within biodiversity hotspots. Biol. Conserv. 223, 97-
446	103. https://doi.org/S0006320717319043
447	Hale, J.D., Fairbrass, A.J., Matthews, T.J., Davies, G., Sadler, J.P., 2015. The ecological
448	impact of city lighting scenarios: Exploring gap crossing thresholds for urban bats. Glob.
449	Chang. Biol. 21, 2467–2478. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12884
450	Hof, A.R., Snellenberg, J., Bright, P.W., 2012. Food or fear? Predation risk mediates edge
451	refuging in an insectivorous mammal. Anim. Behav. 83, 1099–1106.
452	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.01.042
453	Hölker, F., Wolter, C., Perkin, E.K., Tockner, K., 2010. Light pollution as a biodiversity
454	threat. Trends Ecol. Evol. 25, 681-682. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2010.09.007
455	Les D.K. Calamber D. Camber C. C. Des V. Lalier, J.E. Casser, V. Hasserier, A. 2016
	Ing, R.K., Colombo, R., Gembu, GC., Bas, Y., Julien, JF., Gager, Y., Hassanin, A., 2016.
456	Echolocation Calls and Flight Behaviour of the Elusive Pied Butterfly Bat (
456 457	Echolocation Calls and Flight Behaviour of the Elusive Pied Butterfly Bat (<i>Glauconycteris superba</i>), and New Data on Its Morphology and Ecology. Acta
456 457 458	 Echolocation Calls and Flight Behaviour of the Elusive Pied Butterfly Bat (<i>Glauconycteris superba</i>), and New Data on Its Morphology and Ecology. Acta Chiropterologica 18, 477–488. https://doi.org/10.3161/15081109ACC2016.18.2.014
456 457 458 459	 Ing, R.K., Colombo, R., Gembu, GC., Bas, Y., Julien, JF., Gager, Y., Hassanin, A., 2016. Echolocation Calls and Flight Behaviour of the Elusive Pied Butterfly Bat (<i>Glauconycteris superba</i>), and New Data on Its Morphology and Ecology. Acta Chiropterologica 18, 477–488. https://doi.org/10.3161/15081109ACC2016.18.2.014 Jechow, A., Hölker, F., 2019. How dark is a river? Artificial light at night in aquatic systems
456 457 458 459 460	 Ing, R.K., Colombo, R., Gembu, GC., Bas, Y., Julien, JF., Gager, Y., Hassanin, A., 2016. Echolocation Calls and Flight Behaviour of the Elusive Pied Butterfly Bat (<i>Glauconycteris superba</i>), and New Data on Its Morphology and Ecology. Acta Chiropterologica 18, 477–488. https://doi.org/10.3161/15081109ACC2016.18.2.014 Jechow, A., Hölker, F., 2019. How dark is a river? Artificial light at night in aquatic systems and the need for comprehensive night-time light measurements. Wiley Interdiscip. Rev.
456 457 458 459 460 461	 Ing, R.K., Colombo, R., Gembu, GC., Bas, Y., Jullen, JF., Gager, Y., Hassanin, A., 2016. Echolocation Calls and Flight Behaviour of the Elusive Pied Butterfly Bat (<i>Glauconycteris superba</i>), and New Data on Its Morphology and Ecology. Acta Chiropterologica 18, 477–488. https://doi.org/10.3161/15081109ACC2016.18.2.014 Jechow, A., Hölker, F., 2019. How dark is a river? Artificial light at night in aquatic systems and the need for comprehensive night-time light measurements. Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Water 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1388
456 457 458 459 460 461 462	 Ing, R.K., Colombo, R., Gembu, GC., Bas, Y., Julien, JF., Gager, Y., Hassanin, A., 2016. Echolocation Calls and Flight Behaviour of the Elusive Pied Butterfly Bat (<i>Glauconycteris superba</i>), and New Data on Its Morphology and Ecology. Acta Chiropterologica 18, 477–488. https://doi.org/10.3161/15081109ACC2016.18.2.014 Jechow, A., Hölker, F., 2019. How dark is a river? Artificial light at night in aquatic systems and the need for comprehensive night-time light measurements. Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Water 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1388 Jones, G., Rydell, J., 1994. Foraging strategy and predation risk as factors influencing

464 https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.1994.0161

- 465 Kerbiriou, C., Barré, K., Mariton, L., Pauwels, J., Zissis, G., Robert, A., Le Viol, I., 2020.
- 466 Switching LPS to LED Streetlight May Dramatically Reduce Activity and Foraging of
- 467 Bats. Diversity 12. https://doi.org/10.3390/d12040165
- 468 Kerbiriou, C., Bas, Y., Le Viol, I., Lorrillière, R., Mougnot, J., Julien, J.-F., 2019. Bat Pass
- 469 Duration Measurement: An Indirect Measure of Distance of Detection. Diversity 11, 47.
 470 https://doi.org/10.3390/d11030047
- 471 Knop, E., Zoller, L., Ryser, R., Gerpe, C., Hörler, M., Fontaine, C., 2017. Artificial light at
- 472 night as a new threat to pollination. Nature 548, 206–209.
- 473 https://doi.org/10.1038/nature23288
- Koblitz, J.C., 2018. Arrayvolution: using microphone arrays to study bats in the field. Can. J.
 Zool. 96, 933–938. https://doi.org/10.1139/cjz-2017-0187
- 476 Koen, E.L., Minnaar, C., Roever, C.L., Boyles, J.G., 2018. Emerging threat of the 21st
- 477 century lightscape to global biodiversity. Glob. Chang. Biol. 24, 2315–2324.
- 478 https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14146
- 479 Lacoeuilhe, A., Machon, N., Julien, J.F., Kerbiriou, C., 2016. Effects of hedgerows on bats
- 480 and bush crickets at different spatial scales. Acta Oecologica 71, 61–72.
- 481 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actao.2016.01.009
- 482 Lacoeuilhe, A., Machon, N., Julien, J.F., Le Bocq, A., Kerbiriou, C., 2014. The influence of
- low intensities of light pollution on bat communities in a semi-natural context. PLoS One
- 484 9. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0103042
- Laforge, A., Pauwels, J., Faure, B., Bas, Y., Kerbiriou, C., Fonderflick, J., Besnard, A., 2019.
- 486 Reducing light pollution improves connectivity for bats in urban landscapes. Landsc.

- 487 Ecol. 34, 793–809. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-019-00803-0
- Lintott, P.R., Bunnefeld, N., Park, K.J., 2015. Opportunities for improving the foraging
- 489 potential of urban waterways for bats. Biol. Conserv. 191, 224–233.
- 490 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2015.06.036
- 491 Lloyd, A., Law, B., Goldingay, R., 2006. Bat activity on riparian zones and upper slopes in
- 492 Australian timber production forests and the effectiveness of riparian buffers. Biol.

493 Conserv. 129, 207–220. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2005.10.035

- 494 Lookingbill, T.R., Elmore, A.J., Engelhardt, K. a. M.M., Churchill, J.B., Edward Gates, J.,
- Johnson, J.B., 2010. Influence of wetland networks on bat activity in mixed-use
- 496 landscapes. Biol. Conserv. 143, 974–983. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2010.01.011
- 497 Minnaar, C., Boyles, J.G., Minnaar, I.A., Sole, C.L., Mckechnie, A.E., 2015. Stacking the
- 498 odds: Light pollution may shift the balance in an ancient predator-prey arms race. J.

499 Appl. Ecol. 52, 522–531. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12381

- 500 Pauwels, J., Viol, I. Le, Azam, C., Valet, N., Julien, J. -f., Bas, Y., Lemarchand, C., Miguel,
- A.S. De, Kerbiriou, C., 2019. Accounting for artificial light impact on bat activity for a
- 502 biodiversity-friendly urban planning. Landsc. Urban Plan. 183, 12–25.
- 503 https://doi.org/S0169204618311939
- Penone, C., Kerbiriou, C., Julien, J.-F., Julliard, R., Machon, N., Le Viol, I., 2013.
- 505 Urbanisation effect on Orthoptera: which scale matters? Insect Conserv. Divers. 6, 319–
- 506 327. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-4598.2012.00217.x
- Perkin, E.K., Hölker, F., Tockner, K., 2014. The effects of artificial lighting on adult aquatic
 and terrestrial insects. Freshw. Biol. 59, 368–377. https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12270
- 509 Pinaud, D., Claireau, F., Leuchtmann, M., Kerbiriou, C., 2018. Modelling landscape

510	connectivity for greater horseshoe bat using an empirical quantification of resistance. J.
511	Appl. Ecol. 55, 2600–2611. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13228
512	Polak, T., Korine, C., Yair, S., Holderied, M.W., 2011. Differential effects of artificial
513	lighting on flight and foraging behaviour of two sympatric bat species in a desert. J.
514	Zool. 285, 21–27. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.2011.00808.x
515	R Core Team, 2018. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing [WWW
516	Document]. R Found. Stat. Comput. Vienna, Austria. URL https://www.r-project.org/
517	Russo, D., Ancillotto, L., Cistrone, L., Libralato, N., Domer, A., Cohen, S., Korine, C., 2018.
518	Effects of artificial illumination on drinking bats: a field test in forest and desert habitats.
519	Anim. Conserv. 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1111/acv.12443
520	Russo, D., Cistrone, L., Libralato, N., Korine, C., Jones, G., Ancillotto, L., 2017. Adverse
521	effects of artificial illumination on bat drinking activity. Anim. Conserv. 20, 492–501.
522	https://doi.org/10.1111/acv.12340
523	Russo, D., Cosentino, F., Festa, F., De Benedetta, F., Pejic, B., Cerretti, P., Ancillotto, L.,
524	2019. Artificial illumination near rivers may alter bat-insect trophic interactions.
525	Environ. Pollut. 252, 1671–1677. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.06.105
526	Rydell, J., 1992. Exploitation of Insects around Streetlamps by Bats in Sweden. Funct. Ecol.
527	6, 744. https://doi.org/10.2307/2389972
528	Salinas-Ramos, V.B., Ancillotto, L., Bosso, L., Sánchez-Cordero, V., Russo, D., 2020.
529	Interspecific competition in bats: state of knowledge and research challenges. Mamm.
530	Rev. 50, 68-81. https://doi.org/10.1111/mam.12180
531	Sirami, C., Jacobs, D.S., Cumming, G.S., 2013. Artificial wetlands and surrounding habitats
532	provide important foraging habitat for bats in agricultural landscapes in the Western

- 533 Cape, South Africa. Biol. Conserv. 164, 30–38.
- 534 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2013.04.017
- Smith, P.G., Racey, P.A., 2008. Natterer's bats prefer foraging in broad-leaved woodlands
 and river corridors. J. Zool. 275, 314–322. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-
- 537 7998.2008.00445.x
- 538 Spoelstra, K., Ramakers, J.J.C., van Dis, N.E., Visser, M.E., 2018. No effect of artificial light
- of different colors on commuting Daubenton's bats (Myotis daubentonii) in a choice
- 540 experiment. J. Exp. Zool. Part A Ecol. Integr. Physiol. 329, 506–510.
- 541 https://doi.org/10.1002/jez.2178
- 542 Spoelstra, K., van Grunsven, R.H.A., Ramakers, J.J.C., Ferguson, K.B., Raap, T., Donners,
- 543 M., Veenendaal, E.M., Visser, M.E., 2017. Response of bats to light with different
- spectra: light-shy and agile bat presence is affected by white and green, but not red light.
- 545 Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 284, 20170075. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.0075
- 546 Todd, V.L.G., Williamson, L.D., 2019. Habitat usage of Daubenton's bat (Myotis
- 547 daubentonii), common pipistrelle (Pipistrellus pipistrellus), and soprano pipistrelle
- 548 (Pipistrellus pygmaeus) in a North Wales upland river catchment. Ecol. Evol. 4853–
- 549 4863. https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.5085
- 550 Wakefield, A., Broyles, M., Stone, E.L., Jones, G., Harris, S., 2016. Experimentally
- comparing the attractiveness of domestic lights to insects: Do LEDs attract fewer insects
- than conventional light types? Ecol. Evol. 6, 8028–8036.
- 553 https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.2527
- Zeale, M.R.K., Stone, E.L., Zeale, E., Browne, W.J., Harris, S., Jones, G., 2018.
- 555 Experimentally manipulating light spectra reveals the importance of dark corridors for
- commuting bats. Glob. Chang. Biol. 24, 5909–5918. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14462

- Zuur, A., Ieno, E., Elphick, C., 2010. A protocol for data exploration to avoid common
 statistical problems. Methods Ecol. Evol. 1, 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-
- 559 210X.2009.00001.x