

1

2

3 **Full title: Light pollution causes object collisions during local nocturnal**  
4 **manoeuvring flight by adult Manx shearwaters (*Puffinus puffinus*)**

5 **Running head: Lights out for Manx shearwaters**

6

7 Tim Guilford<sup>1</sup>, Oliver Padget<sup>1</sup>, Sarah Bond<sup>1</sup> and Martyna M. Syposz<sup>1</sup>

8

9

10 <sup>1</sup> Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Oxford, Oxfordshire, England

11

12

13 \* Correspondence author: E-mail: [tim.guilford@zoo.ox.ac.uk](mailto:tim.guilford@zoo.ox.ac.uk)

14 **Abstract**

15 Understanding the detrimental effects of anthropogenic light on nocturnally mobile  
16 animals is a long-standing problem in conservation biology. Seabirds such as  
17 shearwaters and petrels can be especially affected, perhaps because of their  
18 propensity to fly close to the surface, making them vulnerable to encountering  
19 anthropogenic light sources.

20 We investigated the influence of light pollution on adult Manx shearwaters at  
21 close range in foggy conditions. We recorded collisions with a building at a  
22 breeding colony for six consecutive pairs of intervals in which the house lights  
23 were left on as normal for 135 seconds, then turned off for 135 seconds. The  
24 relationship between lighting condition and collision frequency was highly  
25 significant, with a collision rate in the presence of lighting around 25 times that  
26 in its absence. Our results show that birds were clearly affected by the lights, by  
27 being either directly attracted, or disorientated during flight close to the structure.  
28 This could have been due to the light source itself, or an indirect effect of the all-  
29 round reflective glow in the fog perhaps interfering with visual or magnetic  
30 control inputs on both sides of the bird simultaneously. Our results suggest a  
31 mechanism by which the screening of artificial lights close to shearwater  
32 breeding areas, at least during foggy nights, could lead to improved welfare and

33 survival at breeding colonies.

## 34 **Introduction**

35 Understanding the detrimental effects of anthropogenic light on nocturnally mobile  
36 animals is a long-standing problem in conservation biology (Montevecchi 2006;  
37 Gaston *et al.* 2013; Gaston *et al.* 2014). Artificial light at night can draw  
38 individuals from long distances, whilst repelling others, affecting many activities  
39 including foraging (e.g. Garber 1978; Frank 2009; Pereszlényi *et al.* 2017),  
40 reproductive behaviour (e.g. Miller 2006; Kempenaers 2010; de Jong *et al.* 2015;  
41 Russ *et al.* 2017), and daily, monthly or annual movements (e.g. Salmon 2003;  
42 Mathews *et al.* 2015; Rodríguez *et al.* 2017).

43 Amongst the most endangered groups of birds (Croxall *et al.* 2012), shearwaters  
44 and petrels (Procellariiforms) are especially badly affected by anthropogenic light  
45 sources and the grounding of their fledglings in particular has been studied in many  
46 parts of the world (Rodríguez *et al.* 2017). Manx Shearwaters (*Puffinus puffinus*),  
47 which breed at island colonies predominantly around the UK and Ireland, are  
48 classified as of Least Concern by the IUCN, but still they are often reported  
49 grounding in artificially lit urban areas or at other light sources particularly during  
50 the fledging period (Brooke, M. 1990; Le Corre *et al.* 2002; Rodríguez *et al.* 2008;  
51 Miles *et al.* 2010; Archer *et al.* 2015). There are fewer studies on the grounding of

52 adults on land, in this or other species, since adults usually constitute a small  
53 percentage of the individuals affected in any fallout (Le Corre *et al.* 2002;  
54 Rodríguez & Rodríguez 2009; Telfer *et al.* 1987). Here we report a short  
55 experiment designed to test the instantaneous effect of anthropogenic house light  
56 on collisions with a man-made object, and outside of the fledging period when  
57 only adults are present at breeding colonies.

58 Electric lighting is used to provide night service to the seasonal residents (a nightly  
59 summer maximum of 42 staff and tourists, of which up to 10 might stay in the  
60 Island Office) of the several buildings on Skomer Island National Nature Reserve,  
61 which is an internationally important Manx shearwater breeding colony.

62 Shearwaters returning to the colony sometimes collide with the buildings and  
63 higher numbers of crashing seabirds are expected on cloudy and rainy nights  
64 (Telfer *et al.* 1987; Jones 1980). It may be that more birds visit breeding colonies  
65 in such conditions anyway, when there is less ambient light from the moon (Riou  
66 & Hamer 2008), but it is also possible that visual guidance in local manoeuvring  
67 flight is less effective and this contributes to collision risk. To determine whether  
68 there is a local effect of artificial light on collisions with the structure from which it  
69 is emanating, we conducted a very short experiment.

70

71 **Study area**

72 Skomer Island (51° 44' N; 5° 19' W) hosts the biggest colony of Manx  
73 shearwaters in the world, an estimated 316 000 breeding pairs, making up around  
74 36% of the global breeding population when combined with the neighbouring  
75 islands of Skokholm and Middleholm (Perrins *et al.* 2012), The other species  
76 active at night on the island include European storm petrels (*Hydrobates pelagicus*),  
77 rarely seen close to the Island Office and not on the night of our experiment, and  
78 extremely unusually, vagrant shearwater species. There are no migratory  
79 passerines at this time of year. By contrast, thousands of Manx shearwaters fly  
80 low over the colony each night at this time of year as they return to their burrow  
81 nests (if breeding), or in display flights whilst calling to prospective  
82 partners. Typically, when a shearwater collides with the building it will make a  
83 loud thud (too loud for a smaller bird), and will fall to the ground where it will  
84 remain for a few seconds or minutes, appearing stunned, before walking into the  
85 undergrowth. It is therefore overwhelmingly likely that every single impact we  
86 heard was of a different individual Manx shearwater. We do not know the fate of  
87 crashed birds in general, but very occasionally we find a bird killed by the impact  
88 or bleeding from the head (TG personal observations), suggesting that whilst the  
89 vast majority escape to cover in the minutes following collision, there is the

90 potential for serious injury which might affect future survival. We did not attempt  
91 to recover or assess birds for the effects impact during this experiment.

92

## 93 **Methods**

94 **On 27<sup>th</sup> May 2015, whilst undertaking fieldwork, we noticed**  
95 **that for several hours there were many shearwater collisions**  
96 **with the building. We therefore opportunistically conducted**  
97 **an experiment, exploiting the occasion of an unusually foggy**  
98 **night. The number of significant shearwater collisions with a**  
99 **prominent man-made structure, the Island Office (Fig. 1), on**  
100 **Skomer Island NNR, was recorded by tallying in a notebook**  
101 **each audible crash with roof, walls or windows that could be**  
102 **heard from inside the researchers' quarters located centrally**  
103 **on the seaward (north) side of the structure. The**  
104 **predominantly wooden building is of a two-part design with**  
105 **a lower one-storey section measuring 17.5m x 7.7m x 5.5m**

106 **high at the top of the pitched roof leading to a taller two-**  
107 **storey section measuring 7.6m x 12.0m x 8.5m at the highest**  
108 **point. The design of the study was decided as soon as we**  
109 **started observing the phenomenon and data on collision**  
110 **incidents were then recorded for six consecutive pairs of**  
111 **intervals in which (A) the house lights were left on as normal**  
112 **for 135 seconds, then (B) the lights were turned off. This**  
113 **interval (2.25 minutes) was decided arbitrarily but to**  
114 **provide a short period (half an hour) that would allow six**  
115 **replicates during the middle of the night whilst the weather**  
116 **conditions persisted and before the colony became empty as**  
117 **the nights in May are short at this latitude. No other**  
118 **artificial lighting, except the very dim emergency exit panels**  
119 **and LEDs from electronic equipment indoors, was visible in**  
120 **the building. Luminance from two white fluorescent twin**

121 **tube compact lights (Pro-light 11W 2700k) was visible**  
 122 **externally via two rectangular glass windows (each 0.8m x**  
 123 **1.0m tall), and one small (0.37m diameter) round window in**  
 124 **the external door, and it is these sources that were**  
 125 **extinguished during the lights-off treatment. The**  
 126 **experiment started at 2330 GMT and lasted 27**  
 127 **minutes.Results**

128 The relationship between lighting condition and collision frequency was highly  
 129 significant (Wilcoxon Test W=0, N=6, P=0.0044; Table 1), with a collision rate in  
 130 the presence of lighting (5.9 collisions per minute) around 25 times that in its  
 131 absence (0.2 collisions per minute).

132

133 **Table 1. Results from study shows the collision count data (rates per minute in**  
 134 **brackets) across the six sequential treatment interval pairs.**

<b>Interval</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>III</b>	<b>IV</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>
Lights on	13 (5.8)	14 (6.2)	10 (4.4)	11 (4.9)	18 (8.0)	14 (6.2)	13.3 (5.9)	13.5 (6.0)
Lights off	1 (0.4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0.4)	0 (0)	1 (0.4)	0.5 (0.2)	0.5 (0.2)

135



136

## 137 **Discussion**

138 The extinguishing of artificial building lights caused a dramatic (25-fold) and  
139 almost instantaneous reduction in shearwater collisions with the man-made  
140 structure from which the light was emanating. It is possible that the sound of one  
141 bird may be masked by another, so our numbers may even be, to some extent,  
142 underestimates. In addition, the recorders informally observed that collisions  
143 during the lights-off treatment always occurred shortly after the switch in treatment,  
144 suggesting that collisions during the lights-off period were mainly influenced by  
145 the effect of the light that had just been turned off. Because the treatment intervals  
146 were short (135 seconds) our experiment suggests a predominantly local effect of  
147 lighting, with collisions by birds already at the colony and in the vicinity of the  
148 buildings. In an earlier GPS tracking study we estimated the mean speed of Manx  
149 shearwaters in flight to be around  $11\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$  (Guilford et al. 2008), allowing for the  
150 maximum attraction distance during an illuminated period to be about 1.5km on  
151 this relatively calm night. Of course it is possible that birds may have been  
152 attracted in to the area by illumination prior to the experiment, or during a previous  
153 lights-on interval during the experiment itself, but restricted penetration of light in  
154 foggy conditions is likely to mean that in fact our building lights were only visible

155 from much shorter distances. Furthermore, the often immediate effect of turning  
156 on the lights and the striking disparity in collision rates between the on and off  
157 treatments, strongly suggests that a local effect of the light is responsible for  
158 inducing collision. A different design would be required to determine whether, as  
159 has been suggested for urban groundings (e.g Miles *et al.* 2010; Reed *et al.* 1985),  
160 artificial lights can also attract birds from longer distances under some conditions.  
161 A study using GPS on Cory's shearwaters Rodríguez *et al.* (2015) showed that  
162 locations where birds were rescued had greater light pollution levels than at  
163 colonies, and found that areas with high intensity light attracted birds from further  
164 away than areas with low intensity light. In our study, birds already at or close to  
165 the colony are either being attracted by the light source locally, or are being  
166 disoriented during visually guided flight close to the structure either directly by the  
167 light source or indirectly by the reflected glow in the fog. These two effects could  
168 operate in combination: Day *et al.* 2003). Although it might have been interesting  
169 to replicate this experiment under different conditions this has not been possible  
170 because curtains have been fitted to the building windows (in response to our  
171 observations) so that very restricted light now emanates from the structure under  
172 normal operation. Paradoxically, manipulation of light levels would now involve  
173 knowingly inducing potentially fatal collisions with the structure, whereas in the

174 current experiment it opportunistically involved reducing them, thereby changing  
175 the ethical and legal basis of the research under UK law.

176 The mechanism by which light interferes with normal behaviour in flying birds is  
177 unknown. Hypotheses range from direct interference with stellar, lunar, or  
178 magnetic compass orientation mechanisms, to a normal attraction to light sources  
179 having its origin in mechanisms for hunting bioluminescent prey (for reviews see  
180 Montevecci 2006; Gaston *et al.* 2013). In our experiment birds would have been  
181 engaging in control flights above the colony rather than directional flights of any  
182 distance. This makes it unlikely that the mechanism interfered with was part of  
183 either long-distance guidance (the role normally assumed for compass orientation  
184 in migratory birds for example), or hunting. Direct attraction to the light is a  
185 possibility (Reed, 1986), but it is interesting that most of the collisions witnessed in  
186 our experiment were not with the windows themselves, from which the light  
187 emanated, but with the surrounding structure. Furthermore, in fog as here light is  
188 scattered to produce a locally bright glow but with little distance penetration, so  
189 birds should if anything be attracted from less far than on clear nights. Although  
190 we did not explicitly compare fog with clear conditions in this experiment, it is  
191 certainly the informal experience of researchers (see also Black, 2005) that  
192 collisions are much rarer on clear nights which is the opposite of what would be

193 expected if direct attraction was responsible. In the absence of the light, birds are  
194 apparently normally able to avoid collision with this structure despite the poor  
195 visibility. One hypothesis, therefore, is that sudden proximity to relatively bright  
196 light may disrupt the ability of birds to use their normal dark-adapted visual  
197 guidance effectively. This could be more pronounced on dark nights when birds  
198 are more dependent on dark-adaptation. Perhaps the scattering of light in fog also  
199 contributes by interfering with dark-adaptation in multiple directions,  
200 simultaneously disabling low-light visual guidance input from both eyes. A  
201 second hypothesis, however, is that birds manoeuvring in low light conditions  
202 might make use of a magnetic compass as a “heading indicator” (Guilford &  
203 Taylor 2014) to monitor and control local changes in orientation relative to the  
204 ground. The suggestion that birds moving in a fluid medium might use compasses  
205 as heading indicators in flight control has been made before for a sun-compass  
206 during diurnal flight (Guilford & Taylor 2014), and we now know that Manx  
207 shearwaters have a time-compensated sun compass (Padget *et al.* 2018), but in  
208 nocturnal flight when solar cues are unavailable a magnetic compass might operate  
209 in a similar way. It is possible, therefore, that a light-dependent magneto-receptor  
210 (Hore & Mauritsen 2016) becomes temporarily disrupted by saturation in the  
211 presence of bright light, and that this disrupts the bird’s ability to gauge its heading

212 changes during local flight manoeuvres, causing collision. Again it is possible that  
213 in fog input from both eyes (eyes are thought to be the organs responsible for  
214 sensing magnetic direction) become affected simultaneously because of local light  
215 scattering.

216 Whether the effect of light witnessed in our experiment is an effect on visual or  
217 magnetic guidance in flight control remains to be determined. However, our  
218 results do suggest that light pollution may cause interference effects at several  
219 scales, with disruption of local flight control in addition to one or more attraction  
220 or compass disorientation effects operating at longer distances.

221 Measurements made during a rescue programme for Manx shearwaters suggested  
222 that around 7% of fledglings die as a result of grounding (Syposz *et al.* 2018), but  
223 such estimates are biased and the likely death rate may generally be much higher  
224 (about 40% in a study of short-tailed shearwaters) where humans do not intervene  
225 (Le Corre *et al.* 2002; Rodríguez & Rodríguez 2009; Fontaine *et al.* 2011;  
226 Rodríguez *et al.*, 2017). In particular the seriousness of the effect on flying  
227 shearwaters of collision with a man-made structure is not well understood.

228 Shearwaters rarely alight on a terrestrial surface with great control unless the wind  
229 strength and direction is very favourable (personal observation), so it is common to  
230 see or hear them crash into the undergrowth during normal attempts to land and

231 they may be at least partially adapted to rough landings. However, after collision  
232 with buildings birds can usually be found sitting still for some time before making  
233 their way to cover, but on occasion may be found bleeding from the beak or killed  
234 by the impact. The longer-term effect of collisions on birds that survive immediate  
235 impact is not known, however. Birds that perish on the surface during the night, or  
236 fail to reach their nests, are likely to be removed and eaten by aerial predators and  
237 scavengers (mainly great black-backed gulls *Laurus marinus* on Skomer, where  
238 there are no mammalian predators) (Raymond *et al.* 1993).

239 Our results suggest that the normal controlled flight behaviour of adult shearwaters  
240 can be severely negatively affected by proximity to artificial lights on structures  
241 under some nocturnal conditions. They suggest a mechanism by which the  
242 screening of artificial lights close to shearwater breeding areas, at least during  
243 foggy nights, could lead to improved welfare and survival at breeding colonies.

244 Off-shore, artificial light sources on structures or vessels are known to cause  
245 collisions in open water, particularly during foggy conditions, which can be  
246 reduced by light-screening or reduction (Black, 2005; Glass & Ryan, 2013). So in  
247 addition it is possible that lights on vessels close to colonies, or close to the flight  
248 paths of returning birds, might interfere with collision avoidance behaviour in adult  
249 shearwaters, even if they do not attract birds from a distance. Large, highly lit

250 tankers commonly anchor in the waters close to Skomer, but their effect on the  
251 Manx shearwaters remains unknown.

252

## 253 **Acknowledgements**

254 We would like to thank the Skomer and Skokholm Islands Conservation Advisory  
255 Committee, the Wildlife Trust for South and West Wales, and Natural Resources  
256 Wales.

257

## 258 **References**

259 **Archer, M., Jones, P. H., & Stansfield, S. D. 2015.** Departure of Manx  
260 Shearwater *Puffinus puffinus* fledglings from Bardsey, Gwynedd, Wales, 1998 to  
261 2013. *Seabird*, 28, 43–47.

262

263 **Black, A. 2005.** Light induced seabird mortality on vessels operating in the  
264 Southern Ocean: incidents and mitigation measures. *Antarctic Science*, 17(1), 67-  
265 68.

266

267 **Brooke, M. 1990.** The Manx Shearwater. Poyser, London.

268

269 **Croxall, J. P., Butchart, S. H. M., Lascelles, B., Stattersfield, A. J., Sullivan, B.,**  
270 **Symes, A., & Taylor, P. 2012.** Seabird conservation status, threats and priority  
271 actions: a global assessment. *Bird Conservation International* 22:1–34.  
272

273 **Day, R. H., Cooper, B. A., Telfer, T. C. & Powell, A. 2003.** Decline of  
274 Townsend's (Newell's) shearwaters (*Puffinus auricularis newelli*) on Kauai,  
275 Hawaii. *The Auk* 120: 669-679.  
276

277 **de Jong, M., Ouyang, J. Q., Da Silva, A., van Grunsven, R. H., Kempenaers,**  
278 **B., Visser, M. E. & Spoelstra, K. 2015.** Effects of nocturnal illumination on life-  
279 history decisions and fitness in two wild songbird species. *Philosophical*  
280 *transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B*, published online doi:  
281 10.1098/rstb.2014.0128.

282 **Fontaine, R., Gimenez, O. & Bried, J. 2011.** The impact of introduced predators,  
283 light-induced mortality of fledglings and poaching on the dynamics of the Cory's  
284 shearwater (*Calonectris diomedea*) population from the Azores, northeastern  
285 subtropical Atlantic, *Biological Conservation* 144: 1998-2011.



286

287 **Frank, K. 2009.** Exploitation of artificial light at night by a diurnal jumping  
288 spider. *Peckhamia* 78: 1-3.

289 **Garber, S. D. 1978.** Opportunistic feeding behavior of *Anolis cristatellus*  
290 (Iguanidae: Reptilia) in Puerto Rico. *Transactions of the Kansas Academy of*  
291 *Science* 81: 79-80.

292 **Gaston, K. J., Bennie, J., Davies, T. W. & Hopkins, J. 2013.** The ecological  
293 impacts of nighttime light pollution: a mechanistic appraisal. *Biological reviews*  
294 88: 912-927.

295 **Gaston, K. J. & Bennie, J. 2014.** Demographic effects of artificial nighttime  
296 lighting on animal populations. *Environmental Reviews* 22: 323-330.

297 **Glass, J., & Ryan, P. 2013.** Reduced seabird night strikes and mortality in the  
298 Tristan rock lobster fishery. *African Journal of Marine Science*, 35(4), 589–592.

299

300 **Guilford, T., Meade, J., Freeman, R., Biro, D., Evans, T., Bonadonna, F.,**  
301 **Boyle, D., Roberts, S. & Perrins, C. M. 2008.** GPS tracking of the foraging

302 movements of Manx Shearwaters *Puffinus puffinus* breeding on Skomer Island,  
303 Wales.” *Ibis*, 150, 462-473.

304

305 **Guilford, T. & Taylor, G. K. 2014.** The sun compass revisited. *Animal*  
306 *Behaviour*, 97, 135-143.

307 **Hore, P. & Mouritsen, H. 2016.** The radical-pair mechanism of  
308 magnetoreception. *Annual review of biophysics* 45: 299-344.

309 **Jones, P. H. 1980.** The effect on birds of a North Sea gas flare. *British Birds* 73:  
310 547-555.

311 **Kempnaers, B., Borgström, P., Loës, P., Schlicht, E. & Valcu, M. 2010.**  
312 Artificial night lighting affects dawn song, extra-pair siring success, and lay date in  
313 songbirds. *Current Biology* 20: 1735-1739.

314 **Le Corre, M., Ollivier, A., Ribes, S. & Jouventin, P. 2002.** Light-induced  
315 mortality of petrels: a 4-year study from Réunion Island (Indian Ocean). *Biological*  
316 *Conservation* 105: 93-102.

317 **Mathews, F., Roche, N., Aughney, T., Jones, N., Day, J., Baker, J. & Langton,**  
318 **S. 2015.** Barriers and benefits: implications of artificial night-lighting for the  
18

319 distribution of common bats in Britain and Ireland. *Philosophical transactions of*  
320 *the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological sciences* 370: published online  
321 doi: 10.1098/rstb.2014.0124.

322 **Miles, W., Money, S., Luxmoore, R. & Furness, R.W. 2010.** Effects of artificial  
323 lights and moonlight on petrels at St Kilda. *Bird Study* 57: 244-251.

324 **Miller, M. W. 2006.** Apparent effects of light pollution on singing behavior of  
325 American robins. *The Condor* 108: 130-139.

326

327 **Montevecchi, W. A. 2006.** Influences of artificial light on marine birds. In: Rich,  
328 C. & Longcore, T. (eds.) *Ecological consequences of artificial night lighting*: 94–  
329 113. Island Press, Washington.

330

331 **Padget, O., Bond, S., Kavelaars, M. M., van Loon, E. E., Bolton, M., Fayet, A.,**  
332 **Syposz, M., Roberts, S. & Guilford, T. 2018.** *In situ* clock shift reveals that the  
333 sun compass contributes to orientation in a pelagic seabird. *Current Biology*,  
334 **28:275-279.**

335

336 **Pereszlényi, Á., Horváth, G. & Kriska, G. 2017.** Atypical feeding of

337 woodpeckers, crows and redstarts on mass-swarming *Hydropsyche pellucidula*  
338 caddisflies attracted to glass panes. *Urban Ecosystems*: published online doi:  
339 10.1007/s11252-017-0672-3.

340

341 **Perrins, C. M., Wood, M. J., Garroway, C. J., Boyle, D., Oakes, N., Revera, R.,**  
342 **Collins, P. & Taylor, C. 2012.** A whole-island census of the Manx Shearwaters  
343 *Puffinus puffinus* breeding on Skomer Island in 2011. *Seabird* 25: 1-13.

344 **Reed, J. R., Sincock, J. L. & Hailman, J. P. 1985.** Light attraction in endangered  
345 procellariiform birds: reduction by shielding upward radiation. *The Auk* 102: 377-  
346 383.

347

348 **Reed, J. R. 1986.** ‘*Seabird vision: spectral sensitivity and light-attraction*  
349 *behaviour*’. PhD Thesis, University of Wisconsin - Madison.

350

351 **Riou, S. & Hamer, K. C. 2008.** Predation risk and reproductive effort: impacts of  
352 moonlight on food provisioning and chick growth in Manx shearwaters. *Animal*  
353 *Behaviour* 76: 1743-1748.

354

355 **Rodríguez, A., Burgan, G., Dann, P., Jessop, R., Negro, J. J., & Chiaradia, A.**

356 **2014.** Fatal Attraction of Short-Tailed Shearwaters to Artificial Lights. *PLoS ONE*,  
357 9(10), e110114.

358  
359 **Rodríguez, A., Holmes, N. D., Ryan, P. G., Wilson, K-J., Faulquier, L.,**  
360 **Murillo, Y., Raine, A. F., Penniman, J., Neves, V. & Rodríguez, B., Negro, J.**  
361 **J., Chiaradia, A., Dann, P., Anderson, T., Metzger, B., Shirai, M., Deppe, L.,**  
362 **Wheeler, J., Hodum, P., Gouveia, C., Carmo, V., Carreira, G. P., Delgado-**  
363 **Alburquerque, L., Guerra-Correa, C., Couzi, F-X., Travers, M. & Le Corre, M.**  
364 **2017.** Seabird mortality induced by land-based artificial lights. *Conservation*  
365 *Biology* 31(5), 986-1001. Doi: 10.1111/cobi.12900.

366  
367 **Rodríguez, A. & Rodríguez, B. 2009.** Attraction of petrels to artificial lights in  
368 the Canary Islands: effects of the moon phase and age class. *Ibis* 151(2): 299-310.

369  
370 **Rodríguez, A., Rodríguez, B., Barone, R., Pérez, B., & Hernández, A. 2008.**  
371 Status and conservation requirements of Manx shearwaters *Puffinus puffinus* on  
372 Tenerife (Canary Islands). *Alauda*, 76(1), 72–74.

373  
374 **Rodríguez, A., Rodríguez, B. & Negro, J. J. 2015.** GPS tracking for mapping

375 seabird mortality induced by light pollution. *Scientific Reports* 5: 10670.

376

377 **Russ, A., Lučeničová, T. & Klenke, R. 2017.** Altered breeding biology of the  
378 European blackbird under artificial light at night. *Journal of Avian Biology* 48:  
379 1114-1125.

380

381 **Salmon, M. 2003.** Artificial night lighting and sea turtles. *Biologist* 50: 163-168.

382

383 **Syposz, M., Gonçalves, F., Carty M, Hoppitt, W. & Manco, F. 2018.** Factors  
384 influencing location and number of Manx Shearwater grounding in west Scotland.  
385 *IBIS*, [/doi.org/10.1111/ibi.12594](https://doi.org/10.1111/ibi.12594)

386

387 **Telfer, T. C., Sincock, J. L., Byrd, G. V. & Reed, J. R. 1987.** Attraction of  
388 Hawaiian seabirds to lights: conservation efforts and effects of moon  
389 phase. *Wildlife Society Bulletin (1973-2006)* 15: 406-413.

390

391 **Figure 1.** Photograph of the Island Office showing its position on the shearwater  
392 nesting slopes at north haven on Skomer island. The windows through which light  
393 emanated during the lights-on treatment are the two furthest right of the line of five  
394 in the lower section of the building, and a small circular window in the door  
395 immediately right of these.

396



397

398

399 **Table 1. Results from study shows the collision count data (rates per minute in**

400 brackets) across the six sequential treatment interval pairs.

<b>Interval</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>III</b>	<b>IV</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>
Lights on	13 (5.8)	14 (6.2)	10 (4.4)	11 (4.9)	18 (8.0)	14 (6.2)	13.3 (5.9)	13.5 (6.0)
Lights off	1 (0.4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0.4)	0 (0)	1 (0.4)	0.5 (0.2)	0.5 (0.2)

401

402