Scaring waterfowl as a management tool: how much more do geese forage after disturbance?
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Appendix S2. Method to calculate energy intake rate and expenditure

Energetics

We assume that the birds aim to be in weight balance, meaning that on a daily basis metabolizable energy intake (\( MEI, \) J d\(^{-1} \)) is equal to energy expenditure (\( DEE, \) J d\(^{-1} \)), or in case an energetic deficit is incurred, it will be counterbalanced by an energetic surplus as soon as the circumstances allow. A 24h day (\( T = 86,400 \) s d\(^{-1} \)) is split into time spent resting, foraging (\( T_f, \) s d\(^{-1} \)), and flying (\( T_v, \) s d\(^{-1} \), from and to a roost).

The daily intake of metabolizable energy (\( MEI, \) J d\(^{-1} \)) is the product of the instantaneous intake rate \( IIR \) (g s\(^{-1} \)), a function of the sward height (see section Intake rate below), after conversion to metabolizable energy (\( q.e.IIR, \) J s\(^{-1} \)), and the daily foraging time \( T_f \):

\[
MEI = q \cdot e \cdot IIR \cdot T_f \tag*{(eqn 1)}
\]

where \( q \) is the assimilation and \( e \) (J g\(^{-1} \)) the energy content of the food. \( T_f \) is a function of the energy balance (see below).

The daily energy expenditure (\( DEE, \) J d\(^{-1} \)) is:

\[
DEE = (T - T_f - T_{RMR}) RMR + T_f \cdot FMR + T_v \cdot VMR \tag*{(eqn 2)}
\]

where \( RMR \) (J s\(^{-1} \)) is resting metabolic rate, \( FMR \) (J s\(^{-1} \)) is field metabolic rate, and \( VMR \) (J s\(^{-1} \)) is flying metabolic rate.

Flying is an energy-demanding activity. Flight time \( T_v \) (s d\(^{-1} \)) is \( 2V/v \) where \( V \) is the average distance (m) from the roost to the foraging site and \( v \) is the average flight speed (m s\(^{-1} \)) [11]. The flight costs \( VMR \) (J s\(^{-1} \)) are allometrically scaled to body mass according to empirical data from other bird species [10]. For parameter values see Table S1.

The bird is in balance when the time spent foraging yields a net intake of foraging exactly covering the costs of resting and flying. Equalling \( MEI \) to \( DEE \), the required time spent foraging amounts to

\[
T_f^* = \frac{(T - T_f) RMR + T_v \cdot VMR}{q \cdot e \cdot IIR - (FMR - RMR)} \tag*{(eqn 3)}
\]

However, because the geese only forage during the day, the foraging time is limited by \( T_l \), the available time (day length including civil twilight; day length was calculated from geographical location, http://herbert.gandraxa.com/length_of_day.xml, adding 0.5 h to account for the timing of roost flights). Hence, if \( T_l < T_f^* \), the bird cannot cover its energy requirements on this day, and it loses weight [12]:

\[
\Delta M = k_m (MEI - DEE)/e \tag*{(eqn 4)}
\]

where \( k_m \) is the efficiency for utilization of metabolizable energy during maintenance (0.95, [3]) and \( e \) is the energy density of the tissue (27.5 kJ/g, [9]). As soon as the circumstances allow, and as long as the current weight is below the starting weight, body weight is gained again:
\[ \Delta M = k_m (MEI - DEE)/e \]  
\[(eqn 5)\]

where \(k_m\) is the efficiency for utilization of metabolizable energy during fat synthesis (0.8, [3]).

Within the thermoneutral zone, \(RMR\) is \(1.4 \times BMR\) (basal metabolic rate) and \(FMR\) is \(1.9 \times BMR\) [17]. During cold weather with wind and little radiation from the sun, the costs of maintaining body temperature can be higher than these standards \((RMR_s\) and \(FMR_s\)). Therefore, using the theory on heat exchange, we calculate the metabolic rate \(HMR\) needed to keep a bird body at 40 °C, both during the day \((HMR_d)\) and during the night \((HMR_n)\) [4, 14, 18]. Thus, realized resting metabolic rate \(RMR = \max(RMR_s, HMR_n)\) and, likewise, realized field metabolic rate \(FMR = \max(FMR_s, HMR_d)\). \(HMR\) is a function of ambient air temperature \(T_a\) (°C), wind speed \(u_{hc}\) (m s\(^{-1}\)) at \(h_c = 10\) m, and the global radiation \(R_g\) (W m\(^{-2}\)). The effect of cooling by wind is a function of the sward height. We neglect the heat loss through evaporation [4]. For further details see Thermoregulation costs.

**Intake rate**

On grassland, bite size \(S\) (g; all biomass in dry weight) is a function of sward height \(L\) (m) [6, 19]:

\[ S(L) = \frac{b_1 L}{1 + b_2 L} \]  
\[(eqn 6)\]

where \(b_1\) and \(b_2\) are regression-coefficients. As these herbivores are foraging on spatially concentrated plants [process 3, 15], total handling time \(T_h\) (s) is:

\[ T_h(S) = T_c + \frac{1}{R_{max}} S \]  
\[(eqn 7)\]

where \(T_c\) is cropping time (s) and \(R_{max}\) the maximum rate of chewing (in the absence of cropping, g s\(^{-1}\)). The cropping time \(T_c\) is in turn a function of sward height \(L\), presumably because the birds are becoming more selective with increasing sward height [6]:

\[ T_c(L) = T_{c0} + cL \]  
\[(eqn 8; [Box 1, 8])\]

One should also consider that geese regularly look up during foraging in order to check their surroundings. The ratio alert : feeding varies between 0.22 to 0.03, being lower the larger the group size [16] and the shorter the day length [7]. During alert the heart beat is elevated above resting levels [1, 13], and therefore we modelled alert as part of foraging. The intake rate is calculated over the time span feeding + alert, assuming a minimum proportion alert of 0.05. These processes together result in a type 4 functional response, with an instantaneous intake rate \(II R\) (g s\(^{-1}\)) as function of sward height \(L\):

\[ II R(L) = \frac{S(L)}{\alpha T_h(S)} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \left[ \frac{1 + b_2 L}{b_1 L} (T_{c0} + cL) + \frac{1}{R_{max}} \right]^{-1} \]  
\[(eqn 9)\]

where \(\alpha\) is the factor with which the feeding time is multiplied to account for the alert time (\(\alpha = 1.05\)). See Table S1 for parameter values.
Table S1. Parameter values for white-fronted geese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Footnote, [Ref]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>body mass $M$ (g)</td>
<td>2094</td>
<td>1,[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>functional response $b_1$ (g m$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>functional response $b_2$ (g m$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>functional response $c$ (s m$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimal cropping time $T_c$ (s)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximal chewing rate $R_{\text{max}}$ (g s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metabolic energy content of grass $q \cdot e$ (J g$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>7300</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basal metabolic rate $BMR$ (J s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resting metabolic rate $RMR$ (J s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>1.4$\times$BMR</td>
<td>[17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foraging metabolic rate $FMR$ (J s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>1.9$\times$BMR</td>
<td>[17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flight speed $v$ (m s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flight metabolism $VMR$ (J s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>114.4</td>
<td>9,[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distance from roost $V_{\text{max}}$ (m)</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 average of adults in winter
2 based on allometric relationship: $\log b_1 = -0.332 \log M + 0.493 \ (R^2 = 0.66, N = 4)$
3 based on allometric relationship: $\log b_2 = -1.49 \log M + 6.40 \ (R^2 = 0.85, N = 3)$
4 interpolation
5 average of other waterfowl species
6 based on allometric relationship: $\log R_{\text{max}} = 0.871 \log M - 4.38 \ (R^2 = 0.84, N = 4)$
7 based on allometric relationship: $\log BMR = 0.755 \log M - 1.642 \ (R^2 = 0.97, N = 9)$; in [2] erroneously listed under pink-footed goose
8 this study
9 based on allometric relationship in [10]
Thermoregulation costs

Input variables are the ambient air temperature $T_a$ (°C), windspeed $u_{hc}$ (m s$^{-1}$) at 10 m height and daily sunshine duration $SSD$ (h day$^{-1}$). For daytime we used maximum temperature and windspeed and daily sunshine, and for nighttime minimum temperature and windspeed and no sunshine. Output is $HMR$, the metabolic rate needed to heat the body and keep it at 40 °C.

$$HMR = H . 4 \pi . r^2$$

(Note: [18] uses $\pi . r^2$)

where $r$ (m) is the radius of the bird, calculated from body mass $M$ (g) using an empirical relationship (Birkebak 1966 in [18]):

$$r = \sqrt{(485.6 \times M/1000+592.83)/(4 \pi)} / 100$$

and $H$ (W m$^{-2}$) is the heat flux per surface area, which in turn is calculated as:

$$H = (\rho . cp) . (T_b - T_{es})/(r_p + r_e)$$

where

$\rho$ (g m$^{-3}$) is the density of dry air as a function of $T_a$:

$$\rho = 1292 - (5 . T_a) + (0.01567 . T_a^2)$$

(Monteith 1973 in [14])

cp is specific heat of air (1.010 J g$^{-1}$  oC$^{-1}$)

$T_b$ is body temperature (40 °C)

$T_{es}$ is standard operative temperature (°C) (see below)

$r_p$ is plumage resistance (867 s m$^{-1}$) [18]

$r_e$ (s m$^{-1}$) is equivalent outer resistance:

$$r_e = (r_r . r_o)/(r_r + r_o)$$

[14]

with:

$r_r$ (s m$^{-1}$) is radiation resistance:

$$r_r = (\rho . cp) / [4. \varepsilon . \sigma . (T_a + 273)^3]$$

where

$\varepsilon$ is emissivity of the surface of the bird (0.98) [4]

$\sigma$ is the Stefan-Boltzmann constant (5.67 10$^{-8}$ W m$^{-2}$ oC$^{-4}$)

$r_a$ (s m$^{-1}$) is convection resistance:

$$r_a = (r_{fr} . r_{fo})/(r_{fr} + r_{fo})$$

with:

$r_{fr}$ (s m$^{-1}$) is free convection resistance:

$$r_{fr} = 820 \ [2 . r / (T_s - T_a)]^{1/4}$$

and

$r_{fo}$ (s m$^{-1}$) is forced convection resistance:

$$r_{fo} = 307 \sqrt{(2. r / u)}$$

where:

$u$ (m s$^{-1}$) is the wind speed experienced by the bird (see below).

Furthermore:

$$T_{es} = T_b - (1 + 0.26 . \sqrt{u}) . (T_b - T_e)$$

(Bakken, 1990 in [4])

where:

$T_e$ (°C) is equivalent temperature:

$$T_e = T_a + (R_{abs} - R_{emi}) . r_e / (\rho . cp)$$

(Campbell, 1977 in [4])
in which:

\[ R_{\text{abs}} \ (\text{W} \ \text{m}^{-2}) \] is the *radiation absorbed* by the bird:

\[ R_{\text{abs}} = \alpha \cdot A_{\text{ratio}} \cdot R_g + \varepsilon_s \cdot \sigma \cdot (T_s + 273)^4 \]  
(Campbell, 1977 in [4])

where:

\( \alpha \) is *absorbtivity to radiation* (0.75) (Calder & King 1974 in [14])

\( A_{\text{ratio}} \) is *relative surface receiving direct radiation* (0.29) [4]

\( \varepsilon_s \) is *emissivity of the surroundings* (0.94) [4]

\( R_g \ (\text{W} \ \text{m}^{-2}) = R_a \cdot (A_a + B_a \cdot (\text{SSD} / \text{DL})) \)

**Footnotes:**^2 [2] incorrectly gives (W) as unit; \(^5 \) [4] incorrectly gives \( T_b \) instead of \( T_s \)

The wind speed \( u \) (m s\(^{-1}\)) at the bird level is:

\[ u = \frac{u^*}{k_v} \cdot \left[ \ln \left( \frac{(h_b + z_m - p d_0 \cdot h_v)}{z_m} \right) \right] \]  
(Campbell, 1977 in [4])

where:

\( u^* \) (m s\(^{-1}\)) is *friction velocity*:

\[ u^* = u_{hc} \cdot k_v \cdot \left[ \ln \left( \frac{(h_c + z_m - p d_0 \cdot h_v)}{z_m} \right) \right] \]  
(Campbell, 1977 in [4])

with:

\( u_{hc} \) is the wind speed measured at height \( h_c \) (\( h_c = 10 \) m)

\( k_v \) is the *Von Karman proportionality constant* (0.41) (note: \( k_v \) cancels out in eqn \( u^* \))

\( z_m \) is *roughness length* (0.01 m)  
(Wieringa, 1993 in [18])

\( p d_0 \) is *relative displacement height* (0.78 of \( h_v \)) (Shuttleworth, 1989 in [18])

\( h_v \) (m) is *vegetation height* (m)

\( h_b \) (m) is *height of the bird’s centre of gravity above the ground*, from \( r \) (bird radius)

\( h_b = 1.5 \times r \)

**Footnotes:**^5 [2] incorrectly gives (W) as unit; \(^5\) [4] incorrectly gives \( T_b \) instead of \( T_s \)
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