

# Wildlife Management Advice Note

Legal measures to resolve conflict with wild birds

NATURAL  
ENGLAND

WML-GU01  
April 2019



## Introduction

**Widespread and common** species of the crow family, geese, gulls and pigeons can sometimes have a harmful effect on agriculture, game and other wildlife species and pose a risk to public health and safety. Despite their abundance, like all wild birds, these species are legally protected.

There are a range of methods, however, that can be used to deter these birds to prevent or at least minimise problems, and many have application for more than one situation.

This advice note provides guidance on the legal methods that can be used to help manage certain wild birds lawfully without any licence.

### Legal methods to deter wild birds:

1. [Visual deterrents](#)
2. [Auditory scaring](#)
3. [Human disturbance and shooting to scare](#)
4. [Restricting access to food sources](#)
5. [Modification of loafing and/or roosting areas](#)
6. [Habitat management](#)
7. [Public education](#)
8. [Lethal control of geese during the open season](#)

### To maximise success and ensure birds do not become habituated you need to:

- Monitor how well methods work and adapt if necessary to improve effectiveness;
- Use a range of different methods; and
- Ensure methods are used at the right time, in the right way and that methods are varied regularly.

### When planning the action it is important to consider the following factors:

- Human presence, proximity to residential areas and public rights of way;
- Proximity to any areas that are designated as a 'protected site' and the presence of other protected species that may be affected by management actions;
- Uncontrollable variables such as weather; and
- Which management methods are already being used and how well they are working.

The following sections give detail on the standard bird management options listed above which can be applied across bird species and sectors. This is followed by specific advice on:

- [Protecting livestock from corvid predation](#)
- [Non-lethal management of geese](#)
- [Non-lethal management of gulls and pigeons](#)

# Standard legal deterrent methods

## 1. Visual deterrents

- Items which reflect light and break lines of flight can be effective. People have used items such as CDs, small mirrors, '1970s disco' balls and suspended feed sacks with large 'eyes' drawn on them.
- Flashing lights such as amber flashing car beacons and even disco lights may be tried.
- Single sided reflective tape (which also serves as a physical barrier) can be strung across vulnerable areas and the light flashing from one side of the tape has a deterrent effect. If single sided reflective tape is not available, red and white barrier tape could be used, with aluminium foil strips attached along it to provide the flashing effect.
- Tapes should be set at varying heights and spacing to break flight lines and can have streamers of tape hanging down from the suspended horizontal lines to provide additional benefit (see also 'Exclusion' below). Spinning reflective or metallic strips (such as spinners manufactured to prevent eave nesting birds) may also enhance the effect.
- Mannequins or scarecrows can be very effective, especially when they appear as human as possible. Mannequins used for clothes displays with human style eyes are ideal. It is recommended that the mannequin is dressed like the person or people that undertake scaring. Deterrence of certain bird species can be aided by dressing the scarecrow in a hi-visibility jacket, and the landowner also wearing a hi-visibility jacket of the same colour (orange has been shown to work with some species) whenever shooting to scare. The problem birds are conditioned to associate an orange figure with danger, and should then be deterred whenever a human or scarecrow wearing this colour is present, even when not scaring.
- It is vital that scarecrows are visible from the air, so that they can scare before the bird attempts to land. They must be regularly moved to prevent habituation (birds becoming accustomed to their presence and learning they are not a threat), ideally once a day but at least once every two/three days and wherever possible should be reinforced by further shooting to scare from behind them.

Visual scarers are available in various forms (for example pop-up effigies, kites, helium balloons, etc.). The most effective techniques appear to be those that simulate shooting by the use of effigies that suddenly appear from cover. One example is a model of a man with a gun that is attached to a gas cannon in such a way that the effigy appears a few seconds before the cannon is fired. This can also be used for purely visual scaring when simultaneous use of the cannon is inappropriate. However, such measures are only thought to have an effective range up to 200 metres (220 yards) and so would be of limited use on larger sites.

## 2. Auditory scaring

- Noise generating scarers (for example gas cannons which are powered by propane, controlled by electric timers to produce loud reports, rope bangers, rockets) can be effective at smaller sites, particularly if combined with the use of mobile visual scarers, or human disturbance.
- The location of noise generating scarers should be changed frequently, and the interval between reports varied to decrease the risk of habituation. The use of such devices may be limited where there are risks of disturbing other wildlife or due to the proximity of human habitation and they are not

considered effective on large areas. If not moved regularly birds may habituate quickly to their presence.

- Starter pistols are very effective at scaring target birds. Target birds when they come in to feed, repeating shots as and when the birds return.
- Air horns are considered effective if target birds are circling and trying to land.
- A very cost effective noise scarer is simply a metal ruler connected to a square of plywood. The ruler is 'twanged' against the board and the resulting noise is both loud and resembling that of a gun.
- Portable radios have been used in and around release pens to simulate human presence. Radios should be tuned to a talk radio station as it is the human voice that is the deterrent. These, combined with scarecrows can be very effective. They can also deter mammals, which may be positive or negative. Again they should be moved regularly for maximum effect.
- 
- Gas guns may be more effective for larger areas, but they have to be moved regularly to maintain any effect. Their effectiveness may be increased by shooting to scare and mannequins dressed the same as the shooter. They are more suited to protecting crops and physical structures than protecting other living creatures. If stock is being protected, the use of such devices needs careful consideration to ensure the likely impact on the stock do not outweigh any beneficial effect.

### **3. Human disturbance and shooting to scare**

- Human presence is by far the most effective means of deterring problem birds. It helps to keep a diary of problem bird activities e.g. timings, so that changes in wild bird behaviour are detected and the timing of human presence adjusted accordingly.
- Efforts should be made to maximise human presence at or near particularly vulnerable sites and make this as effective at scaring the birds as possible. Approaching birds, shouting, clapping hands and waving arms are all effective. Human presence should be kept varied and irregular to reduce the chances of birds habituating to human presence.
- If persons undertaking scaring patrols are dressed in the same clothing as persons either shooting to scare, or to kill and as scarecrows, then the effect is also enhanced.

#### **Shooting to scare**

- This technique is highly effective, especially when combined with other techniques. No licence is required for non-lethal shooting to scare birds. As with other techniques shooting to scare needs both repeating and varying in its application.
- To be effective in the longer term, shooting to scare needs to be repeated at frequent (but not predictable) intervals. Scaring measures should also be implemented as early as possible to prevent birds establishing a pattern of feeding at a particular site. It is advised that communication should be made with local residents/landowners/local police to inform them of plans to shoot to scare and timings.

### **4. Restricting access to food sources**

Where birds are accessing food supplies then the following should be undertaken:

- Avoid the spillage of foodstuffs, or quickly clean up those that do occur;
- Keep food storage areas secure and bird-proof;
- Ensure that disposal and waste facilities are kept clean and tidy;
- Limit or prevent the deliberate feeding of birds by the public or site staff.

- Outdoor livestock units pose particular challenges for preventing bird access to feed, but a variation in feeding times may be beneficial.
- Certain bird species, including the swallow and barn owl regularly breed inside farm buildings. Such species must be taken into account when deciding upon proofing measures that restrict their access to breeding sites.
- With regard to physical exclusion, the prevention of bird contact with livestock and feed by the fitting of suitable proofing materials offers the best chance of finding a long-term solution.
- Where livestock can reach the proofing, the use of suitable wire mesh may be necessary instead of plastic or other vulnerable materials.

## 5. Modification of loafing and/or roosting areas

### Roost management

- Roost management may be an option where it is possible to cut down or modify roosting and resting sites to stop their use or make sites less attractive. However, this is likely to be constrained by factors such as adverse environmental or amenity impact. It is not considered a viable option for larger sites. Where whole trees cannot be removed, it may be possible to remove parts favoured by resting birds.
- Removal of a roosting or loafing tree can work very well, as long as there aren't other suitable trees present. Landowner consent is required before removing any trees and suitable checks need to be undertaken with regards to preservation orders, nesting birds, and roosting or hibernating bats. In some cases, coppicing of trees has been effective - removing the loafing opportunities to target birds, but providing long term nesting habitat for other species.
- Gull spikes work very well in proofing roosting or resting areas (such as gutters, roof edges, branches and gables/jetties) and have worked in a number of locations.

### Loafing Areas

- Areas where birds sit on the ground and rest between feeding and flight are known as loafing areas and efforts should be made to either proof them or disturb the birds using them.
- Human presence will soon deter birds from loafing at that location, and if this is not possible, other auditory and visual scarers should be considered.
- Also a simple arrangement of sticks of posts with barrier type tape tied between them in an irregular pattern is likely to be highly effective. Spacing and height should be varied and lengths of tape can be left hanging from posts to blown in the wind – creating a visual, physical and also audible deterrent, with the tapes flapping and often 'humming' in the wind.

## 6. Habitat management

Further guidance is provided in the annexes for [protecting livestock from corvid predation, geese, feral pigeons and gull species](#).

### Removal of unused nests

The removal of unused nests outside of the nesting season can be undertaken lawfully and can be very effective for some problem situations. Species which cause problems by roof nesting (such as gulls) can be deterred or reduced in number by removing old nests, to prevent their re-use the following season. It is also lawful and effective to proof areas to prevent birds from nesting.

## **Physical barriers**

- Where scaring is not desirable, it may be possible to exclude the birds from sensitive areas by physically preventing them from gaining access. As with scaring techniques, exclusion is likely to be most effective if alternative sites are available for the birds to move to. However, these techniques may create some difficulties as they affect other bird species.
- Where birds habitually walk from one area to another it might be possible to erect a fence, even of a temporary nature, to deter birds from walking in that direction. This can be effective for geese and swans, both in urban and agricultural problem situations.
- Cages or roofing may be used for small or discreet areas, but are rarely practical and cost effective measures.

## **Proofing measures**

- Netting and mesh materials can be used to cover vulnerable areas. It is important that all materials are correctly installed and maintained as they can be prone to damage and trapping birds.
- As a guide, netting and mesh materials should not exceed 50 mm for pigeons (measurements refer to square mesh construction). Proofing may also provide additional benefits by reducing draughts and heat loss. However, where this is likely to affect ventilation and pose a possible health risk to livestock, specialist advice should be sought.

## **Crop planting**

- Where crop damage is occurring, consider planting sacrificial crops along field margins and siting valuable crops nearer to human disturbance and away from woodland/cover. Where possible, consider switching to Spring-sown crop varieties which are less likely to suffer serious damage, particularly from geese.

## **7. Public education**

This primarily relates to urban situations and species such as geese, pigeons and gulls. Geese fouling in public parks and pigeons fouling pavements or food premises can present a risk of slipping and/or disease spread. Gull species are often problematic in seaside towns where they nest on rooftops, scavenge food from people on the seafront and make a loud noise.

- Discourage the feeding of birds by members of the public or staff, including by providing information about the health and safety risks. Encourage responsible disposal of food waste with appropriate signage and adequate rubbish disposal bins in public areas.

## **8. Lethal control of huntable species during the open season**

Where huntable species like Canada geese and Greylag geese are causing problems, lethal control during the open the season is lawful without a licence.

- Shooting in the open season can help reduce the local population to a manageable level and avoid the need for licensed control during the breeding season.
- Shooting in the open season also helps reinforce the deterrent effect of 'shooting to scare'
- The open season for geese and other wildfowl species is 1 Sept – 31 Jan (inland) and 1 Sept-20 Feb (below high water mark). To find out which geese are huntable see [Schedule 2](#) Part 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

## Annex 1: Protecting livestock (e.g. poultry, sheep, lambs, piglets and reared game birds) from corvid predation

In addition to the standard bird management options, the following techniques may be effective at reducing problems:

- Exclusion/proofing
- Habitat management
- Husbandry

### Exclusion/proofing to protect reared game birds and poultry

- When birds, such as pheasant poults are placed in a pen in the wild or free range chickens released into a field, a logical option is to roof the pens, providing complete separation of wild and released birds.
- Complete roofing is not generally suitable in woodland environments (see below), or for large areas such as field for free range poultry. It is however very suitable for smaller areas, such as rearing pens for chicks etc.
- There are two aspects to consider regarding the practicality of this technique in woodlands.
  - Firstly pens or release areas may be both large and set in environments, such as woodland, which may be difficult to effectively roof securely due to protruding trees. This is likely to make this method expensive and impractical in some situations. Pheasant poults typically only remain within the release pen for the first 2-3 weeks upon release, thereafter spreading into the wider environment. Thus, for pheasant poult releases, unless predation is entirely within the pen (which is unlikely) this method will only provide very short term benefit, which may be unreasonable when set against costs as well as being impractical.
  - Secondly, poults released into the pen will typically roost in the trees in the pen initially (above likely roof level) and within 2-3 weeks will leave and enter the pen via the 'roof'.
- However, roofing, including partial or temporary roofing, should be considered as an option and not dismissed out of hand for any situation, it may be a very effective long term solution for birds which are kept in penned type environments for longer periods or all of their life.
- It may be possible to roof part of a pen for a short period of time, or to semi-roof it by placing ropes/wires/tapes across the roof for a short period of time. The aim being to reduce corvid access by making it either impossible, or very difficult for them to enter the area. For poults, when they start to leave the pen by flying up and out, temporary tapes can be removed – and redeployed over other vulnerable areas – not only re-using the material but also varying the technique, which makes it harder for problem birds to habituate to the deterrent.
- Suspending wires and tapes over the pens and across vulnerable areas such as open ground, rides and feeding areas can be very effective. Barrier or reflective tape may be used as may ropes or twine. Heavy duty plastic barrier mesh fencing may be useful as it provides a wider barrier and covers more area making access difficult for corvids. When using any of these methods, care should be taken to prevent birds becoming entangled.
- Tapes and wires should be suspended in sufficient density to make it difficult for corvids to fly through the area and also at different heights. Streamers or CD's can be added to increase the effect. Placing merely a few regularly spaced lengths of tape at the same height is not likely to be effective.
- Lengths of square gauge plastic site fencing may also be used to good effect, either suspended vertically or even horizontally over very vulnerable areas. These offer larger areas of protection and mixed with tapes and wires may enhance effectiveness.

- Pheasant and chicken will react differently to avian predation, with the former making for cover and the latter 'hunkering' down to the ground until danger has passed. Thus a chicken in a field is more vulnerable and less likely to use cover – but options to increase protection could include – taping in a 'fan' shape over feeding areas, housing units (if mobile) brought together in a circle to provide additional safe ground, with tapes strung between them.
- Where possible, obvious perches for problem birds should be removed and nails driven into the top of fence posts (nail head protruding upwards) to prevent them being used as perches or vantage points. Removing perches in woods, where there will be many, is quite often impossible, but if obvious ones are present then efforts should be made to remove them.

## Habitat management to protect reared game birds and poultry

- The type and nature of vegetation in and around the site is a very important factor. It can provide increased attractiveness to problem birds as well as being important for the livestock itself, especially for game bird releases. For this activity, vegetation should be managed to maintain the optimum levels of cover both inside and outside the pen. Quite often woodland growth, such as canopy closure, and resultant restricted growth of ground level vegetation and shrubs can rapidly change conditions. Management needs to be ongoing and planned ahead to maintain suitable structure. Whilst short term measures can provide a more immediate solution, good habitat management is essential for minimising the problem in the long term.
- For free range poultry, allowing vegetation within the fields used by the livestock to grow longer and offer more cover may also be an option worth considering.
- By far the most effective method of reducing predation by birds at game bird release pens is good habitat and this being in the form of good vegetative, herb and shrub cover. Recommendations for pen cover varies slightly between sources and over time, however the most recent advice from the GWCT to NE is roughly one third shrubs, one third ground cover and one third open sunny areas for birds to sunbathe. This should be provided in a mosaic throughout the area not in single large blocks. In areas of high predation, effort should be made to increase the amount and also density of the shrub layer. Shrubs should have a good structure and be quite dense to provide cover, blackthorn and hawthorn being good species. Larger leaved broadleaf species such as elder have value but generally offer less dense structure and cover. Without management, shrub cover can become thin and leggy; it requires management to maintain the optimum structure. This obviously takes time to achieve and long term wood and release pen management is essential to provide this.
- A short term solution for lacking shrub cover may be to provide additional low and mid height cover by using branches and brash to form loose piles, wigwams or windrows to increase density. If the pen is in woodland and the canopy has closed then selective removal of some trees may increase both light to the woodland floor and stimulate plant growth as well as provide brushing material. Splitting or laying overgrown shrubs may also increase density and new growth. Bringing down windblown and hung up trees may likewise provide cover of their own or be used to provide brash within the wood.
- Siting release pens in dense stands of un-thinned conifer woodland should be avoided, as these offer little cover and can be dark and cold. Often rides are straight and ideal predator corridors. If the stand has been brashed (removal of low branches to around head height) this makes the wood even more unsuitable for releases as there is little cover beneath the canopy.
- Birds should have access to well developed and well placed cover outside the pen and the home wood. This can be via natural vegetation such as copses, hedgerows and cover strips etc.

## Husbandry

- As well as the additional non-lethal measures given elsewhere in this document, it should also be remembered that alongside adapted and good husbandry practices, control of other predators should be undertaken as normal for an enterprise with livestock kept outdoors. Fox predation can be a

significant factor in losses for livestock, and ground vermin and other predator control should be undertaken where appropriate.

- Good husbandry practices, including regularly checking livestock and removing sick or injured animals to safe areas, can help reduce the risk of predation.
- Where predation is a recognised problem choosing less susceptible breeds and / or larger, less vulnerable animals can help reduce predation risk.

### **Reared game birds and poultry**

- Stocking density should be in accordance with industry guidance. For pheasant poults this should be within GWCT guidelines for maximum stocking density of 700-1000 birds per hectare.
- Feed/water/grit etc. should be placed adjacent to cover so birds can quickly access cover if threatened. Proof open areas with wires/tapes etc. as above.
- Pheasant poults are normally released around 6 weeks old. Releasing poults that are older and larger can help reduce losses to avian predation. Release of 7 to 8 week old or even slightly older poults should be considered, although this may create some issues to balance. Many breeders are reluctant to hold on to birds much older than nine weeks, so this may be difficult to achieve. Older birds may also be both more difficult to retain in the pen long enough and increase losses to ground predators and possible health and welfare issues may arise from penning birds for longer.
- Similarly if young chicken, 'pullets', are more subject to predation than adults, consider releasing these birds at a larger size.

### **Sheep, lambs and piglets**

- Check stock regularly. Sick or poorly livestock, which are likely to be more vulnerable to predation, should be kept in safer areas, and checks on cast ewes (laying on their backs and unable to right themselves) conducted regularly.
- Keep vulnerable stock indoors at critical times. If not possible, keep vulnerable stock in fields close to areas of greatest human activity (farms, houses, busy paths and roads).
- Fields and locations where regular corvid attacks occur should not be used to hold vulnerable stock.
- Consider the use of tapes or wires to deter corvids from small penned areas.

## Annex 2: Non-lethal management of geese

Geese and can cause agricultural damage as well as problems related to health and safety due to fouling, disease and attacks on people. In addition to the standard bird management options, you should try the following techniques to remove problem birds from a site:

- Habitat management
- Physical barriers to prevent access

### Habitat management

It may be possible to permanently alter an area where geese are causing problems to make the site permanently unattractive to them. Whilst the features that make a water body suitable for geese are not fully understood, enough is known about the biology of the birds to allow a number of suggestions for habitat modifications to be made.

#### Landscaping: bank steepening and island removal

- As with fencing (see below), making it more difficult for geese to walk out of water bodies onto feeding areas by steepening banks may encourage the birds to move elsewhere.
- Avoiding shallow marginal areas which support water plants will also restrict the food supply for the geese, but this may adversely affect other waterfowl and/or damage the rest of the aquatic habitat. Safety concerns arising from deep water and steep banks in public areas would also need to be considered.
- Because geese prefer to breed on islands, the complete removal of an island could be considered if fencing proved ineffective in discouraging the birds. Low lying islands could be effectively removed by raising water levels in some circumstances. As with all other exclusion or habitat modification techniques, the effect on other wildlife would need to be considered before undertaking such action.

#### Barrier planting, marginal vegetation, trees

- Establishing areas of dense vegetation along the shores of water bodies (possibly concealing a cheaper fence structure) or breaking up large grass areas with planting which restricts the bird's view of the water (and hence reduces its feeling of safety) have all proved effective in certain circumstances.
- If geese do fly out to feed in small areas flanked by hedges and trees, they prefer a shallow angle when flying back out of the grazing area. Thus, the taller the surrounding vegetation relative to the size of the field or other grazed area the less likely the geese are to use it.

#### Reducing available foraging areas adjacent to water bodies by changing ground cover

- It may be possible to reduce or eliminate goose damage to amenity areas by changing the ground cover planting to species that are not palatable to the geese. Ground cover plants with tough leaves, such as ivy, and many shrub species are not readily eaten by geese and planting the fringes of lakes with a combination of barrier planting and unpalatable ground cover may reduce the feeding opportunities to the point where the geese move elsewhere. Also, allowing short grass used by geese for grazing to grow long and/or mowing grass to create alternative feeding areas can also be successful in moving geese within a site and may even reduce geese numbers. However, it should be noted that a change in planting may also affect other waterfowl.

#### Alternative feeding areas

- Scaring the target birds from problem areas will be easier to achieve if other feeding areas are available nearby. Any plant that is attractive to the target species can be used in alternative feeding areas. The

crop most frequently considered is grass. Some farmers have sown fields of barley or oilseed rape as sacrificial crops to attract the geese away from other crops the farmers want to harvest.

- Set-aside land can be used as long as the vegetation is attractive to the target bird species and is appropriately managed.

## Physical barriers to prevent access

Where scaring of geese is not desirable, it may be possible to exclude the birds from sensitive areas by physically preventing them from gaining access. As with scaring techniques, exclusion is likely to be most effective if alternative sites are available for the birds to move to. However these techniques may create some difficulties as they affect other waterfowl species as well as geese. The erection of fences along a lakeside may also have implications for public safety if someone were to fall into the water and be unable to get out easily.

### Fencing

- Perhaps the most obvious way to exclude geese is to fence sensitive areas to prevent them gaining access. Despite the fact that the geese can fly, even low fences of between 30 cm to 1 m high can be effective in excluding them from some areas as they prefer to walk to their feeding and roosting sites if possible.
- Fencing the edge of a lake may be sufficient to cause the geese to move elsewhere if they are unable to walk easily out of the water. Geese dislike enclosed areas where they cannot easily escape from predators.
- Barriers that divide an area into smaller units may therefore help to discourage the birds from using the site concerned.
- Fences have been successfully used to exclude geese from breeding and roosting sites, especially where alternative sites were available nearby. Fencing the perimeter of park lakes is not necessarily an expensive option because a simple post and chicken wire fence will suffice if properly erected, but a more decorative and permanent structure may involve a significant cost.
- Fencing may be a particularly effective option at sites used by moulting geese because if they are prevented from walking out of the water whilst they cannot fly they will not be able to access the protected areas. Care should be taken, however, to ensure that moulting birds and newly hatch young have access to sufficient suitable grazing areas so they do not starve. A gap at the bottom of the fence of about 8cm will allow smaller waterfowl access to the land. However, any fencing will also deter other geese and mute swans.

## Annex 3: Non-lethal management of pigeons and gulls

Pigeons and gulls can pose health and safety problems such as fouling, disease, flooding from nests blocking gutters and attacks on people. It is difficult to control individual birds and management usually involves management of flocks at nesting and roosting sites.

In addition to standard bird management options you should consider the following:

- Environmental management
- Preventing access

### Environmental management

- A build-up of bird numbers in urban environments is normally a result of the presence of a readily accessible food supply and/or the availability of attractive habitats where they can roost or breed. Effective long-term management is normally dependent on the ability to eliminate or reduce these aspects.
- In urban areas, this can be difficult because numerous occupiers and individuals may have some degree of responsibility for the cause of the problem or may be affected by it.
- A very important factor is the ability of the birds to gain access to a regular supply of food. If this can be denied them, then problems may be resolved without recourse to other measures.

Consider the possibilities for:

- Avoiding the spillage of foodstuffs;
- Keeping food storage areas secure and bird-proof;
- Ensuring that disposal and waste facilities are kept clean and tidy;
- Limiting or preventing the deliberate feeding of birds by the public or site staff.

### Preventing access

- Birds can be prevented from entering or roosting on buildings by either installing netting over vulnerable areas or fixing wire, plastic or other purpose-designed devices to deter birds from landing on ledges, window sills or other structures.
- The fitting of proofing and deterrent measures can be complicated, and is usually carried out by experienced operators. Correctly installed, these measures can provide a long term solution to bird problems. If inappropriate techniques are used, they may fail to exclude or deter the birds. For example, the mesh size of netting must be suitable for the species involved.
- Correct installation and maintenance of netting is essential to maintain its effectiveness and to prevent the accidental trapping of birds.
- Attempts at scaring birds in urban situations using conventional visual or audible scarers are generally neither effective nor practical. Although there are a number of electronic devices on the market for which claims of bird deterrence are made, only the appropriate use of recorded distress calls of specific species, is likely to work.