Predicting the probability of encounter between fish species and tidal stream energy devices using acoustic telemetry

Charles W. Bangley, Daniel J. Hasselman, Joanna Mills Flemming, Frederick Whoriskey, Michael Stokesbury, Joseph Beland, Rod Bradford, and Brian G. Sanderson











Minas Passage



Risk Assessment Program (RAP)

RAP Objectives

- Build and test species distribution and encounter rate models
- Enhance understanding of fish distribution and behaviour within Minas Passage
- Build tools to support science-based decision making for tidal projects



Research Objectives

- Identify spatial and seasonal patterns of presence and residency
- Identify relationships between presence and environmental conditions
- Use environmental associations to develop predictive species distribution models within Minas Passage



Species of Interest

Alewife American eel American shad Atlantic salmon Atlantic sturgeon Atlantic tomcod Spiny dogfish **Striped bass** White shark









Methods

Environmental associations using boosted regression tree modeling – 2017-2020 data

- Sea surface height anomaly, current velocity, vorticity, divergence, bathymetry standard deviation derived from FORCE X-band radar installations
- Temperature receiver sensors
- Environmental data and presence/absence from tag detections summarized by hour
- Environmental and modeled results grids at 150-m x 150-m resolution



Methods

Accounting for detection efficiency

- 69-kHz ppm tags can have limited detection efficiency at high current speeds
- Range testing in Apr-May 2021 using line of receivers and sentinel tags over full tide cycle
- Scaled mapped model presence probability to reflect probability of presence given probability of detection – based on MacKenzie et al. 2002
- Weights observations made during poor conditions



Probability of presence given probability of missing detection Probability of absence given probability of missing detection

$$(p \times (1-d)) \times (d(1-p) + (1-d))$$

Methods

Model validation

- Model metrics compared between runs using 2017-2020 data and including 2021-2022 data
 - Cross-validation, area under curve (AUC), % deviance explained
- Predictions run against mapped 2021 data
- Scaled and unscaled mapped results compared percentile of predicted presence probability



Marginal effect plots

- Temperature 12-17 °C
- Relatively active water
- Sea surface high associated with higher/lower tide stages





sshgrad (3.3%)

Mapped results



Model parameter and metric comparison

Model	2017-2020	2017-2022
Learning rate (lr)	0.05	0.05
Bag fraction (bf)	0.6	0.5
Tree complexity (tc)	7	7
N trees	1950	4850
Training correlation	0.69	0.78
Training AUC	0.99	0.99
Cross-validation AUC	0.97	0.97
Overfitting (training-CV AUC)	0.02	0.02
% False positive	6.6	4.1
% False negative	5.4	3.7
% Deviance explained	62.4	70.44

Modeled and scaled probability comparison



2017-2020 Model, 2021 Data

* = significant at 0.05

Conclusions

Model performance and validation

- Base model (2017-2020 data) performs well
- Performance improves by including 2021-2022 data
- Scaling function seems to improve predictive performance during flood tide



Conclusions

FORCE RAP SDM can provide accurate estimates for at least first three layers of collision risk



Acknowledgements



Project team

Project support





Natural Resources Canada

Ressources naturelles Canada



Questions?

