Managing Birds and Controlling Aircraft in the Kennedy Airport-Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge Complex: The need for hard data and soft opinions

Kevin M. Brown
R. Michael Erwin
and
Milo E. Richmond

Technical Report NPS/BSO-RNR/NRTR/00-9

October 1999

Department of the Interior
National Park Service
New England System Support Office

The Boston Support Office (BSO) of the National Park Service is responsible for preserving, protecting and enhancing the natural resources and processes of national park areas in the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island and Vermont. The Natural Resource Management and Research Program conducts natural resource and social science research, designs long-term monitoring, conducts inventories, and provides technical assistance in support of these activities.

The Natural Resources Management and Research Office publishes and distributes natural resource technical reports and natural resource science reports as a part of the NER Regional Publications Series in accordance with the Natural Resource Publication Management Handbook (1991).

Copies are available from the following:

National Park Service
Boston Support Office
Natural Resource Management and Research
15 State Street
Boston, MA 02109-3572

Managing Birds and Controlling Aircraft in the Kennedy Airport-Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge Complex: The need for hard data and soft opinions

Kevin M. Brown
Department of Natural Resources
Cornell University
New York Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit
Ithaca, New York 14853
U.S.A. e-mail: kevin_brown @nps.gov

R. Michael Erwin
USGS-Patuxent Wildlife Research Center
Biological Resources Division
12100 Beech Forest Road
Laurel, MD 20708
U.S.A. e-mail: rme5g@virginia.edu

and

Milo E. Richmond
Department of Natural Resources
Cornell University
New York Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit
Ithaca, New York 14853
U.S.A. e-mail: mer6@cornell.edu

July 1999

National Park Service
Boston Support Office
Natural Resources Management
15 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-3572

Abstract. A recent Final Environmental Impact Study (1994) evaluated the hazards that gulls and other birds pose to aircraft at John F. Kennedy International Airport (JFKIA), New York City. The study identified gulls as a potential threat to aircraft safety and contributed a series of management recommendations aimed at reducing the presence of birds on the airport including actions to reduce/eliminate Laughing Gull (Larus atricilla) colonies in the Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge (JBWR), located adjacent to JFKIA. The National Park Service (NPS), however, was reluctant to manage the JBWR colonies (the only ones in New York State) because gull control would be contrary to their mandate to preserve natural resources in the refuge. They also maintained that the frequency of bird-strikes could be minimized by full implementation of an airport-wide, integrated wildlife management program at JFKIA.

While all agencies involved were concerned with both human safety and wildlife protection, there remained no consensus regarding an appropriate balance between these two goals and what management approach would produce it. We reviewed information from the literature in an effort to determine if: (1) NPS needs to reduce or eliminate the JBWR colonies; and (2) on-colony population control would reduce the presence of gulls, and bird-strikes, at JFKIA. Some form of on-colony management might be justified if the colonies have increased risk to the flying public and all on-airport management alternatives have been implemented and shown to be ineffective.

To monitor bird hazards at JFKIA, airport personnel record all 'bird-strikes' by aircraft each year. 'Bird-strike' data include those bird-aircraft collisions reported by pilots and ground crews (reported bird-strikes), and all dead birds found within 200 feet of the center line of a runway (assumed to be non-reported bird-strikes). Of the 3,444 total 'bird-strikes' (# of aircraft struck) recorded at JFKIA since 1979, most (2,987, 87%) were non-reported; actually carcasses found near runways. Of the 457 reported bird-strikes (mean = 23 ± 6 aircraft/year, N = 20 years), 78 (17%) involved Laughing Gulls.

Laughing Gulls colonized JBWR in 1979. During the 1980's, the colonies increased exponentially from 15 to about 7,600 nests in 1990, and the number of reported bird-strikes involving Laughing Gulls increased from 0.5 ±1.0 to 6.9 ± 2.9 aircraft per year (1979 - 1982 and 1983 - 1990, respectively, P = 0.006). A gull-shooting program was initiated at JFKIA in 1991. Since then, a total of 50,521 adult Laughing Gulls have been shot and the nesting population in JBWR has declined about 30 percent to 5,200 ± 850 nests (N=7 years, 1992-1998). Reported Laughing Gull strikes have also declined to 2.6 ± 1.3 aircraft per year (N = 8 years, P = 0.001)

but remains higher than between 1979 to 1982 when the colony was small (< 750 nests, P = 0.028). In contrast, reported bird-strikes involving non-gull species have more than doubled from 6.4 ± 2.6 to 14.9 ± 5.1 aircraft/year (1983 - 1990 and 1991 - 1998, P = 0.001).

While intuitively it seems logical that reducing bird populations near an airport would decrease bird hazards to aircraft, we found no evidence to indicate that reducing the size of the Laughing Gull colony would necessarily reduce bird-strikes at JFKIA. Dietary and mark-recapture studies suggest that 60 to 90 percent of the Laughing Gulls collected at JFKIA were either failed-breeders or non-breeding birds. Conversely, nest destruction and harassment activities at the colony could create additional hazards to aircraft because harassed birds would tower above the colony site and failed breeders would disperse to loafing areas on or near JFKIA.

At this time, we argue that the JBWR Laughing Gull colonies should not be managed at least until all on-airport management alternatives have been implemented and proven ineffective at reducing bird-strikes. While airport authorities have moved towards implementing several on-airport management programs, they have often done so only recently (long-grass management since 1987; improved drainage installed 1991 - 1994) or partially (removal of vegetation, 1998 - 1999); some recommendations were formally submitted to them as early as 1965. Thus, it was likely that the rise in the 'bird-strike' rate during 1980's could have been avoided, or at least lessened, by timely and appropriate implementation of wildlife management practices at JFKIA including habitat alterations and increasing the capability of the Bird Control Unit until it had successfully eliminated bird flocks on-airport.

Some form of management, however, may be warranted to preserve the local Laughing Gull populations. The shooting program at JFKIA may be resulting in a non-sustainable regional population. Given that JBWR represents the only Laughing Gull nesting area in New York State, and that a large number of gulls are shot each year at the airport, we recommend that attempts be made to initiate an experimental colony elsewhere on Long Island to determine if colony relocation is a feasible management option. By providing an alternative breeding site for young and prospecting birds, a second colony may lure some breeding and non-breeding gulls away from the JBWR/JFKIA airport complex and reduce the level of recruitment into this population.

History. The Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge (JBWR, about 3600 ha), located at the southwestern end of Long Island, is of major wildlife importance to the New York metropolitan area because it provides excellent nesting, migrating and wintering habitats for over 300 species of shore-, land- and waterbirds, and is one of the few relatively unmodified "greenscapes" remaining in this highly urbanized area. Jamaica Bay is a shallow (<3m at low tide except for dredged channels) tidal lagoon with one inlet. Major habitat types include numerous saltmarsh (characterized by Spartina grasses) and upland islands, several manmade fresh- and brackish water ponds, and expanses of tidal mudflats and waterways (Burger 1983a). The refuge, a unit of the Gateway National Recreation Area managed by the U.S. National Park Service (NPS), supports one of the largest heronries (about 800 pairs in 1997) on Long Island and the only Laughing Gull (Larus atricilla) and Forster's Tern (Sterna forsteri) colonies in New York State (see Sommers et al. 1996, Brown et. al. 1999a).

John F. Kennedy International Airport (JFKIA), one of the three major airports which service the New York metropolitan region, is located immediately adjacent to the northeastern boundary of Jamaica Bay (Fig. 1.); the airport is operated by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PANYNJ). This location creates a situation where bird activities in and near Jamaica Bay can be potentially hazardous to aircraft operations at JFKIA. In fact, a major runway 4L-22R (built on fill) extends into Jo Co Marsh which contains the largest colony of Laughing Gulls in the bay. As a measure of the potential hazard that birds pose to aircraft, PANYNJ record all 'bird-strikes' by aircraft each year (hereafter the 'bird-strike' rate). 'Bird-strike' data include those bird-plane collisions reported by pilots and ground crews, and all dead birds (assumed to be non-reported bird-strikes) found within 200 feet of the center line of a runway (Dolbeer et al. 1989, U.S. Department of Agriculture 1994; also see below, Definition of a 'Bird-strike').

Since it was built in the late 1940s, JFKIA (formerly Idlewild International Airport) has had problems with waterbirds attracted to its flat, freshwater-collecting areas. In 1975, a DC-10 aborted takeoff, following collision with feral Canada Geese (Branta canadensis), resulted in the destruction of the aircraft and the evacuation of all 139 people on board. After that incident, PANYNJ established a bird-control unit to disperse birds from runways and collect bird carcasses found on the airport ('bird-strikes by definition). The first dead Laughing Gull was found in the 1970s, two in 1979, and by 1984 had reached 60 (Buckley and McCarthy 1994). PANYNJ assumed that the newly established Laughing Gull colony in the refuge was the source of these

birds.

Between 1984-86, following extended discussions with NPS to remove the colony, PANYNJ contracted a study (block-design) to determine what could be done to make the airport unattractive to the gulls (Buckley and Gurien 1986, Buckley and McCarthy 1994). The authors concluded that: Oriental Beetles were the major food of gulls foraging at the airport; short grass, favored by airport maintenance, made it easy for gulls to land and consume beetles while longer grass deterred most gulls from foraging; and standing water areas were attractive to birds and should be removed. Another study between 1990 and 1992, that involved tracking color-dyed birds in the vicinity of the airport, reached similar conclusions and recommendations (Griffin and Hoopes).

Airport authorities only partially implemented those recommendations and 'bird-strikes' continued to increase as the gull colony grew (Fig. 2). From 1987 through 1990, the Laughing Gull accounted for 48 to 54 percent of all 'bird-strikes' at JFKIA. PANYNJ attributed the high incidence of Laughing Gull 'strikes', particularly during the months of June and July, to the movement of breeding adults from the colony to foraging sites within the urban areas surrounding the airport. They insist that the colony represents an unacceptable risk to the safety of the flying public and argue that reducing and/or eliminating the colony would decrease the frequency of flyovers, and ultimately reduce the 'bird-strike' rate at the airport (Dolbeer et al. 1989, USDA 1994, Dolbeer and Bucknall 1997).

Although concerned about human safety, the NPS maintained that the frequency of 'bird-strikes' could be minimized on JFKIA by full implementation of an airport-wide integrated wildlife management program that was designed to eliminate all on-airport and off-airport attractants to birds, and included an adequately staffed Bird Control Unit, trained and equipped to disperse all birds that entered the airport (Buckley and Gurien 1986, Buckley and McCarthy 1994). In this case, NPS also maintained that the more conservative stance (non-Park management) was desirable given that the JBWR Laughing Gull colonies were the only ones in New York State.

In 1991, in the midst of the Laughing Gull controversy, a gull-shooting program was initiated at JFKIA by U.S. Department of Agriculture's Wildlife Services Division (USDA, formerly known as its Animal Damage Control Unit; Dolbeer et al. 1993). During the first two years of the program, some 26,038 Laughing Gulls was shot as they attempted to overfly or pass the airport, and the number of 'bird-strikes' involving Laughing Gulls was reduced from 135 in 1990 to 60 and 22 aircraft 'struck' in 1991 and 1992, respectively (Fig. 2). But, because PANYNJ did not

prepare an environmental impact assessment prior to the shooting program, conservation groups (Fund for Animals Inc.) and private citizens filed a lawsuit against PANYNJ and government agencies (USDA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of Transportation, N.Y. State Department of Environmental Conservation). The lawsuit resulted in a Final Environmental Impact Statement regarding bird hazards at JFKIA and a review of management alternatives at the airport and in Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge (USDA 1994).

In the Final Environmental Impact Statement, each management alternative was evaluated for feasibility, effectiveness at reducing bird-strikes, and environmental impacts. The Preferred Alternative was an Integrated Management Program that included six components divided between two categories (USDA 1994, Lambertson 1994, 1996). Category 1 components addressed management actions to be conducted by PANYNJ outside of NPS property: (1) the continued development of "on-airport" management programs (habitat alterations; enhanced capability of the Bird Control Unit); (2) reduction of off-airport attractants of birds; and (3) on-airport shooting of gulls (also see Table 1). Category 2 components addressed management actions on NPS property: (4) destruction of Laughing Gull nests and eggs in the refuge; (5) on-colony shooting of adult Laughing Gulls; and (6) display of gull models to harass gulls. While Category 1 components were to begin immediately, NPS was not required to initiate steps towards implementing Category 2 actions until it was demonstrated that the off-colony components were ineffective in reducing bird-strikes (Lambertson 1994, 1996).

In this paper, we review information collected from the literature, and during our field research activities in Jamaica Bay, pertaining to the question: Does NPS need to manage the Laughing Gull colonies in JBWR and, if so, how? We accept that some form of management of the Laughing Gull colonies might be justified if either: (1) the presence of the colony has increased the level of risk to the flying public and all alternative on-airport management options (elimination of attractants to gulls) had been adequately/correctly implemented and shown to be ineffective; or (2) on-airport management practices (the gull shooting program) were detrimental to the sustainability of the local and regional Laughing Gull populations; that is, management might be necessary for the sake of the viability of the wildlife population. In the sections that follow, we present data in the context of these two criteria and conclude by discussing the feasibility of establishing a new Laughing Gull colony on Long Island.

Gull Populations in Jamaica Bay. Three species of Larus gulls nest in JBWR. Laughing Gull is a summer resident (April to November) and nests on three saltmarsh islands (about 400 total acres): Jo Co Marsh, Silver Hole Marsh, and East High Meadow. Herring and Great Black-backed Gulls (L. argentatus, L. marinus) are year-round residents and nest sympatrically on the four largest upland islands in the bay. Ring-billed Gull (L. delawarensis) is present year-round but does not yet nest on Long Island.

Although common along the Atlantic coast during the nineteenth century, the Laughing Gull was extirpated from Long Island before 1890 by eggers and feather hunters (Bent 1921). It did not return to Long Island as a breeding bird until 1978 when one nest was found on the Line Island complex in Great South Bay, near Jones Beach (Buckley et al. 1978).

In 1979, 15 pairs of Laughing Gulls colonized Jo Co Marsh in JBWR (Post and Riepe 1980). During the 1980's, the number of nests in the colony increased exponentially to about 7,600 nests in 1990 (Buckley and Buckley 1984, Griffin and Hoopes 1992; Fig. 1). In 1991, the gull-shooting program began at JFKIA. Since then, a total of 50,521 Laughing Gulls has been shot at the airport and the number of nests in the colony has declined about 30 percent to 5,200 ± 850 nests/year (N = 7 years, 1991-1998; data taken from Dolbeer et al. 1997, Dolbeer and Chipman 1998).

During the past 25 years, the number of Herring Gull pairs nesting in JBWR has decreased linearly from about 3,300 pairs in 1974 - 1978 to 2,350 pairs in 1998 ($r = 0.6$, $P = 0.0232$) while nesting Great Black-backed Gulls have increased in the same period from about 50 to 400 pairs in 1998 (linear relationship, $r = 0.8$, $P = 0.0001$; Buckley and Buckley 1980, Brown et al. 1999a).

HAS THE LAUGHING GULL COLONY INCREASED THE LEVEL OF RISK TO THE FLYING PUBLIC?

Next, we review information pertaining to five factors that will help to determine if the Laughing Gull colony in JBWR has indeed increased the level of risk to the flying public at JFKIA including: (1) the definition of a 'bird-strike'; (2) the frequency of 'bird-strikes'; (3) intraspecific risk; (4) sources and status of gulls reported as 'bird-strikes'; and (5) aircraft wake turbulence as a source of bird mortality. In order to determine whether or not the Laughing Gull colony has increased the relative risk to aircraft and passengers, we need a baseline level for comparison. Here, we use the frequency of 'bird-strikes' as an indirect measure of risk (also see Intraspecific Risk). Ideally, it

would be best to compare risk imposed by Laughing Gulls and other birds between the 20 year period since the Laughing Gull colony was established in JBWR (e.g. 1979 - 1998) to a similar period prior to colonization. Prior to 1979, however, 'bird-strike' data are presently not available and so, as a baseline for comparison, we use bird-strike data collected during the four year period between 1979 and 1982 when the colony was relatively small (≤ 715 nesting pairs).

Definition of a 'Bird-strike' and its Implications for Kennedy Airport. According to the international standard definition of a 'bird-strike', developed by Bird Strike Committee Canada and endorsed by the United Nations' International Civil Aviation Organization (USDA 1994), a bird-strike is considered to have occurred when either: (a) a pilot reports a bird-strike, (b) aircraft maintenance personnel identify damage to an aircraft as having been caused by a bird(s); (c) personnel on the ground report seeing an aircraft strike a bird(s); or (d) a bird carcass, or parts thereof, is found on an active runway, or within 200 feet of a runway, unless another cause of death is identified. This standard definition is used to collect 'bird-strike' data at JFKIA and most other airports in the U.S., Canada and Europe (USDA 1994).

Thus, 'bird-strike' data at JFKIA come from two different sources: (1) all reported bird-strikes (includes a, b, and c, above) are investigated by searching the designated runway and the adjacent areas for dead birds and, when possible, inspecting the aircraft for bird remains; and (2) Bird Control Unit personnel at the airport continually search runways and adjacent areas on their patrols and collect all dead birds which are all assumed (our emphasis) to be unreported 'bird-strikes' (d, above; Burger 1985, Dolbeer et al. 1989). Thus, any dead birds that are found within 200 feet of a runway are considered 'bird-strikes' by definition unless another cause of death is identified. At JFKIA, reported strikes account for 8 to 22 percent of all 'bird-strikes' each year (Dolbeer and Chipman 1998).

While it may be correct to assume that all reported strikes are indeed bird-plane collisions, especially if they are confirmed by inspection of the plane, it is unlikely that all bird carcasses collected near runways (unreported 'bird-strikes') are the result of actual collisions with aircraft. Given the large breeding population of gulls adjacent to the airport, it is probable that some birds die near runways from natural (avian botulism, poor body condition, high mortality of newly fledged young, predation) and other causes (wake turbulence, see below). This rationale is supported by the fact that while Laughing Gulls accounted for 51.8 percent (± 2.4; range = 48 to

54%) of all 'bird-strikes' from 1987 through 1990, it accounted for notably fewer (32.6 ± 11.0%, range = 19 to 45%) of the reported strikes (Dolbeer et al. 1989, Dolbeer and Bucknall 1997; Appendix 1).

Based upon the differences regarding the known information between reported and unreported 'bird-strikes,' we believe that the number of reported strikes is a somewhat better measure of actual risk to the flying public. It seems logical that if a bird actually collides with a plane, then some evidence (freeze-dried tissue; similar to when an insect strikes the windshield of a car) should be found during regular inspections and maintenance by ground crews; tissues would most likely be found on the nose/cockpit area or in an engine, and occasionally on the leading edge of a wing. While the number of reported strikes might represent a minimum estimate of the actual number of bird-aircraft collisions (Burger 1985), because air-carriers may be reluctant to report bird-strikes, the most serious cases (i.e. collisions that cause aircraft damage and delays) are likely reported and investigated.

In the sections that follow, we use the term 'bird-strike' (in quotes) to refer collectively to unreported and reported strikes (data taken from Dolbeer et al. 1989, Dolbeer and Chipman 1998); we also discuss reported strikes separated (unpublished data from R. Dolbeer, personal communication; see Appendix 1).

Frequency of 'Bird-strikes' at Kennedy Airport. Since 1979, there have been a total of 3,444 'bird-strikes' at JFKIA (N = 20 years; Appendix 1). Most (1,052, 93%) of the 1,130 'bird-strikes' involving Laughing Gulls were unreported 'strikes' or carcasses found near runways. From 1979 through 1990, the numbers of Laughing Gull 'bird-strikes' at JFKIA were correlated with the numbers of Laughing Gull nests in the JBWR colony (Spearman rank correlation: r = 0.8, Z = 2.5, P = 0.0124; Fig. 2). Since the gull-shooting program began at JFKIA in 1991, the mean (±1SD) number of Laughing Gull 'bird-strikes' has dropped from 104 ± 49 (1983 - 1990, N = 8 years) to 30 ± 14 per year (1991 - 1998, N = 8 years; Table 2).

Of the 457 reported bird-strikes since 1979, 78 (17%) involved Laughing Gulls. From 1979 to 1990, there was also a significant correlation between the number of reported Laughing Gull strikes and the size of the colony (Spearman rank correlation: N = 11 years, r = 0.9, P = 0.0045). Reported strikes increased from 0.5 ±1.0 to 6.9 ± 2.9 aircraft per year between 1979 - 1982 and 1983 - 1990, respectively (Mann-Whitney U test: U = 32, P = 0.006; Table 2). During the eight

years since the shooting program began in 1991, the number of reported strikes involving Laughing Gulls (N = 21 reports, 3 aircraft were damaged or delayed) has declined to 2.6 ± 1.3 aircraft per year but still remains higher than between 1979 to 1982 when the colony was small (U = 63, P = 0.001; U = 28.5, P = 0.028; respectively).

Laughing Gull is one of over 50 species recorded in 'bird-strikes' at JFKIA (USDA 1994). All species taken together, the number of reported bird-strikes has ranged from 14 to 37 aircraft per year since 1979 (mean = 23 ± 6 aircraft/year, N = 20 years, Dolbeer and Chipman 1998; see Appendix 1). From 1979 to 1990, the total number of reported bird-strikes was not correlated to the number of Laughing Gull nests in JBWR (Spearman rank correlation: 1979-1990, N = 11 years, r = 0.4, P = 0.1937; Fig. 3).

Correctly identifying the species involved in reported strikes requires analyses of tissues collected from the aircraft because bird carcasses found near runways are often gulls. During the late-1980's, about one half the bird carcasses found near runways at JFKIA were Laughing Gulls raising the possibility that some reported strikes may have been incorrectly attributed to it; that is, when PANYNJ personnel searched runways for dead birds after a reported strike, they were most likely to find a Laughing Gull carcass especially prior to the onset of shooting program in 1991. It is interesting to note that while the frequencies of 'bird-strikes' involving other birds (*non-gull* carcasses found near runways) are similar between 1983 - 1990 and 1991 - 1998, the number of non-gull reported strikes has more than doubled since 1991 (6.4 ± 2.6 to 14.9 ± 5.1, respectively; U = 64, P = 0.001; Table 2).

While the association between the size of the Laughing Gull colony and the frequency of 'bird-strikes,' and reported strikes, with aircraft at JFKIA is strong (the Laughing Gull colony appears to have increased the level of risk to the flying public), it is important to point out that simply finding a correlation (an association) between two variables does not determine causality; variable A may cause variable B or, equally likely, B may cause A (Zar 1996). Obviously we do not believe that the rise in the 'bird-strike' rate at JFKIA caused the growth of the Laughing Gull colony in JBWR. But more importantly both variables could be correlated to a third factor that was either not quantified or controlled for in the analysis. For example, both the growth of the Laughing Gull colony and the increase in 'bird-strikes' could be related to the dramatic increase in the total North American population of Laughing Gulls between 1966 and 1994, and the eventual expansion of their breeding range to Long Island (reviewed by Burger 1996), coupled with increases in on-

airport attractants to gulls at JFKIA (food, standing water; see Buckley and Gurien 1986, Griffin and Hoopes 1992, Buckley and McCarthy 1994). Other confounding variables include: (1) increasing numbers of aircraft operations at JFKIA (over 3 percent each year between 1986 and 1992; USDA 1994); (2) increasing use of wide-bodied aircraft (Boeing 747, L1011, DC-10), equipped with larger and quieter engines, that were involved in disproportionately more bird-strikes than the old-type, narrow-bodied aircraft (Boeing 707, 727; Burger 1983b); and (3) inadequacies in the definition of a 'bird-strike'.

Intraspecific Risk. Bird species are not equally hazardous to aircraft. Intraspecific risk can have important implications to wildlife managers at airports because actions to reduce one species may increase the abundance of another species (Burger 1983c, Dolbeer and Wright 1998). For example, at JFKIA, maintaining grass height above 14 cm has apparently reduced the numbers of Laughing Gulls feeding on scarabaeid beetles but increased the abundance of small mammals, in turn attracting more raptors (pers. comm., L. Ryder, PANYNJ).

Several authors have suggested that gulls pose the greatest avian threat to aircraft (Burger 1983c, 1985, Dolbeer et al. 1989, Seubert 1990). In addition to sheer numbers of individuals, however, numerous other factors also contribute to the inherent risk of different bird species to aircraft collisions including their ecology and behavior, body mass and density, wing-loading (body mass/wing area, $g \cdot cm^{-2}$) and aerial agility. For example, birds such as swallows and starlings that form large flocks can be particularly hazardous to aircraft because engine failures are more likely to occur when multiple birds are ingested (U.S. Department of Transportation: Federal Aviation Administration 1992). Birds like Laughing Gulls with low wing-loading are typically maneuverable and agile flyers and so are better able to avoid aircraft than those with relatively higher wing-loading, such as Canada and Snow geese (Chen caerulescens) and Mute Swans (Cygnus olor).

The probability of engine damage increases with the mass of the ingested bird. In a wind tunnel experiment with Boeing 737 engines, birds heavier than 0.5 kg were more likely to cause engine damage than lighter ones (USDT:FAA 1992). From the National Wildlife Strike Database, Dolbeer and Wright (1998) estimated the relative hazard scores for 19 species-groups of birds that had been involved in 17 or more 'bird-strikes' since 1991. Based upon extent of damage to aircraft, and the effect on flight, they found that relative hazard scores were significantly and positively correlated

with body mass; vultures and geese ranked the most hazardous among the 19 groups of birds. Among four species of gulls, ranked ninth as a group, the larger-bodied Great Black-backed and Herring Gulls were more likely to cause damage or affect flight than relatively smaller-bodied Ring-billed and Laughing Gulls (Dolbeer and Wright 1998). These four species of gulls had intraspecific body masses ranging from 1.20 to 2.10 kgs (Good 1998), 0.72 to 1.38 (Pierotti and Good 1994), 0.38 to 0.65 (Ryder 1993) and 0.20 to 0.37 (Burger 1996). For example, from 1979 to 1998, Herring Gulls caused more damaged and delayed aircraft at JFKIA than Laughing Gulls (15 versus 11 cases, respectively; Dolbeer and Chipman 1998); it was not stated how many aircraft were damaged versus delayed.

Sources and Breeding Status of Laughing Gulls at Kennedy airport. Based upon observations of color-marked gulls, the JBWR colony is known to be a periodic and seasonal (April to August) source of gulls at JFKIA (Griffin and Hoopes 1992). What is not clear, however, is the actual proportion that are breeders from JBWR colony among all gulls present at the airport any one time. Based upon differences between nestling diet (predominantly marine origin), and that of adults collected at the airport (mostly insects), Buckley and Gurien (1986) and Buckley and McCarthy (1994) concluded that most (90%) of the Laughing Gulls foraging on JFKIA property were not current breeders; this estimate would include non-breeders as well as those breeders that failed during the incubation stage or had come in from elsewhere. Of the Laughing Gulls shot at JFKIA each year, about nine percent are second-year birds and young-of-the-year fledglings (Dolbeer and Bucknall 1997).

In 1996 - 1998, as part of a related study in JBWR (Brown et al. 1999b), we color-marked one or more Laughing Gull chicks on their heads with Rhodamine B (pink) dye from 79, 247 and 179 nests, respectively. Chicks were marked at hatching and dye was subsequently transferred to the breast and side feathers of their brooding parents. Assuming that one parent was marked per chick dyed (maximum 2 parents per nest), we estimate that about 91, 433 and 312 adult gulls were marked with dye in 1996, 1997 and 1998, respectively; of those color-marked, 5, 24 and 31 (5.5, 5.5 and 9.9%) were subsequently shot at JFKIA in the 3 years (Table 3).

In 1996, 1997 and 1998, totals of 1,970, 3,242 and 2,920 Laughing Gull were shot at JFKIA. Assuming that our sample of color-marked gulls was representative of the breeding population, then about 5 - 10 percent of the breeding population was shot at the airport each year; equivalent to

471, 372, and 1,079 breeding gulls, in the 3 years, respectively (Table 3). Accordingly, we estimate that 11 - 37 percent of those shot were parental gulls with chicks; the remaining 63 to 89 percent were either failed and/or non-breeding birds.

The sources and breeding status of gulls (those with young versus failed and non-breeders), that contribute most to the 'bird-strike' rate, at JFKIA have critical management implications concerning the Laughing Gull colony in JBWR. If indeed most of the Laughing Gulls that frequent JFKIA airspace are failed and non-breeders, then non-lethal control techniques (in-colony nest destruction and egg-oiling, and falconry) would increase the population on non-breeders in the JBWR/JFKIA complex and so possibly increase the frequency of 'bird-strikes' and the numbers of gulls shot at the airport. During an egg-oiling experiment at the colony in 1990, Griffin and Hoopes (1992) observed disproportionately more red-dyed adults (marked at oil-treated nests) on airport property than green-dyed adults (marked at non-treated nests) suggesting that recently failed breeders were more likely to visit JFKIA than those tending eggs and chicks.

Wake Turbulence as a Source of Bird Mortality. If not collisions with aircraft, what accounts for the other 80 to 90 percent of the birds found dead near runways? We suggest, as did Buckley and Gurien (1986), that many of the dead birds found near runways at JFKIA are being killed by the wake turbulence (i.e. wing-tip vortex) produced by large commercial aircraft. As an airfoil passes through the air, the air rolls up and back about each wing tip producing two distinct counter-rotating vortices, one trailing each wing-tip. The intensity of the turbulence within these vortices is directly proportional to the weight, and inversely proportional to the wing span and the speed of the airplane; that is, the heavier and slower the airplane, the greater is the intensity of the air circulation in the vortex cores. Therefore, the most violent vortices are generated during take-off and landing, and near maximum gross weights. The vertical gusts encountered when crossing laterally through the vortex can impose structural loads as high as 10Gs and can cause the structural failure of small 'light' aircraft such as Cesna 152s/172s and Piper Cherokees. The combined effect of an up-gust followed immediately by a down-gust has been estimated to be as high as 80 feet per second; most small planes are designed to withstand vertical gusts of only 30 feet per second (MacDonald 1963).

Wing-tip vortices are generated at the point of lift-off and end when the aircraft touches down (i.e. they occur only between take-off and landing). The vortices settle below and behind the

aircraft, and may trail the aircraft by 10 miles; in still air, they decay slowly and may be encountered as long as five minutes after the passage of the airplane. When vortices sink to the ground, they tend to move laterally outward over the ground at a speed of about 5 knots and so may position themselves parallel to the designated, or a parallel, runway (MacDonald 1963). Given the potential hazard that wake turbulence poses to the structural integrity of light aircraft, it is not surprising that many bird carcasses are found near runways at JFKIA and other large airports. Their role in the causes of bird deaths on airports remains unstudied.

MANAGEMENT OPTIONS TO REDUCE THE PRESENCE OF BIRDS AT KENNEDY AIRPORT

Three approaches have been used in an effort to reduce the abundance of gulls and other birds at airports: (1) the reduction of gull populations on or near the airport; (2) habitat manipulations to reduce and eliminate on-airport and off-airport attractants to birds; and (3) dispersing and removing birds from the airport. In this paper, we do not attempt to review all of the various techniques employed to control bird populations, or their effectiveness at doing so (see reviews by Burger 1983c, Seubert 1990, USDA 1994). Instead, we focus our discussion on those Category 1 and 2 management options (after USDA 1994) that are applicable to the Laughing Gull controversy in the JBWR/JFKIA complex (also see Table 1).

Category 1: Integrated Wildlife Management Program at Kennedy Airport. Airports are attractive to birds because they are generally flat and open, and they provide roosting and loafing areas that have good visibility of predators (e.g. runways, light stands), sources of fresh water for drinking and bathing, and a variety of food resources including seeds, insects, small mammals and human refuse (Blokpoel 1976, Burger 1983c). Presumably then, bird-plane interactions could be minimized by making the airport and its vicinity unattractive to birds. Indeed, several authors stress that habitat modification is the best long-term solution to bird control at airports, and that management must extend beyond the airport to reduce the numbers of birds that come to the vicinity of the airport (e.g. Burger 1983c, and references within Seubert 1990, Buckley and McCarthy 1994). Thus, a good wildlife management program would include eliminating both on-airport and off-airport attractants to birds, and a Bird Control Unit sufficiently staffed, trained and equipped to disperse all birds that enter the airport at any time of day or night,

365 days per year.

Habitat Alterations at Kennedy Airport. The development of the Bird Hazard Reduction Program at JFKIA has been an on-going process since the 1960's when PANYNJ began removing water and vegetation that were attractive to birds, and harassing birds with carbide cannons and pyrotechnics (USDA 1994). Since then, several studies have been conducted at the airport to evaluate the 'bird-strike' problem and to identify on-airport attractants to birds (Buckley and Gurien 1986, Buurma et al. 1989, Griffin and Hoopes 1992, Buckley and McCarthy 1994). For example, in 1965, J. Bull (American Museum of Natural History, cited in USDA 1994) submitted several recommendations to PANYNJ including: (1) the elimination of water on the airport; (2) modification of the airport's shoreline with Jamaica Bay; (3) the employment of a shotgun patrol to harass birds; and (4) the elimination of nearby landfill sites.

Based upon these and other recommendations, the PANYNJ has implemented a variety of management programs at JFKIA in an effort to make the habitat less attractive to birds. For example, in 1985 and 1986, Buckley and Gurien (1986) and Buckley and McCarthy (1994) identified 10 areas on runways where gulls were attracted to pools of standing water. Similarly, from June to August 1990, Griffin and Hoopes found that gulls spent the majority (range: 60 - 100%) of their time on JFKIA engaged in maintenance behaviors (resting, preening), usually in a large area (50 x 20 m) of standing water between two taxiways. Accordingly, between 1991 and 1994, PANYNJ has filled or repaved many of these wet areas and installed styrofoam wicks to improve drainage near most runways and taxiways (USDA 1994).

Buckley and Gurien (1986) and Buckley and McCarthy (1994) also found that short-grassy areas near runways were attractive to Laughing Gulls foraging for Oriental Beetles (Anomala orientalis), their dominant food on-airport, and recommended that these areas be eliminated by reducing the frequency of mowing and maintaining grass height above 45 cm. Since 1987, PANYNJ has attempted to maintain long-grass conditions near runways during the summer, regularly applies pesticides (at two-week intervals) to control insect populations (USDA 1994) and, in 1998, began to remove shrubs, brush and other cover attractive to birds and rodents (Dolbeer et al. 1999). PANYNJ has also improved sanitation at the airport by replacing open trash containers with closed trash compactors, and prohibiting taxi drivers from feeding birds (USDA 1994). Despite all of these initiatives, however, insects and human refuse have consistently been the most frequent food types found in the stomachs of adult Laughing Gulls collected on JFKIA

(Griffin and Hoopes 1992, Brown et al. 1999b).

PANYNJ has committed less effort to eliminating off-airport attractants located nearby (< 5 km) although several have been identified including three landfills located adjacent to Jamaica Bay (Bull 1965, Burger 1983a), Jamaica Sewage Treatment Plant and Aqueduct Race Track (Griffin and Hoopes 1992). Pennsylvania and Fountain Avenue landfills were closed in 1985 and Edgemere in 1991 (Fig. 1).

Removal and Dispersal of Birds from Kennedy Airport. One of the earliest bird control recommendations to PANYNJ was the employment of a shotgun patrol to harass and disperse birds from the airport (Bull 1965). After the 1975 DC-10 aborted takeoff, PANYNJ employed a Bird Control Unit to keep runways clear of birds and stationed one full-time person in the FAA control tower to monitor bird activity and potential hazards. During each of two consecutive 8-hour shifts every day, Unit staff (one supervisor and one agent per shift) conduct roving patrols and runway sweeps to disperse birds from the vicinity of runways, collect dead birds and keep records of all 'bird-strikes' (USDA 1994). During the 1980s, however, several independent evaluations included recommendations directed at enhancing and modernizing the capability of the Bird Control Unit to disperse birds including higher levels of staffing (i.e. > 2 patrols), better training of staff to detect, identify and disperse birds, and the availability of state-of-the-art bird dispersal equipment (Buckley and Gurien 1986, Burma et al. 1989, Griffin and Hoopes 1992, Buckley and McCarthy 1994). These recommendations have not been fully implemented (USDA 1994, Lambertson 1994, 1996).

Given the location and the size of JFKIA (about 4,930 acres), are two bird control personnel/patrols per shift sufficient to protect the airport? The increasing numbers of 'bird-strikes' (an indirect measure of bird activity on the airport) during the 1980's indicates that the Bird Control Unit was not effective at detecting and dispersing birds. For example, in August 1990, Griffin and Hoopes (1992) observed three feeding flocks each of about 2000 gulls (95% Laughing Gulls) hawking insects over three separate areas of the airport. In one case, a flock persisted within the vicinity of two active runways for at least 75 minutes. During this time, there were three reported bird-strikes involving six Laughing Gulls, one immature Herring Gull and one adult Great Black-backed Gull.

In response to the increasing numbers of 'gull-strikes', PANYNJ contracted with the USDA's Wildlife Services Division to conduct a gull-shooting program at JFKIA since 1991; usually for

about 10 weeks during the gull nesting season (mid-May to early August; see Dolbeer et al. 1993). Each morning, five biologists, armed with shotguns and live ammunition, were stationed along the airport perimeter adjacent to the bay to shoot all gulls that flew within the immediate vicinity (30 - 40 m) of the airport. In 1996, an experimental falconry program was also added to aid bird dispersal efforts at the airport.

While the shooting program has reduced the number of 'bird-strikes' involving gulls, the reduction also may have been due to the overall increase in human effort to control birds before they enter the airport. It cannot be ruled out that an equal effort by bird-control personnel (7 persons/units per shift) using non-lethal bird dispersal techniques (distress calls, pyrotechnics) would also have reduced 'bird-strikes' at the airport during the 1980s and 1990s. This hypothesis could be tested by manipulating the number of personnel using non-lethal techniques to disperse birds and recording the numbers of bird-strikes. Such a study could be conducted at JFKIA by encouraging USDA shooters to use non-lethal techniques to disperse gulls (and also other birds) prior to lethal control. Reductions in the numbers of reported bird-strikes, bird carcasses near runways, and gulls shot at JFKIA would support the hypothesis.

Currently, it is not possible to determine whether or not the on-airport wildlife management programs have already reduced, or eventually will reduce, bird hazards to aircraft because (1) PANYNJ has yet to produce a written Wildlife Management Plan that is in compliance with the Final Environmental Impact Statement (USDA 1994), and (2) on-airport management programs often fail to include the appropriate control groups and sampling protocols that are necessary for rigorous scientific evaluation (e.g. falconry, non-lethal bird dispersal; also see Burger 1983c).

Category 2: On-colony Population Management. In the Final Environmental Impact Statement (USDA 1994), and in the USDA's and USFWS's records of decision, the preferred "on-colony" management option (Category 2) was the relocation of the Laughing Gull colony from Jamaica Bay to another suitable location more remote from the airport. Implicit to this option is the establishment of a new colony on Long Island and the simultaneous elimination of the existing one in JBWR. Is colony relocation a feasible management option (i.e., practical to implement and effective at long term reduction of bird strikes)?

Eliminating the Laughing Gull Colony. USDA (1994) biologists reviewed numerous lethal (e.g.,

poisoning and shooting adults, destruction of nests and eggs) and non-lethal (e.g., habitat modifications, harassment, exclosures) management techniques aimed at reducing and/or eliminating the Laughing Gull colony in JBWR. The colony (about 5,450 nests in 1998) spreads over three adjacent marshes (about 400 total acres). Based upon their literature review and interviews with knowledgeable professionals, USDA evaluated each method for technical feasibility (practical to implement), effectiveness at reducing the colony, and environmental impacts. They concluded that a combination of colony-wide nest and egg destruction every two weeks, on-colony shooting of adults from blinds, and continuous harassment with models of dead gulls would be the best approach to reduce and eliminate the colony (USDA 1994).

While it is probable that nest destruction and gull harassment would reduce the nesting population, at least during the implementation period, the elimination of the colony will likely require long-term management (> 5 years, possibly indefinitely; see Olijnyk and Brown 1999) and might ultimately depend upon the availability of alternative nesting sites (Burger 1983c, USDA 1994). In this case, it is also important to point out that frequent and prolonged human-intrusion into the colony would result in structural damage to the marsh habitat (trampling of grasses) and also have detrimental effects (nest and egg loss) on other non-target, marsh-nesting species including Common and Forster's terns, Clapper Rails (Rallus longirostris), and Black Ducks (Anas rubripes).

Given the potentially adverse consequences associated with nest destruction activities, it is important to evaluate a priori whether or not population reduction would indeed reduce gull hazards to aircraft at JFKIA. While the USDA (1994) describes the various management protocols in detail, and review the literature regarding the effectiveness of each technique to reduce populations, they were unable to cite a single case study that shows that on-colony reduction of a gull population did indeed reduce bird-strikes. In her review of bird control techniques at airports, Burger (1983b) points out that such information is sparse and often available only on non-peer-reviewed reports from Bird Control meetings.

Does population reduction actually reduce gull hazards at airports? Seubert (1990) reviewed eight cases where gull populations were reduced or eliminated from colony sites near airports (range: 1 to 40 km). Of these eight case studies, Herring Gull strikes were apparently reduced at two airports. Although Seubert provided details pertaining to control method, numbers of gulls killed, and/or the extent of the population reduction, he did not provide any data pertaining to the

degree of gull hazard reduction. Upon reviewing data from five other bird control programs, Burger (1983b) found that killing large numbers of birds only achieved a temporary population reduction. She concluded that: (1) attempts to maintain bird populations below the carrying capacity of the environment have generally been expensive and unsuccessful; and (2) killing gulls at airports has also failed to reduce populations because other gulls move in from elsewhere to fill vacant niches. Burger (1983b) asserts that permanent reductions of birds can be achieved only by lowering the carrying capacity of the environment by direct manipulation of habitat.

Burger's conclusions remain particularly relevant to the Laughing Gull situation at JFKIA. First, despite the shooting of over 50,000 Laughing Gulls at the airport, the colony in JBWR remains at about 5,200 ± 850 pairs (1992 - 1998; a 30 percent reduction since 1990) because of immigration from New Jersey and elsewhere (Dolbeer and Chipman 1998). Second, numbers of non-gull, reported strikes have more than doubled since the gull shooting program was initiated in 1991 (Table 2). Third, numbers of reported strikes involving all birds has remained relatively constant since 1979 (range: 14 - 37 aircraft struck/year; mean = 23 ± 6 aircraft/year, N = 20 years). Taken together, these facts suggest that, during the 1980's Laughing Gulls may have displaced other birds from foraging and loafing habitats on and near JFKIA.

While intuitively it seems logical that reducing bird populations near an airport would decrease bird hazards to aircraft, there is no evidence to indicate that a reduction of the JBWR Laughing Gull colony would yield any reduction in bird-strikes at JFKIA. Conversely, nest destruction and harassment activities at a gull colony located adjacent to an airport could create additional hazards to aircraft because harassed birds would tower above the colony site and/or failed breeders would disperse to loafing areas on or near the airport (Seubert 1990, Griffin and Hoopes 1992, USDA 1994).

Establishing a New Colony. Relocating the JBWR Laughing Gull colony to another location on Long Island requires identifying suitable nesting habitat that is in close proximity to abundant natural food resources, and attracting prospecting birds to the desired colony site. Currently, it is not known if another suitable nesting site exists on Long Island.

During the past 20 years, Laughing Gulls have made few attempts to nest elsewhere on Long Island. In 1978, one nest was found on the Line Island complex in Great South Bay, near Jones Beach (Buckley et al. 1978). In 1990 and 1991, up to four pairs nested on North Cinder Island (the Cinder Island Group, Town of Hempstead; Sommers et al. 1994), and two pairs nested on

Young's Island, Smithtown, in 1995 (Sommers et al. 1996); these sites were abandoned after one or two years of nesting attempts. Historically, Laughing Gulls nested in South Oyster Bay up to 1884, at Amityville until 1887, and on Cedar Island as late as 1888 (W. Dutcher in Bent 1921).

In New York and New Jersey, Laughing Gulls typically nest on non-barrier saltmarsh islands, characterized by Spartina grasses; tidal flooding is often the major cause of nest loss (Bongiorno 1970, Montevecchi 1978, Burger and Shisler 1980). It may be possible to use marsh-nesting Forster's and Common Terns to identify those marsh habitats suitable (low wave action and tidal flooding) for nesting by Laughing Gulls. For example, in New Jersey during 1989, the Laughing Gull nested with Forster's and Common terns at 27 (84%) and 50 (62%) colony sites (Jenkins et al. 1990; Table 4). Although the bulk of breeding Forster's Terns on Long Island are in JBWR colonies, they are slowly expanding into saltmarshes north of Long Beach and Jones Beach where Common Terns have long had a large presence. Breeding Common Terns are widely distributed on Long Island, and in the period 1974-83 alone, colonies were found at 115 different sites, with as many as 50 marsh colonies in a given year (Buckley and Buckley 1980, 2000).

In addition to identifying suitable nesting and foraging habitats, several extrinsic factors must be considered when choosing a location to establish a gull colony including land ownership, human disturbance, potential conflicts with human interests (marinas, vineyards) and resident species, and the distance from the site to JFKIA and other airports. At a colony on Egg Island, New Jersey, radio-tagged Laughing Gulls were located up to 40 km from the colony foraging at airports, agricultural fields and other sites (Dosch 1996, 1997).

If a suitable location is found for a new colony, prospecting gulls could be attracted to the site using physical (wrack) and social stimuli (decoys of courting Laughing Gulls, vocalizations broadcast through speakers). Kress (1983) used tern decoys and non-aggressive vocalizations to encourage the settlement and nesting of Arctic Terns (S. paradisaea) on Eastern Egg Rock, Maine. Similarly, Blokpoel et al. (1997) used decoys and gull harassment techniques to restore a Common Tern colony on Ice Island in the St. Lawrence River.

Animal Welfare Considerations. It may be desirable to relocate the colony for ethical reasons and necessary to sustain the natural population in New York. Since the gull-shooting program began in 1991, a total of 50,521 Laughing Gulls have been shot at JFKIA. After one year of shooting, the number of nests in the JBWR colony declined about 30 percent from 7,600 nests in

1990 to 5,100 in 1992. Since 1992, the colony has remained relatively stable at 5,200 ± 850 nests/year (N = 7 years, 1992-1998; data taken from Dolbeer et al. 1997, Dolbeer and Chipman 1998).

The shooting program could also be having adverse effects on regional populations of Laughing Gulls. The recent stability of the JBWR colony, despite the loss of thousands of adults each year, suggests that the Jamaica Bay population may be acting as a sink. That is, prospecting gulls immigrate to JBWR and are subsequently shot at JFKIA. Of the banded Laughing Gulls shot at JFKIA, most (97%) were banded as chicks at colony sites in New Jersey (Dolbeer and Bucknall 1997). During the 1980's, the New Jersey population increased from 30,700 adults in 1977 to 58,722 adults in 1989, but has subsequently declined to 39,085 adults in 1995 (Jenkins et al. 1990, D. Jenkins pers. comm.). It is not clear to what extent this apparent decline (about 34%) is the direct result of the shooting program at JFKIA.

Given that JBWR represents the only Laughing Gull nesting area in New York State, we recommend that attempts be made to initiate an experimental colony elsewhere on Long Island to determine if colony relocation is a feasible management option. By providing an alternative breeding site for young and prospecting birds, a second colony also may attract some Laughing Gulls from JBWR and reduce the level of recruitment into this population. Furthermore, it is more important to determine if a second colony would reduce gull abundance at JFKIA. While it is possible that an alternative breeding site would attract young and prospecting gulls away from the JBWR/JFKIA complex, a second colony could also result in more Laughing Gulls at local airports.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this paper, we have attempted to objectively review information pertaining to the effect that the JBWR Laughing Gull colony has had on 'bird-stikes' at JFKIA. Has the colony increased the level of risk to the flying public? Below, we list our conclusions:

1. Laughing Gull is one of more than 50 species of that have been struck by planes at JFKIA. Given the relatively low mass of Laughing Gulls (about 0.3kg), they are less likely to cause engine damage to aircraft than larger, heavier (> 500 g) less agile birds like Herring and Great Black-

backed Gulls or geese.

2. The definition of a 'bird-strike' at JFKIA requires re-definition. 'Bird-strike' data come from two very different sources including (1) reported strikes and (2) all bird carcasses found near runways that are assumed to be unreported 'bird-strikes' (see above, and Dolbeer et al. 1989). Most (80 - 90% per year) 'bird-strikes' at JFKIA are actually dead birds found near runways whose actual causes of mortality are unknown (collision with an aircraft versus wake turbulence and natural causes).

Based on differences between reported and unreported 'bird-strikes,' we strongly urge that these two data sets always be presented separately. In addition, the misleading term 'bird-strike' should be changed to "index of bird mortality" since the later term more accurately reflects the known information pertaining to unreported 'bird-strikes'. Similarly, confirmed reported strikes should be referred to as "bird-plane collisions". We believe that the number of reported strikes (known collisions) each year is a better measure of risk to planes and passengers; all airlines should be encouraged to report such strikes.

3. Data pertaining to whether or not the Laughing Gull colony has increased the level of risk to aircraft at JFKIA are contentious. From 1979 to 1990, the number of Laughing Gulls involved in reported strikes increased with year and with the number of pairs nesting in the refuge. Including all bird species, however, the numbers of aircraft actually struck by birds were not correlated with either the size of the Laughing Gull colony or year.

Including all bird species, numbers of reported strikes have fluctuated between 14 - 37 aircraft each year (mean = 23 ± 6 aircraft/year, N = 20 years). While reported strikes were highest from 1983 to 1990, only about 25 percent involved Laughing Gulls while 50 percent involved other gulls. Since the shooting program began at JFKIA in 1991, numbers of aircraft struck (reported strikes) by Laughing Gulls have been reduced to a levels similar to that recorded between 1979 and 1982 when the colony was small (Dolbeer and Chipman 1998). Reported strikes involving non-gull species, however, have more than doubled since 1991. Taken together, these data suggest that the level of risk to planes and passengers at JFKIA has remained constant during the past 20 years, irrespective of the size of the Laughing Gull colony.

4. Based upon three years of mark and recapture data (1996 - 1998), we estimated that 11, 24 and 37 percent (average = 24%) of Laughing Gulls shot at JFKIA were breeding adults from JBWR; the remaining 60 to 90 percent were either failed and/or non-breeding birds. If most of the Laughing Gulls frequenting JFKIA airspace are failed and non-breeders, then non-lethal control techniques (on-colony nest destruction, egg-oiling and falconry) to manage the colony would increase the population of non-breeders in the JBWR/JFKIA complex, in turn possibly increasing the frequency of 'bird-strikes' and numbers of gulls shot at the airport.

5. While PANYNJ has moved towards implementing several on-airport management programs, they have often done so only recently (long-grass management since 1987; improved drainage installed 1991 - 1994) or partially (removal of vegetation, 1998 - 1999); recall that some recommendations were formally submitted to them as early as 1965. Thus, it is likely that the rise in the 'bird-strike' rate during 1980's could have been avoided, or at least lessened, by timely and appropriate implementation of wildlife management practices at JFKIA including habitat alterations (eliminating sources of food and water) and increasing the capability of the Bird Control Unit until it had successfully eliminated bird flocks on-airport.

6. Since the gull-shooting program began at JFKIA in 1991, the number of Laughing Gull nests in JBWR has declined about 30 percent to 5,200 ± 850 nests (N=7 years). While the Jamaica Bay population has remained relatively stable for seven years, despite the loss of 50,521 adults, the Laughing Gull population in New Jersey has declined from 58,722 in 1989 to 39,085 adults in 1995. This 34 percent reduction may be conservative because investigators counted adult gulls on nesting areas from helicopters and usually, technique-dependent conversion factors equate one adult on the ground to one nest/pair (Erwin 1979). Thus, it is possible that as many as 38,000 adults are missing from New Jersey colonies.

7. At this time, we argue there is no scientifically supportable evidence that the Laughing Gull colony in JBWR needs to be managed (reduced or eliminated) and that, in any event, this should not be considered until all on-airport management options have been implemented and proven ineffective. Some form of management, however, may be warranted to preserve the local Laughing Gull populations. It is possible that the shooting program at JFKIA is resulting in a non-

sustainable regional population. Given that a large number of 'bird-strikes' involve non-breeding birds, and that a large number of gulls are shot each year at the airport, we do recommend that attempts be made to establish a new Laughing Gull colony elsewhere on Long Island in order to determine if: (1) colony relocation is a feasible management option; (2) it would lure breeding and non-breeding gulls away from the JBWR/JFKIA complex; and (3) whether said birds would nonetheless also wind up at the airport.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was funded under the Natural Resources Protection Program (NRPP) of the Biological Resources Division, U.S.G.S. Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, with a Cooperative Agreement (No. 14-45-0009-1553) with the New York Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit at Cornell University (Research Work Order no. 34). We are grateful to and thank Demetri Blondell, Tim Carroll, Andrea Coppola, Dawn Davis, Bruce Davis, Brian Eyler, Denis Macrae, Chris Olijnyk, Diane Pollar, Don Riepe, Leo Viana and John Zuzworsky for their contributions in the field; the staff at Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge, at Patuxent Wildlife Research Center and at Cornell University for logistical support; Dave Avrin, Francine Buckley, P. A. Buckley, Janet Bucknall, Richard Dolbeer, Mary Foley, George Frame, Don Riepe, Jeffrey Spendelow and John Tanacredi for discussions and comments regarding Jamaica Bay gull studies. The views and conclusions contained in this paper are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the opinions or policies of the U.S. Government. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute their endorsement by the U.S. Government.

LITERATURE CITED

Bent, A.C. 1921. Life histories of North American gulls and terns. Dover Publications Inc., New York. 433 pp.

Blokpoel, H., Tessier, G.D. and R.A. Andress. 1997. Successful restoration of the Ice Island common tern colony requires on-going control of ring-billed gulls. Colonial Waterbirds 20: 98-101.

Bongiorno, S.F. 1970. Nest-site selection by adult Laughing Gulls (Larus atricilla). Anim. Behav. 18: 434-444.

Brown, K.M., J.L. Tims, R.M. Erwin, and M.E. Richmond. 1999a. Changes in the nesting populations of colonial waterbirds in Jamaica Bay, New York, 1974 - 1998. Technical Report to the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. Pp. 23.

Brown, K.M., J.L. Tims, R.M. Erwin, and M.E. Richmond. 1999b. Diet composition, resource partitioning and competition in a community of Larus gulls in the Jamaica Bay/Kennedy airport complex, New York City. Technical Report to the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. Pp. 22.

Buckley, P.A. and F.G. Buckley. 1980. Population and colony-site trends of Long Island waterbirds for five years in the mid 1970s. Trans. Linn. Soc. N.Y. 9: 23-56.

Buckley, P.A. and F.G. Buckley. 1984. Expanding double-crested cormorant and laughing gull populations on Long Island, New York. Kingbird 34: 146-155.

Buckley, P.A. and F.G. Buckley. 2000. Patterns of colony-site use and disuse in saltmarsh-nesting Common and Roseate terns. J. Field Ornithol. 71: (in press).

Buckley, P.A. and M.M. Gurien. 1986. An ecological approach to the control of Laughing Gulls at John F. Kennedy International Airport, New York City. New Brunswick, Rutgers University. Pp. 71.

Buckley, P.A. and M.G. McCarthy. 1994. Insects, vegetation, and the control of Laughing Gulls (Larus atricilla) at Kennedy International Airport, New York City. J. Applied Ecology 31: 291-302.

Buckley, F.G., M. Gochfeld, and P.A. Buckley. 1978. Breeding laughing gulls return to Long Island. Kingbird 28: 202-207.

Burger, J. 1983a. Jamaica Bay studies III: Abiotic determinants of distribution and abundance of gulls (Larus). Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 16: 191-216.

Burger, J. 1983b. Jet aircraft noise and bird strikes: why more birds are being hit. Environ. Pollution 30: 143-152.

Burger, J. 1983c. Bird control at airports. Environ. Conserv. 10: 115-124.

Burger, J. 1985. Factors affecting bird strikes on aircraft at a coastal airport. Biol. Conserv. 33: 1-28.

Burger, J. 1996. Laughing Gull (*Larus atricilla*). *In* The Birds of North America, No. 225 (A. Poole and F. Gill, Eds.). The Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia and The American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, D.C.

Burger, J. and J. Shisler. 1980. Colony and nest site selection in Laughing Gulls in response to tidal flooding. Condor 82: 251-258.

Buurma, L.S., Solman, V.E.F., Thomas, C.S. and J.E. Karlson. 1989. Bird hazards to aircraft at JFK International Airport. Recommendations to the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, pp. 3.

Dolbeer, R.A. and J.L. Bucknall. 1997. Shooting gulls to reduce strikes with aircraft at John F. Kennedy International Airport, 1991-1997. Draft Report to the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, pp. 33.

Dolbeer, R.A. and R.B. Chipman. 1998. Shooting gulls to reduce strikes with aircraft at John F. Kennedy International Airport, 1991-1998. Draft Report to the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, pp. 32.

Dolbeer, R.A. and S.E. Wright. 1998. Ranking the hazard level to wildlife species to aviation using the national wildlife strike database. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Sandusky, Draft Report, pp. 17.

Dolbeer, R.A., Chevalier, M. Woronecki, P.P., and E.B. Butler. 1989. Laughing Gulls at Kennedy airport: Safety hazard or wildlife resource? In Proceedings of the Fourth Eastern Wildlife Damage Control Conference (Eds. Craven, S.R. and S. Nichols): 37-44.

Dolbeer, R.A., Belant, J.L. and J.L. Sillings. 1993. Shooting gulls reduces strikes with aircraft at John F. Kennedy International Airport. Wildl. Soc. Bull. 21: 442-450.

Dolbeer, R.A., Belant, J.L. and G.E. Bernhardt. 1997. Aerial photography techniques to estimate populations of Laughing Gull nests in Jamaica Bay, New York, 1992-1995. Colon. Waterbirds 20: 8-13.

Dolbeer, R.A., Carrara, M.S. and R.B. Chipman. 1999. Airside vegetation management at John

F. Kennedy International Airport: bird use of mowed and unmowed plots, 1998. Draft Report to the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, pp. 15.

Dosch, J. J. 1996. Influence of nestling diet and salt tolerance on adult movement and foraging patterns: field studies of the Laughing Gull (Larus atricilla). Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Rutgers: The State University of New Jersey; New Brunswick, New Jersey. Pp. 147.

Dosch, J. J. 1997. Diet of nesting Laughing Gulls in southern New Jersey. Colon. Waterbirds 20: 273-281.

Erwin, R. M. 1979. Coastal waterbird colonies, Cape Elizabeth Maine to Virginia, 1977. FWS/OBS 79/10, Washington, DC.

Good, T. P. 1998. Great Black-backed Gull (*Larus marinus*). *In* The Birds of North America, No. 330 (A. Poole and F. Gill, Eds.). The Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia and The American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, D.C.

Griffin, C.R. and E.M. Hoopes. 1992. Birds and the potential for bird strikes at John F. Kennedy International Airport. Final Report to the National Park Service, pp. 102.

Jenkins, C. D., L. J. Niles, and J. Wessel. 1990. Survey of colonial nesting waterbirds on the Atlantic coast of New Jersey - 1989. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Division of Fish, Game and Wildlife. Pp. 42.

Kress, S. W. 1983. The use of decoys, sound recordings, and gull control for re-establishing a tern colony in Maine. Colonial Waterbirds 6: 185-196.

Lambertson, R.E. 1994. Record of decision on gull hazard reduction program for John F. Kennedy International Airport. Dept. of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Pp. 12.

Lambertson, R.E. 1996. Revised record of decision on gull hazard reduction program for John F. Kennedy International Airport. Dept. of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Pp. 12.

MacDonald, S. A. F. 1963. From the ground up. Aviation Publishers Co. Ltd. Ottawa, Canada. Pp. 198.

Montevecchi, W.A. 1978. Nest site selection and its survival value among Laughing Gulls. Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology 4: 143-161.

Olijnyk, C.G. and K.M. Brown. 1999. Results of a seven year effort to reduce nesting by herring and great black-backed gulls. Waterbirds 22: (in press).

Peterson, D.M., T.S. Litwin, D.C. Maclean, and R. Lent. 1986. 1985 Long Island colonial waterbird and Piping Plover survey. Seatuck Research Program, Laboratory of Ornithology,

Cornell University, pp. 158.

Pierotti, R. and T. P. Good. 1994. Herring gull (Larus argentatus). In The Birds of North America, No. 124 (A. Poole and F. Gill, Eds.). The Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia and The American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, D.C.

Post, P.W. and D. Riepe. 1980. Laughing gulls colonize Jamaica Bay. Kingbird 30: 11-13.

Ryder, J. P. 1993. Ring-billed gull (Larus delawarensis). In The Birds of North America, No. 33 (A. Poole and F. Gill, Eds.). The Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia and The American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, D.C.

Seubert, J.L. 1990. Reducing gull hazards to aviation by controlling nesting populations. Proceedings of Bird Strike Committee Europe 20: 613-642.

Somers, L.A., Miller, R., Meskill, K. and M. Alfieri. 1994. 1992-1993 Long Island colonial waterbird and piping plover survey. N.Y. State Dept. of Environ. Conserv., pp. 53.

Somers, L.A., Alfieri, M.L., Meskill, K.J. and R.L. Miller. 1996. 1995 Long Island colonial waterbird and piping plover survey. N.Y. State Dept. of Environ. Conserv., pp. 209.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. 1994. Gull hazard reduction program at John F. Kennedy International Airport. Final Environmental Impact Statement. USDA, Animal Damage Control, Pittstown, New Jersey.

U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration. 1992. Engine bird ingestion experience of the Boeing 737 aircraft - expanded data base (October 1986 - September 1989). National Technical Information Service. Springfield, Virginia.

Zar, J. H. 1996. Biostatistical analysis, 3rd Edition. Prentice-Hall Inc., New Jersey. Pp. 899.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Fig. 1. Locator map of Gateway National Recreation Area, Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge, and John F. Kennedy International Airport, in the Boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens, New York City (map courtesy of P. A. Buckley).

Fig. 2. Numbers of Laughing Gull nests in Jamaica Bay and numbers of 'bird-strikes', involving Laughing Gulls only, at John F. Kennedy International Airport between 1979 and 1998. "N" equals the total number of aircraft 'struck'. Since 1991, a gull-shooting program has been conducted by USDA biologists at Kennedy airport and three nearby landfill sites were closed in 1985 and 1993. Nest count data were taken from: 1978 - 1984 (Buckley and Buckley 1984); 1985 - 1988 (Sommers et al. 1994); 1990 (Griffin and Hoopes 1992); 1992-1995 (Dolbeer et al. 1997); 1996-1997 (Dolbeer and Bernhardt 1997); 1998 (Dolbeer and Chipman 1998). 'Bird-strike' data were taken from Dolbeer and Chipman (1998) and include both reported strikes and non-reported strikes; all dead birds found within 200 feet of the center line of a runway are assumed to be non-reported bird-strikes (Dolbeer et al. 1989, U.S. Department of Agriculture 1994; also see TEXT).

Fig. 3. Numbers of Laughing Gull nests in Jamaica Bay and the numbers of reported bird-strikes, involving all species, at John F. Kennedy International Airport between 1979 and 1998. reported strike data were taken from Dolbeer and Chipman (1998); "N" equals the number of aircraft struck.


BROOKLYN
QUEENS
CONEY ISLAND
SHORE (BELT) PARKWAY
PENN AVE. LANDFILL
FOUNTAIN AVE. LAND FILL
SOUTHERN PARKWAY
JAMAICA BAY
BERGEN BEACH
CANARSIE POL
ROCKAWAY INLET
PLUMB BEACH
FLATBUSH AVE
FLOYD BENNETT FIELD
BREEZY POINT
RUFFLE BAR
FORT TILDEN
RIIS PARK
ATLANTIC OCEAN
LITTLE EGG MARSH
CROSSBAY BLVD
EAST POND
J.F.K. INT. AIRPORT
EAST HIGH MEADOW
SILVER HOLE MARSH
JO COE MARSH
ROCKAWAY BEACH BLVD
ROCKAWAY BEACH
HEAD OF BAY
FAR ROCKAWAY
NEW YORK
CONNECTICUT
LONG ISLAND
ATLANTIC OCEAN
NEW JERSEY
0 10 20 MI
0 10 20 30 KM
GATEWAY N.R.A. BOUNARY
NON-FEDERAL OWNERSHIP
SUBWAY LINES
0 1 2 MI
1 0 1 2 3 KM
GNL


LAGU nests
LAGU 'bird-strikes'
1991 shooting begins
Number of Laughing Gull nests
Number of 'bird-strikes'
Year
8000
7000
6000
5000
4000
3000
2000
1000
200
150
100
50
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98

Fig. 2.


LAGU nests
Bird-plane collisions
1991 shooting begins
Number of Laughing Gull nests
Number of pilot reported 'bird-strikes'
8000
7000
6000
5000
4000
3000
2000
1000
80
60
40
20
78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98
Year

Fig. 3.

Table 1. The six components of the Integrated Management Program (the Preferred Alternative) as reviewed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (USDA 1994) and the Department of the Interior's Record of Decision (Lambertson 1994, 1996). Category 1 components address management actions to be implemented by the Port Authority outside of National Park Service property while Category 2 components address management actions to be implemented (if deemed necessary) by the National Park Service in Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge.

Category 1:

1. The continued development of "on-airport" management programs including:
   (a) habitat alterations on airport property (e.g. vegetation management, improved drainage of standing water, improved sanitation, and insect control);
   (b) enhancing the professional capability of the Bird Control Unit at Kennedy airport (e.g. increased staffing, training and equipment);
   (c) establish the capability to assess and monitor the effectiveness of on-airport control programs on target species;
   (d) prepare a written wildlife management plan for on-airport control programs;
   (e) organize the Bird Hazard Task Force[1] to assist as an independent review body.
2. Reduction of off-airport attractants of birds.
3. On-airport shooting of gulls.

Category 2:

4. Laughing Gull nest and egg destruction in Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge.
5. On-colony shooting of adult Laughing Gulls.
6. Display of gull models to harass gulls.

---

[1] The Bird Hazard Task Force, a non-regulating group, is comprised of representatives from the administrating and regulating agencies involved in the Laughing Gull management issue including: Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, U.S. National Park Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, New York State Department of Enviromental Conservation, New York City Department of Enviromental Protection; and the Federal Aviation Administration.

Table 2. Mean (±1SD) number of 'bird-strikes' and pilot-reported strikes at Kennedy airport from 1979 to 1998. 'Bird-strike' data included both the number of pilot-reported strikes and and the number of unreported 'strikes' (i.e. the number of bird carcasses found near runways).

Category/ Period*	Mean (±1SD) number of aircraft 'striking' birds at Kennedy airport			
	Laughing gull	Other gulls**	Other birds	All birds
'Bird-strikes'				
1979-1982	13.8 ± 8.3ab	74.0 ± 23.5d	33.0 ± 4.7fg	120.8 ± 19.0h
1983-1990	104.4 ± 49.3ac	96.0 ± 29.7e	51.4 ± 18.0f	251.8 ± 61.7hi
1991-1998	30.0 ± 14.4bc	32.9 ± 10.7de	55.5 ± 24.7g	118.4 ± 34.8i
Kruskal-Wallis Anova (df = 2)	H = 13.9 P = 0.001	H = 13.4 P = 0.0012	H = 6.3 P = 0.0423	H = 11.5 P = 0.0031
Pilot reported strikes only				
1979-1982	0.5 ± 1.0jk	9.5 ± 4.9m	8.0 ± 1.8o	18.0 ± 3.2q
1983-1990	6.9 ± 2.9jl	13.1 ± 6.1n	6.4 ± 2.6p	26.4 ± 6.9q
1991-1998	2.6 ± 1.3kl	4.2 ± 3.2mn	14.9 ± 5.1op	21.8 ± 5.8
Kruskal-Wallis Anova (df = 2)	H = 15.2 P = 0.0005	H = 9.0 P = 0.011	H = 14.4 P = 0.0008	H = 5.7 P = 0.0587

Same letter denotes significant differences between two time periods (Mann-Whitney U-tests): **a**, U=32, P=0.007; **b**, U=28, P=0.042; **c**, u=61, P=0.002; **d**, U=31, P=0.011; **e**, U=63, P=0.001; **f**, U=26, P=0.087; **g**, U=31, P=0.011; **h**, U=31, P=0.011; **i**, U=61, P=0.002; **j**, U=32, P=0.006, **k**, U=28.5, P=0.028; **l**, U=63, P=0.001; **m**, U=26.5, P=0.072; **n**, U=59, P=0.004; **o**, U=32, P=0.006; **p**, U=64, P=0.001; **q**, U=28.5, P=0.033.

* The Laughing Gull colonized (N = 15 pairs) Jamaica Bay in 1979. The gull-shooting program was implemented at Kennedy airport in 1991 and continued each year since then.

** Other gull species included: Great Black-backed Gull; Herring Gull; and Ring-billed Gull.

Table 3. Number of breeding Laughing Gulls in Jamaica Bay, number of adults color-marked with Rhodamine B dye, and the numbers of both groups that were shot at Kennedy airport in 1996, 1997 and 1998. Also shown is the estimated number of the total number of shot gulls that were breeders.

Year	Breeding adults (N)*	Dyed-adults**	No. of dyed adults shot (%)†		Total adults shot (N)††	Estimated proportion of shot adults that were breeders	
						N*†	(%)¥
1996	9,652	91	5	(5.5)	1,970	471	(24)
1997	6,762	433	24	(5.5)	3,242	372	(11)
1998	10,896	312	31	(9.9)	2,920	1,079	(37)
Pooled	27,310	836	60	(7.2)	8,132	1,966	(24)

* The number of breeding adults in Jamaica Bay was estimated by doubling the number of nests counted.

** Adults were dyed with Rhodamine B that was transferred from a chick(s) to its brooding parent.

† Data pertaining to the number of color-dyed adults, that were shot at Kennedy, were obtained from R. Dolbeer.

†† The total number of Laughing Gulls that were shot at Kennedy (data taken from Dolbeer and Chipman 1998).

*† We estimated the number of breeders shot at Kennedy by multiplying the percentage of dyed-adults shot by the total number of breeding adults.

¥ The percentage of shot breeders was estimated of the proportion of shot adults that were breeders (i.e. the remainder were probably non-breeders). For example, in 1996, we estimate that about 24 percent (471/1,970) of the Laughing Gulls that were shot at Kennedy were breeders (i.e. tending chicks) from the Jamaica Bay colony.

Table 4. Numbers of colony sites in New Jersey where Laughing Gulls nested with other tern and gull species (Jenkins et al. 1990).

Indicator Species		Number of colonies (1989)	Number of colonies with Laughing Gulls present (%)	
1.	Forster's Tern	32	27	(84)
2.	Common Tern	80	50	(62)
3.	Black Skimmer	9	4	(44)
4.	Herring Gull	93	53	(57)
5.	Great Black-backed Gull	51	30	(59)

Appendix 1. Number of Laughing Gull (Larus atricilla) nests in Jamaica Bay, and the numbers of aircraft involved in 'bird-strikes', and pilot-reported strikes, with respect to type of bird at John F. Kennedy International Airport, 1979 - 1998. Bird-strike data were taken from Dolbeer and Chipman (1998) and R. Dolbeer (unpublished data).

Year	Laughing Gull nests (N)*	Number of aircraft involved in 'bird-strikes' (type of bird struck)**				Number of aircraft involved in pilot-reported strikes (type of bird)†			
		Laughing Gull	Other gull††	Other bird	All birds	Laughing Gull	Other gulls††	Other birds	All birds
1979	15	2	86	29	117	0	15	6	21
1980	235	19	98	29	146	0	10	7	17
1981	325	20	44	36	100	2	3	9	14
1982	715	14	68	38	120	0	10	10	20
1983	1805	48	89	62	199	5	11	9	25
1984	2802	58	114	79	251	5	17	5	27
1985	2741	82	139	72	293	4	24	9	37
1986	3000	59	42	37	138	6	5	3	14
1987	2875	118	73	35	226	10	8	4	22
1988	2665	164	114	36	314	5	16	5	26
1989	•	171	108	36	315	12	15	6	33
1990	7629	135	89	54	278	8	9	10	27
1991	•	60	54	42	156	2	10	11	23
1992	5117	22	37	42	101	0	6	12	18
1993	6032	18	25	37	80	3	2	11	16
1994	5554	21	37	45	103	3	1	18	22
1995	6065	36	32	49	117	4	7	12	23
1996	4826	29	33	83	145	3	3	20	26
1997	3381	37	27	105	169	4	4	24	32
1998	5448	17	18	41	76	2	1	11	14
Total		1,130	1,327	987	3,444	78	177	202	457
		Average	Average	Average	Average	Average	Average	Average	Average
79-83	21	77	39	136	1	10	8	19	
84-90	112	97	50	259	7	13	6	27	
91-98	30	33	56	118	3	4	15	22	
79-82	14	74	33	121	1	10	8	18	
83-90	104	96	51	252	7	13	6	26	
91-98	30	33	56	118	3	4	15	22	

* Laughing Gull data from: 1978 - 1984 (Buckley and Buckley 1984); 1985 - 1988 (Sommers et al. 1994); 1990 (Griffin and Hoopes 1992); 1992-1995 (Dolbeer et al. 1997); 1996-1997 (Dolbeer and Bernhardt 1997); 1998 (Dolbeer and Chipman 1998).

** 'Bird-strikes' include (1) pilot-reported strikes and (2) all dead birds (cause of death unknown) found within 250 feet of a runway; all assumed to have been struck by planes.

† Only those 'bird-strikes' that were reported by pilots and air-carriers.

†† Other gull species include the Great Black-backed Gull (L. marinus), the Herring Gull (L. argentatus) and the Ring-billed Gull (L. delawarensis).



As the nations's principal conservation agency, the Department of the Interior has responsibility for most of our nationally owned public lands and natural and cultural resources. This includes fostering wise use of our land and water resources, protecting our fish and wildlife, preserving the environmental and cultural values of our national parks and historical places, and providing for enjoyment of life through outdoor recreation. The department assesses our energy and mineral resources and works to ensure that their development is in the best interests of all our people. The department also promotes the goals of the Take Pride in America campaign by encouraging stewardship and citizen responsibility of the public lands and promoting citizen participation in their care. The department also has a major responsibility for American Indian reservation communities and for people who live in island territories under U.S. administration.

NPS D-274