



**HAL**  
open science

# Methodological approaches to assessing population-level impacts of bird collisions with wind turbines: a critical perspective

Thierry Chambert, Olivier Duriez, Aurélien Besnard

## ► To cite this version:

Thierry Chambert, Olivier Duriez, Aurélien Besnard. Methodological approaches to assessing population-level impacts of bird collisions with wind turbines: a critical perspective. *Environmental Conservation*, 2023, 51 (1), pp.1-5. 10.1017/s0376892923000346 . hal-04766617

**HAL Id: hal-04766617**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04766617v1>**

Submitted on 5 Nov 2024

**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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - ShareAlike 4.0 International License

1 Methodological approaches to assess population-level impacts of bird  
2 collisions with wind turbines: a critical perspective

3

4 **Running head:** Assessing population impact of collisions

5

6 **Authors:**

7 Thierry Chambert\*, Olivier Duriez, Aurélien Besnard

8 CEFE, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, EPHE-PSL University, IRD, Montpellier, France

9 \*Primary contact: [thierry.chambert@gmail.com](mailto:thierry.chambert@gmail.com)

10

11 **Keywords:** Anthropogenic impacts, Wind energy, Collision fatalities, Additional  
12 mortalities, Population projections, Potential Biological Removal, Population Viability  
13 Analysis.

14

## 15 Abstract

16 Wind energy is a source of collision fatalities for birds and bats. To evaluate the risk  
17 that wind power development projects might pose to the conservation of protected  
18 species, it is essential to quantify the impact of collisions on the dynamics of wild  
19 populations. To address this challenge, two approaches are primarily employed:  
20 Potential Biological Removal (PBR) and Population Projection Analysis (PPA). PBR  
21 is a decision rule designed to calculate a sustainable fatality limit for a given  
22 population, while PPA relies on simulation-based modelling to forecast a population's  
23 future trajectory under various scenarios. In the context of environmental impact  
24 assessments (EIAs), we argue that PPA offers a more suitable method than PBR for  
25 evaluating population-level impacts resulting from collisions with wind turbines. Unlike  
26 PBR, PPA can be focused on a single source of disturbance, aligning with the  
27 perspective of the EIA process. In contrast, PBR necessarily adopts a population-  
28 centered perspective, and is therefore only relevant when considering all sources of  
29 mortality that jointly affect a population. Furthermore, robust utilization of the PBR  
30 approach requires the definition of quantitative conservation objectives and the  
31 implementation of a comprehensive management strategy evaluation, neither of  
32 which is ever undertaken within the context of EIA.

## 33 Introduction

34 Almost everywhere around the world, the development of wind energy stands as one  
35 of the pillars of the energy transition (Teske et al. 2019). However, this mode of  
36 energy production is also a source of negative impacts on biodiversity, particularly for  
37 birds and bats (Drewitt & Langston 2006; Schuster et al. 2015; Barclay et al. 2017;  
38 Thaxter et al. 2017; Serrano et al. 2020). Wind power plants can have two types of  
39 negative effects on these volant animals. First, birds and bats are susceptible to  
40 direct mortalities caused by collisions with wind turbines or by barotrauma (Barclay et  
41 al. 2017; De Lucas & Perrow 2017). Second, like all large artificial infrastructures,  
42 wind power plants are responsible for indirect impacts, such as habitat loss,  
43 disturbance and barrier effects (Drewitt & Langston 2006; Schuster et al. 2015; Fox &  
44 Petersen 2019). Wind energy is currently developing very rapidly around the world  
45 and this rate is projected to continue accelerating in the near future (Teske et al.  
46 2019). In this context, assessing and mitigating the harmful impacts that this  
47 development will have on wildlife has become a primary concern for biodiversity  
48 conservation (Fox & Petersen 2019; Serrano et al. 2020; Durá-Alemañ et al. 2023).

49 In many countries around the globe, the construction of wind power plants is  
50 regulated by environmental protection laws, which usually require pre- and post-  
51 construction impact studies to assess the extent of negative effects on wildlife,  
52 notably protected species (Saidur et al. 2010). Regarding the risk of direct mortality of  
53 birds and bats, environmental impact assessments (EIAs) have historically focused  
54 on estimating fatality risk at the individual level (May et al. 2019) by simply  
55 addressing the question as to how many individuals of a given species are at risk of  
56 dying from collision. However, for species conservation purposes, it is crucial to  
57 assess the consequences that such mortality risk might have at the population level

58 (May et al. 2019). So far, the few EIA studies that have attempted to quantitatively  
59 assess population-level impacts have usually relied on one of two approaches. Some  
60 studies have applied a decision rule called the 'Potential Biological Removal' (PBR) in  
61 an effort to calculate quantitative limits of 'sustainable' collision fatalities (e.g. Poot et  
62 al. 2011; Leopold et al. 2014; Busch & Garthe 2016; NIRAS 2016). Other studies  
63 have focused on simulating population trajectories to predict the fate of populations  
64 exposed to collisions with wind turbines (e.g. Carrete et al. 2009; Masden 2010;  
65 García-Ripollés & López-López 2011; Poot et al. 2011; Rydell et al. 2012; Schaub  
66 2012; Sanz-Aguilar et al. 2015; Grünkorn et al. 2016; Korner-Nievergelt et al. 2016).

67 In this paper, we argue that PBR, as currently used in the context of EIA, is ill-  
68 adapted to the task of assessing population-level impacts of wind energy  
69 infrastructures. On the other hand, the use of population projections, in combination  
70 with metrics of relative impact as a decision rule, is much better suited to this task.

## 71 The Potential Biological Removal (PBR)

### 72 What is the PBR?

73 The PBR is a 'harvest' control rule that was originally developed as a means to define  
74 sustainable limits of cetacean incidental catches by commercial fishing vessels, in  
75 data-poor situations (NMFS 1994; Wade 1998; Moore et al. 2013). The harvest  
76 quota, expressed as a number of individuals removed each year, is based on a  
77 simple formula (Wade 1998):

$$PBR = F_R \frac{R_{max}}{2} N_{min} \quad (1)$$

78 where  $R_{max}$  corresponds to the theoretical maximum growth rate of the population,  
79 i.e. when it is at low density and in the absence of anthropogenic mortalities;  $N_{min}$  is a

80 conservative estimate of the population size; and  $F_R$  is a coefficient between 0.1 and  
81 1, often referred to as the 'recovery factor' (Wade 1998; Dillingham & Fletcher 2008).  
82  $R_{max}$  and  $N_{min}$  are biological parameters that must be estimated for the studied  
83 population. Parameter  $N_{min}$  is usually estimated from field data and, for birds,  $R_{max}$  is  
84 often approximated using allometric relationships that only require knowing the  
85 species' average adult survival and its age at first reproduction (Niel & Lebreton  
86 2005). The recovery factor  $F_R$  is not a biological parameter, but an adjustment  
87 parameter that must be tuned to ensure that the PBR quota fulfills a predetermined  
88 conservation objective even in the presence of uncertainties. The tuning of  $F_R$   
89 requires simulating population trajectories under a realistic demographic model, often  
90 called the 'operational model' (Moore et al. 2013), and testing the influence of a  
91 range of  $F_R$  values on the population's fate (Wade 1998; Dillingham & Fletcher 2008).  
92 Based on these simulation results, a  $F_R$  value is chosen to ensure that, when the  
93 associated PBR harvest rule is implemented, the population will have a high  
94 probability of stabilizing at a level that is equal or greater than the predefined long-  
95 term conservation objective (Figure 1). This tuning and assessment procedure, the  
96 purpose of which is to test the robustness of the PBR decision rule in a specific  
97 context, is called a Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE; Bunnefeld et al. 2011).  
98 Implementing such an MSE not only requires building an operational model for the  
99 species being targeted, but also implies that a quantitative conservation objective has  
100 been clearly defined beforehand (e.g. Haider et al. 2017; Richard & Abraham 2013).  
101 This means setting a population size threshold, often expressed as a fraction of  
102 carrying capacity (NMFS 1994; Wade 1998), above which it is desired to maintain the  
103 population in the long run (Moore et al. 2013). When correctly implemented, the PBR

104 approach can be effective in preventing or reversing population collapses (Cooke et  
105 al. 2012; Moore et al. 2013).

### 106 Why is the PBR not suited to the context of EIA?

107 First, there is a fundamental difference of scope between EIA and the PBR. EIA is a  
108 disturbance-centered endeavor, in the sense that it focuses on assessing the impact  
109 of a given infrastructure development project. This means that the entry point of the  
110 impact analysis is necessarily the source of disturbance itself, not the population. On  
111 the other hand, the PBR is a population-centered approach, in which every source of  
112 disturbance affecting a given population must be considered (Dillingham & Fletcher  
113 2011). Indeed, the rationale for the PBR approach is to find the total amount of non-  
114 natural mortalities (removals) that a population can sustain (Wade 1998). Using the  
115 PBR decision rule in an EIA context is thus a gross oversimplification because it  
116 considers a single source of anthropic mortality, ignoring all others that populations  
117 suffer (Green et al. 2016; O'Brien et al. 2017).

118 Second, because EIA lacks a population-centered perspective, no quantitative  
119 conservation objective is usually defined for the impacted population. This deficiency  
120 has been consistently observed (e.g. Poot et al. 2011; Leopold et al. 2014; Busch &  
121 Garthe 2016; NIRAS 2016) in studies that employed the PBR formula as a decision-  
122 making tool within the context of wind energy's impact on bird populations. As  
123 highlighted above, using the PBR as a decision criterion first requires the  
124 establishment of such an objective, because it constitutes a vital component of the  
125 MSE framework, within which the effectiveness of the decision rule can be rigorously  
126 evaluated.

127 Third, in the context of EIA, the PBR decision rule has been used without  
128 implementing an operational model and simulations to assess its robustness to  
129 uncertainties and tune the value of the recovery factor  $F_R$  (e.g. Poot et al. 2011;  
130 Leopold et al. 2014; Busch & Garthe 2016; NIRAS 2016). Instead, generic values of  
131  $F_R$ , which were derived in a completely different context (marine mammal bycatch in  
132 North America; Wade 1998), have been blindly applied. Therefore, there is no  
133 guarantee that the harvest quota computed through this formula would effectively  
134 align with the conservation objective, assuming such an objective would have been  
135 defined for the population under consideration.

136 Finally, it is important to keep in mind that the PBR method as formulated by  
137 Wade (1998) implicitly assumes the existence of a compensatory density-  
138 dependence relationship, which means that the population growth rate is expected to  
139 increase in response to the removal of individuals, thus partially compensating for  
140 anthropogenic mortalities (Rose et al. 2001; Beverton & Holt 2012). This density-  
141 dependent mechanism is what allows a population to stabilize at some new  
142 equilibrium when facing a sustainable level of mortalities (Wade 1998). In the  
143 absence of such a mechanism, a population exposed to additional mortalities will  
144 constantly decline, necessarily reaching extinction at some point. In birds, however,  
145 this type of compensatory mechanism cannot always be evidenced (Horswill et al.  
146 2017). Applying removal quotas based on the PBR approach in such situations could  
147 trigger or reinforce an unstoppable population decline and therefore have  
148 catastrophic consequences (O'Brien et al. 2017; Miller et al. 2019).



## 149 Population Projection Analysis (PPA)

150 Population Projection Analysis (PPA), also sometimes referred to as  
151 Population Viability Analysis (PVA), is a simulation-based method to predict the  
152 future trajectory of a population under various scenarios (Boyce 1992; Beissinger &  
153 McCullough 2002). PPA relies on a demographic model that bears resemblance to  
154 the operational models utilized within the MSE framework to evaluate decision rules  
155 like the PBR.

156 In our opinion, the PPA method is well suited for assessing population impacts  
157 in the context of EIA because it can easily be framed as a disturbance-centered  
158 assessment exercise, in complete alignment with the EIA framework (Green et al.  
159 2016). To frame a PPA as a disturbance-centered analysis, the most relevant  
160 approach consists in running population projections under two alternative scenarios:  
161 (1) a baseline scenario without collisions and (2) an impact scenario that includes  
162 additional mortalities due to collisions (Cook & Robinson 2017). The comparison of  
163 population trajectories under each of these two scenarios allows calculation of  
164 various metrics of impact induced specifically by the infrastructure (Figure 2). In the  
165 absence of a clear population conservation objective, which is the common situation  
166 in EIA, we recommend using metrics of relative impact, such as the proportional  
167 difference in population size after a given time (e.g. 25 years) between the two  
168 scenarios (Green et al. 2016). This comparative and relative approach, referred to as  
169 the 'Counterfactual of Impacted to Unimpacted' population (CIU), has been shown to  
170 be less sensitive to uncertainties (Cook & Robinson 2017). Indeed, if some model  
171 parameters are inaccurate or some model assumptions happen to be violated, their  
172 influence on the final result will be limited because they apply equally to both  
173 scenarios.

174           In the context of EIA, the use of the CIU approach also has the advantage of  
175 not requiring the definition, *a priori*, of a quantitative population objective, namely a  
176 threshold of critical population size (Green et al. 2016). The lack of a quantitative  
177 conservation objective is not an inherent feature of the PPA method, but rather  
178 reflects the regulatory framework governing the EIA process (Wathern 2013). Indeed,  
179 in this framework, the quantification of impact is separated from the decision of what  
180 level of impact qualifies as 'significant' or not (Schrage 2008).

181           Finally, when using the CIU approach based on PPA, the impact assessment  
182 does not necessarily rely on the assumption of compensatory density-dependence.  
183 The consequences of collision mortalities can thus be explored in situations where  
184 the population would not be expected to stabilize at a new equilibrium. Overall, the  
185 PPA method offers a great deal of flexibility regarding the assumptions and the level  
186 of complexity of the demographic model being used, which allows the right balance to  
187 be found between realism and practicality (Boyce 1992; Morris & Doak 2002).

188

## 189 Conclusion

190 The Potential Biological Removal (PBR) is not simply a formula that can be applied  
191 *ex nihilo* to any species or situation (Moore et al. 2013; O'Brien et al. 2017). It must  
192 be applied from a population-centered perspective, where all sources of non-natural  
193 mortalities are being considered, and it must be embedded in a Management  
194 Strategy Evaluation framework with a clear and quantitative conservation objective  
195 (Wade 1998; Dillingham & Fletcher 2008; Bunnefeld et al. 2011). Our experience  
196 indicates that within the EIA process for wind energy projects, the PBR decision rule  
197 has often been utilized mechanically, without much consideration for these  
198 constraints (Poot et al. 2011; Leopold et al. 2014; Busch & Garthe 2016; NIRAS  
199 2016). From our perspective, it appears that using Population Projection Analysis  
200 (PPA) to quantify relative metrics of impact is better suited to the EIA process, which  
201 has a disturbance-centered perspective. With the PPA approach, one can readily  
202 keep the impact assessment and decision steps separated, as is usually done in EIA.  
203 However, this approach should not lead to neglect of the definition of clear decision-  
204 making rules, as an absence of decision is often detrimental to population  
205 conservation (Cooke et al. 2012).

## 206 References

- 207 Barclay RMR, Baerwald EF, Rydell J. 2017. Bats. Wildlife and wind farms: conflicts  
208 and solutions 1:301.
- 209 Beissinger SR, McCullough DR. 2002. Population viability analysis. University of  
210 Chicago Press.

211 Beverton RJH, Holt SJ. 2012. On the dynamics of exploited fish populations. Springer  
212 Science & Business Media.

213 Boyce MS. 1992. Population viability analysis. Annual review of Ecology and  
214 Systematics 23:481–497. Annual Reviews 4139 El Camino Way, PO Box 10139,  
215 Palo Alto, CA 94303-0139, USA.

216 Bunnefeld N, Hoshino E, Milner-Gulland EJ. 2011. Management strategy evaluation:  
217 a powerful tool for conservation? Trends in ecology & evolution 26:441–447.  
218 Elsevier.

219 Busch M, Garthe S. 2016. Approaching population thresholds in presence of  
220 uncertainty: Assessing displacement of seabirds from offshore wind farms.  
221 Environmental Impact Assessment Review 56:31–42. Elsevier.

222 Carrete M, Sánchez-Zapata JA, Benítez JR, Lobón M, Donázar JA. 2009. Large  
223 scale risk-assessment of wind-farms on population viability of a globally  
224 endangered long-lived raptor. Biological Conservation 142:2954–2961. Elsevier.

225 Cook ASCP, Robinson RA. 2017. Towards a framework for quantifying the  
226 population-level consequences of anthropogenic pressures on the environment:  
227 The case of seabirds and windfarms. Journal of Environmental Management  
228 190:113–121. Elsevier.

229 Cooke J, Leaper R, Wade P, Lavigne D, Taylor B. 2012. Management rules for  
230 marine mammal populations: A response to Lonergan. Marine Policy 36:389–392.

231 De Lucas M, Perrow MR. 2017. Birds: collision. Wildlife and wind farms-conflicts and  
232 solutions 1.

233 Dillingham PW, Fletcher D. 2008. Estimating the ability of birds to sustain additional  
234 human-caused mortalities using a simple decision rule and allometric  
235 relationships. *Biological Conservation* 141:1783–1792. Elsevier.

236 Dillingham PW, Fletcher D. 2011. Potential biological removal of albatrosses and  
237 petrels with minimal demographic information. *Biological Conservation* 144:1885–  
238 1894. Elsevier.

239 Drewitt AL, Langston RHW. 2006. Assessing the impacts of wind farms on birds. *Ibis*  
240 148:29–42. Wiley Online Library.

241 Durá-Alemañ CJ, Moleón M, Pérez-García JM, Serrano D, Sánchez-Zapata JA.  
242 2023. Climate change and energy crisis drive an unprecedented EU environmental  
243 law regression. *Conservation Letters* n/a:e12958. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

244 Fox AD, Petersen IK. 2019. Offshore wind farms and their effects on birds. *Dansk*  
245 *Ornitologisk Forenings Tidsskrift* 113:86–101.

246 García-Ripollés C, López-López P. 2011. Integrating effects of supplementary  
247 feeding, poisoning, pollutant ingestion and wind farms of two vulture species in  
248 Spain using a population viability analysis. *Journal of Ornithology* 152:879–888.  
249 Springer.

250 Green RE, Langston RHW, McCluskie A, Sutherland R, Wilson JD. 2016. Lack of  
251 sound science in assessing wind farm impacts on seabirds. *Journal of Applied*  
252 *Ecology* 53:1635–1641.

253 Grünkorn T, von Rönn J, Blew J, Nehls G, Weitekamp S, Timmermann H. 2016.  
254 Ermittlung der Kollisionsraten von (Greif-) Vögeln und Schaffung  
255 planungsbezogener Grundlagen für die Prognose und Bewertung des

256 Kollisionsrisikos durch Windenergieanlagen (PROGRESS): Verbundprojekt: F &  
257 E-Vorhaben Windenergie, Abschlussbericht 2016. BioConsult SH.

258 Haider HS, Oldfield SC, Tu T, Moreno RK, Diffendorfer JE, Eager EA & Erickson RA.  
259 2017. Incorporating Allee Effects into the Potential Biological Removal Level.  
260 Natural Resources Management, p. e12133

261 Horswill C, O'Brien SH, Robinson RA. 2017. Density dependence and marine bird  
262 populations: are wind farm assessments precautionary? Journal of Applied  
263 Ecology 54:1406–1414. Wiley Online Library.

264 Korner-Nievergelt F, Brossard C, Filliger R, Gremaud J, Lugon A, Mermoud O,  
265 Schaub M, Wechsler S. 2016. Effets cumulés des éoliennes du Jura vaudois et  
266 des régions limitrophes sur l'avifaune et les chiroptères.

267 Leopold MF, Boonman M, Collier MP, Davaasuren N, Jongbloed RH, Lagerveld S,  
268 van der Wal JT, Scholl MM. 2014. A first approach to deal with cumulative effects  
269 on birds and bats of offshore wind farms and other human activities in the  
270 Southern North Sea. IMARES.

271 Lonergan M. 2011. Potential biological removal and other currently used  
272 management rules for marine mammal populations: A comparison. Marine Policy  
273 35:584–589.

274 Masden EA. 2010. Assessing the cumulative impacts of wind farms on birds.  
275 University of Glasgow.

276 May R, Masden EA, Bennet F, Perron M. 2019. Considerations for upscaling  
277 individual effects of wind energy development towards population-level impacts on  
278 wildlife. Journal of Environmental Management 230:84–93.

279 Miller JAO, Furness RW, Trinder M, Matthiopoulos J. 2019. The sensitivity of seabird  
280 populations to density-dependence, environmental stochasticity and  
281 anthropogenic mortality. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 56:2118–2130. Wiley Online  
282 Library.

283 Moore JE, Curtis KA, Lewison RL, Dillingham PW, Cope JM, Fordham S V, Heppell  
284 SS, Pardo SA, Simpfendorfer CA, Tuck GN. 2013. Evaluating sustainability of  
285 fisheries bycatch mortality for marine megafauna: a review of conservation  
286 reference points for data-limited populations. *Environmental Conservation* 40:329–  
287 344. JSTOR.

288 Morris WF, Doak DF. 2002. *Quantitative conservation biology: Theory and Practice of*  
289 *Population Viability Analysis*. Sinauer Associates, Inc., Sunderland, MA, USA.

290 Niel C, Lebreton J. 2005. Using demographic invariants to detect overharvested bird  
291 populations from incomplete data. *Conservation Biology* 19:826–835. Wiley Online  
292 Library.

293 NIRAS. 2016. *Common Scoter Assessment Smålandsfarvandet and Sejerø Bugt*  
294 *Offshore Windfarms*.

295 NMFS. 1994. *Annual Report to Congress Regarding Administration of the Marine*  
296 *Mammal Protection Act*, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries  
297 Service.

298 O'Brien SH, Cook ASCP, Robinson RA. 2017. Implicit assumptions underlying simple  
299 harvest models of marine bird populations can mislead environmental  
300 management decisions. *Journal of environmental management* 201:163–171.  
301 Elsevier.

302 Poot MJM, van Horssen PW, Collier MP, Lensink R, Dirksen S. 2011. Effect studies  
303 Offshore Wind Egmond aan Zee: cumulative effects on seabirds. A modelling  
304 approach to estimate effects on population levels in seabirds. NoordzeeWind  
305 Report OWEZ\_R\_212\_20111021\_Cumulative\_Effects. Bureau Waardenburg  
306 report:11–26.

307 Richard Y & Abraham ER. 2013. Application for potential biological removal methods  
308 to seabird populations, New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity.  
309 Ministry for Primary Industries, Wellington.

310 Rose KA, Cowan Jr JH, Winemiller KO, Myers RA, Hilborn R. 2001. Compensatory  
311 density dependence in fish populations: importance, controversy, understanding  
312 and prognosis. *Fish and Fisheries* 2:293–327. Wiley Online Library.

313 Rydell J, Engström H, Hedenström A, Larsen JK, Pettersson J, Green M. 2012. The  
314 effect of wind power on birds and bats. Page A synthesis. Report.

315 Saidur R, Islam MR, Rahim NA, Solangi KH. 2010. A review on global wind energy  
316 policy. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 14:1744–1762.

317 Sanz-Aguilar A, Sánchez-Zapata JA, Carrete M, Benítez JR, Ávila E, Arenas R,  
318 Donázar JA. 2015. Action on multiple fronts, illegal poisoning and wind farm  
319 planning, is required to reverse the decline of the Egyptian vulture in southern  
320 Spain. *Biological Conservation* 187:10–18. Elsevier.

321 Schaub M. 2012. Spatial distribution of wind turbines is crucial for the survival of red  
322 kite populations. *Biological Conservation* 155:111–118. Elsevier.



323 Schrage W. 2008. The convention on environmental impact assessment in a  
324 Transboundary context. Pages 27–51 Theory and practice of transboundary  
325 environmental impact assessment. Brill Nijhoff.

326 Schuster E, Bulling L, Köppel J. 2015. Consolidating the state of knowledge: a  
327 synoptical review of wind energy's wildlife effects. Environmental management  
328 56:300–331. Springer.

329 Serrano D, Margalida A, Pérez-García JM, Juste J, Traba J, Valera F, Carrete M,  
330 Aihartza J, Real J, Mañosa S. 2020. Renewables in Spain threaten biodiversity.  
331 Science (New York, NY) 370:1282–1283.

332 Teske S, Giurco D, Morris T, Nagrath K, Mey F, Briggs C, Dominish E, Florin N.  
333 2019. Achieving the Paris Climate Agreement Goals: Global and Regional 100%  
334 Renewable Energy Scenarios to Achieve the Paris Agreement Goals with Non-  
335 Energy GHG Pathways for+ 1.5° C and+ 2° C. Springer: Cham, Germany.

336 Thaxter CB, Buchanan GM, Carr J, Butchart SHM, Newbold T, Green RE, Tobias JA,  
337 Foden WB, O'Brien S, Pearce-Higgins JW. 2017. Bird and bat species' global  
338 vulnerability to collision mortality at wind farms revealed through a trait-based  
339 assessment. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences  
340 284:20170829. The Royal Society.

341 Wade PR. 1998. Calculating limits to the allowable human-caused mortality of  
342 cetaceans and pinnipeds. Marine Mammal Science 14:1–37. Wiley Online Library.

343 Wathern P. 2013. Environmental impact assessment: theory and practice. Routledge.

344

345

## 346 Credit author statement

347 **Thierry Chambert:** Conceptualization, Literature review, Writing - Original Draft

348 Preparation, Writing - Review & Editing.

349 **Olivier Duriez:** Conceptualization, Writing - Review & Editing.

350 **Aurélien Besnard:** Conceptualization, Literature review, Writing - Review & Editing.

## 351 Declaration of competing interest

352 The authors declare that they have no competing financial interests or personal  
353 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## 354 Data accessibility

355 This article does not contain data.

## 356 Acknowledgements

357 We thank the MSH-SUD, as well as the funders and steering committee members of  
358 the MAPE project. A.B. and O.D. were funded by their salaries as French public  
359 servants. The post-doctoral contract of T.C. and the internship of M.D. were funded  
360 through the MAPE project. The MAPE project was funded by the ADEME, OFB,  
361 DREAL Occitanie, LABEX CEMEB (University of Montpellier), FEE, SER, Région  
362 Occitanie, the French Ministry of Ecology (MTES/DGEC), as well as 25 wind power  
363 plant operators (the full list can be seen here: [https://mape.cnrs.fr/le-](https://mape.cnrs.fr/le-projet/financeurs/)  
364 [projet/financeurs/](https://mape.cnrs.fr/le-projet/financeurs/)).

## 365 Figures legends

366 **Figure 1.** Theoretical trajectory of two populations with two different  
367 initial states (red, green), suffering the same rate of annual mortality,  
368 which is equal to the PBR (here, with  $F = 1$ ). Independently from their  
369 initial state, each population tends toward the same equilibrium, which is  
370 equal to half the carrying capacity ( $K/2$ , blue horizontal line). The black  
371 horizontal line represents the full carrying capacity  $K$ .

372

373 **Figure 2.** Example of possible population trajectories according to two  
374 scenarios: (i) without collision mortality (in green) and (ii) with collision  
375 mortality due to the presence of a windfarm (in black). The impact can be  
376 defined as the relative difference in population size between these two  
377 scenarios after some time (e.g., 30 years).

378



