

**Journal of Fish and Wildlife Management :: Issues and Perspectives**

**Florida's strategic position for collaborative automated-telemetry tracking of avian movements across the Americas**

Kara L. Lefevre\*, Adam D. Smith

**K.L. Lefevre**

Department of Ecology and Environmental Studies, Florida Gulf Coast University, Fort Myers, FL 33965

**A.D. Smith**

U.S. Fish and Wildlife, National Wildlife Refuge System, Division of Strategic Resource Management, Inventory and Monitoring Branch, South Atlantic-Gulf and Mississippi Basin, 135 Phoenix Road, Athens, GA 30605

\* Corresponding author: [klefevre@fgcu.edu](mailto:klefevre@fgcu.edu)

Received: August 15, 2019; Accepted: December 29, 2019; Published Online Early: January 2020; Published: xxx

Citation: Lefevre KL, Smith AD. 2020. Florida's strategic position for collaborative automated-telemetry tracking of avian movements across the Americas. *Journal of Fish and Wildlife Management* 11(1):xx-xx; e1944-687X. <https://doi.org/10.3996/082019-JFWM-068>

This Online Early paper will appear in its final typeset version in a future issue of the Journal of Fish and Wildlife Management. This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading

process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. The findings and conclusions in this article are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

## Introduction

A central challenge to understanding the ecology of migratory animals stems from their dependence on environmental conditions and resources spread across vast spatial scales (Webster et al. 2002; Martin et al. 2007). By definition, migrants inhabit not only the two worlds of breeding and non-breeding grounds (*sensu* Greenberg and Marra 2005), but also diverse migratory routes and stopover locations between those worlds (Faaborg et al. 2010; Bayly et al. 2018). The study of animal migration and movement ecology has experienced a renaissance over the last two decades spurred by innovations that help tackle this central challenge, including advances in tracking via satellite-based (e.g., Argos, Global Positioning Systems, ICARUS), cellular-based (e.g., Cellular Tracking Technologies or CTT), and position or light-logging (e.g., GPS logger, geolocator,) tag technology (e.g., see reviews by Wikelski et al. 2007; Bridge et al. 2011; McKinnon and Love 2018). These innovations and associated data portal initiatives (e.g., Movebank; Kranstauber et al. 2011; Wikelski and Kays 2012) have enabled new insights about movement patterns of migratory animals across all parts of the globe.

Such technological advances give unprecedented access to the annual cycle of many migratory species (e.g., Bayly et al. 2018; Cohen et al. 2018), although they have limitations, related mainly to the relatively large size of satellite- and cellular-based tags (>5 g) and the necessity of recapturing individuals to retrieve logging tags (Bridge et al. 2011; Kays et al. 2015). More traditional “very high” (VHF) or “ultra high” frequency (UHF) transmitters and their digitally-encoded descendants (e.g., Taylor et al. 2017) remain as the primary option for tracking small-bodied migratory animals on the move, particularly when used in the context of collaborative or cooperative automated telemetry (Bridge et al. 2011; Kays et al. 2015; Taylor et al. 2017). Our objectives are to advance the collective goal of studying the ecology of migratory animals using that collaborative approach, and to stimulate further research that illuminates animal movements across the Americas. Specifically, here we (1) document and encourage the filling of infrastructure and research gaps within an expanding automated telemetry system in North America that is available to study the movement ecology of small migratory animals, and

(2) highlight the strategic position of Florida as a bridge between the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of the United States, and between North and South America via the Caribbean. Our comments focus on birds because that is our primary study system, although these principles pertain more generally to flying migratory species including bats and insects. While we share common goals with a broad array of colleagues, throughout this paper the word “we” refers specifically to the authors (i.e. the viewpoint of two collaborating researchers of avian migration).

### **Coordinated automated telemetry via Motus**

The Motus Wildlife Tracking System is a recent but well-established and well-supported application of cooperative automated telemetry. The purpose of Motus is to facilitate landscape-scale research and education on the ecology and conservation of migratory animals. It is a program of Birds Canada in partnership with collaborating researchers, organizations, educators, and citizens to undertake impactful ecological research and education in support of that shared goal. While the name Motus is sometimes mistaken for an acronym, it is simply the Latin word for movement or motion (Birds Canada 2019a).

Within the system or network, small (0.25 - 3 g) digitally-coded transmitters on single VHF frequencies are used to detect and infer the trajectory of animal movements within a collaboratively maintained and ever-growing global array of over 700 monitoring stations (Taylor et al. 2017; Mackenzie 2018). While other large-scale automated telemetry systems have been used elsewhere (e.g., Kays et al. 2011; Řeřucha et al. 2015; Toledo et al. 2016), Motus is the most accessible and fastest-growing system in the Americas. It has facilitated new insights into the migration routes, rates, and stopover behavior of individual migratory birds. Assessments have been made of phenomena such as the full life cycle of the formerly endangered Kirtland's Warbler *Setophaga kirtlandii* (Cooper et al. 2018), migratory staging behavior of the vulnerable Rusty Blackbird *Euphagus carolinus* (Wright et al. 2018), individual migratory flight decisions of songbirds (Baldwin et al. 2018), and the dispersal and staging of terns throughout the Western North Atlantic (Loring et al. 2017, 2019).

What is now Motus began as a regional network of custom-built receiving stations, founded and coordinated by Acadia University (Nova Scotia, Canada) and other partners in the northeast of North America in 2012-2013 (Taylor et al. 2017). Initial receiving stations were established in

Nova Scotia, southern Ontario, and around the Gulf of Maine. Thus, in its early stages circa 2014-2015, few receiving stations existed in the southeastern United States (Figure 1a). Since then, Motus partners such as the United States Fish and Wildlife Service's National Wildlife Refuge System and Migratory Birds Program, Louisiana Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Gulf Coast Bird Observatory in Texas, and others have established nearly 50 stations and partnered with other federal, state, university, and non-profit organizations to improve coverage along the south Atlantic and Gulf Coasts (Figure 1b). Despite these improvements, the continued low density of receiving stations in that region and within peninsular Florida misses an important opportunity to enhance our ability to track continental animal movements via the Motus network.

### **Strategic importance of Florida as a crossroads**

The southeast region of the United States figures prominently in the pathways of migrating birds; landscapes around the Gulf of Mexico alone provide habitats for billions of Nearctic–Neotropical migrants that travel between their breeding grounds in North America and tropical non-breeding grounds in the Caribbean and Central and South America (Lafleur et al. 2016; Cohen et al. 2017; Horton et al. 2019). Ensuring robust Motus coverage across the eastern Gulf and throughout Florida is essential for the network to reach its full potential because of this region's importance to migratory birds. Florida effectively functions as a crossroads, bridging East-West and North-South. Florida is located within a major path for North American migratory birds, i.e. the Atlantic flyway. We additionally infer that Florida's adjacent panhandle and peninsula function as a land extension for southbound migrants reaching the Gulf Coast en route to the Caribbean and South America (or avoiding northbound flights across the Gulf of Mexico) at the administrative "end" of the Mississippi flyway (USFWS 2019). So, roughly speaking, these two of the continent's major flyways overlap longitudinally along the state's length (see Lovette and Fitzpatrick 2016, Figure 12.17). Motus data demonstrate that Florida's migration catchment area extends well beyond these two flyways: to date, Motus stations have detected more than 300 tagged animals moving through the state, representing at least 35 species spread among tagging locations around the Americas (data from Motus 2019; Figure 2).

Moreover, the state forms a critical connection by straddling north and south: “its latitudinal position astride the northern edge of the tropics fosters mingling of, and competition between, temperate and tropical biotas” (Webb 1990, p.70). The distinctly sub-tropical climate of the southern tip of the state highlights this linkage to the tropical south. For example, the prevalence of mangrove forests (Stevens et al. 2006) and the presence of bird species more associated with the tropics, like the Magnificent Frigatebird *Fregata magnificens* and the Swallow-tailed Kite *Elanoides forficatus*, further illustrate Florida’s strategic position as a “bridge” within the Americas.

The coastlines of the southeast play a particularly important role in “funneling” migrants south through the Caribbean and figure prominently in the migration pathways of Neotropical migrants. For southbound migrants, these coasts culminate in the long and flat, narrow peninsula of Florida, stretching at most a mere 150 km from its Atlantic to Gulf Coasts with a maximum elevation of 120 m. Owing to a geography paralleled in Central America, migrants are much more concentrated in their non-breeding areas compared to on their northern breeding grounds, as demonstrated by big-data models based on eBird sightings (Rodewald and Rosenberg 2018).

The increased concentration of migrants moving through Florida also conveys a potential for increased susceptibility to multiple environmental stressors. Impacts of global climate change may disproportionately affect low-lying areas that provide important stopover habitats (e.g., Lester et al. 2016). Other factors such as rapid coastal development (Johnson and Barbour 1990; Kautz 1993) and recently heightened harmful algal blooms (Perkins 2019) make Florida’s coastal birds particularly vulnerable. More generally, shifts in avian distributions and movements, whether due to altered climate or food distributions or their synergistic effects, are being documented by both amateur and scientific observers (e.g., Wilson et al. 2013; Hovick et al. 2016). Informed and efficient conservation efforts will therefore depend on better understanding how habitats throughout Florida are used by numerous species of migrating birds. Noteworthy recent examples include the demonstration that the most important non-breeding node across the Americas for the widespread Tree Swallow *Tachycineta bicolor* is south Florida (Knight et al. 2018), and that areas across Florida provide important stopover areas for the formerly endangered Kirtland’s Warbler (Cooper et al. 2017).

Given this strategic importance of Florida for migratory birds, surprisingly limited resources are devoted to ongoing monitoring of populations. Coastal birds are well-studied in select locations, owing to collaborations of state agencies, non-profit groups, and other organizations, through regional partnerships that comprise the Florida Shorebird Alliance. Yet much of the ongoing data collection depends on volunteer efforts from the community, such as Audubon Florida's shorebird stewardship programs. These citizen efforts stitch together the patchwork of scant resources for bird monitoring, and they are laudable and invaluable. However, we argue that they should be bolstered by dedicated funding to support research and management initiatives for avian conservation.

More evidence of a gap in research attention and resources is the fact that the Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network includes no site within Florida, despite the state's extensive coastline available to shorebirds. We infer a possible explanation: shorebird populations may be more diffuse across Florida, attributable to the expanse of available habitat. The lack of standout sites with concentrations of shorebirds can make monitoring even more challenging, underscoring the value and effectiveness of bolstering Motus coverage to better understand movements and site use throughout the state.

#### **Moving forward: more collaboration and embracing new tools**

A multi-sectoral effort to grow Motus receiving network coverage in the Gulf and the Atlantic continues: in southern Florida, many new stations became operational in 2018 and 2019, fueled by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service efforts to install stations on coastal National Wildlife Refuges, and to engage and support potential land management, conservation, and academic partners. Large gaps persist, but every new receiving station grows our capacity to better understand the region's importance to migratory animals. For example, detections of several Kirtland's Warblers by multiple Motus stations in south and west Florida advocate for an expanded Florida network: those tagged birds were not detected by other stations in the region (N. Cooper, pers. comm.), demonstrating how a modest investment in additional monitoring efforts can generate important ecological insights. Continuing to fill the gap in southeastern station coverage—particularly in Florida—will improve our ability to assess the roles that this

region plays in the annual cycle of migratory species. It will in turn spur regional-to-international initiatives for monitoring mobile species that depend on the habitats along the Gulf of Mexico and south Atlantic Coast of North America.

The lack of dedicated funding means that creative partnerships are essential. For example, the growing contribution of zoos and aquaria to migratory bird research (Hutchins et al. 2018) can also enhance collaborative efforts like Motus, and this is indeed transpiring in Florida: Zoo Miami, the Florida Aquarium, and Vero Beach High School (School District of Indian River County) now operate Motus stations. In addition to bolstering basic research, this provides opportunities to enhance public education and awareness of bird migration and conservation. Such initiatives also demonstrate how Motus functions as a positive feedback loop: the effective tracking of migratory movements over large scales depends on a solid, widespread detection network that is “built” (both figuratively and literally) by partners. Birds Canada spearheaded the initial capital investment to establish and maintain the technological framework and network infrastructure; they manage the central data repository and remain integral to the network’s functionality. Now, as the collaborative infrastructure grows, the improved capacity and efficiency in turn generates more awareness of and participation in the network. Nonetheless, increased resolution will require thoughtful expansion of the network’s receiving “footprint”, which depends on new collaborators willing to establish and maintain additional receiving stations, in some cases altruistically. With the support of many Motus colleagues, we continue to work in that role by developing stations in the southeastern United States, and sharing knowledge with (and lowering potential entry barriers to) new partners who are interested in participating.

An exciting outcome of this feedback loop is that the resolution of insights about migratory ecology grows with the network, from both the expansion of the receiving footprint, and the development of compatible technologies. Motus is poised to grow effectively because it is based on open source software and widely accessible components. One emerging advance is the integration of Motus systems with coded transmitters from Cellular Tracking Technologies (Mackenzie 2018). This is an example of the progress that can happen when organizations and individuals with a stake in the network commit to openly and collaboratively explore new tools and avenues.

In sum, there is a demonstrated need for bolstered resources to study migratory animals in the southeastern region of the United States, Florida in particular. In this era of cuts to budgets and staff for environmental management and protection, we acknowledge that there is no simple solution. More effective conservation will depend on increased funding *and* enhanced cooperation among diverse partners. Further, monitoring of species' movements with a collaborative approach can also lead to a more efficient use of resources and hence more effective conservation action: benefits include the ability to direct funding and effort where birds need it most, identification of new areas for attention that might have escaped prior notice, and better prioritization of areas for protection. Continued investment in a more robust Motus network in the southeast is a key piece of the puzzle. Beyond providing improved insights about avian ecology in this region, more broadly this will enhance understanding of movement linkages between the north and south and critical areas of habitat across the Americas, to bolster the basic data collection that is integral to sound management and conservation of migratory animals.

## Supplemental Material

Please note: The Journal of Fish and Wildlife Management is not responsible for the content or functionality of any supplemental material. Queries should be directed to the corresponding author for the article.

**Data S1.** Motus receiving station location data (Birds Canada 2019b), basic deployment data for Motus tags detected by receiving stations in Florida (Birds Canada 2019c), and associated R code (R Core Team 2019) to access the data and reproduce Figures 1 and 2. Found at DOI: <URL TO BE PROVIDED BY JOURNAL>).

**Reference S1.** Loring, PH, Paton PWC, McLaren JD, Bai H, Janaswamy R, Goyert HF, Griffin CR, Sievert PR. 2019. Tracking offshore occurrence of Common Terns, endangered Roseate Terns, and threatened Piping Plovers with VHF arrays. Sterling, VA: US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. OCS Study BOEM 17: 140p.



Found at DOI: <URL TO BE PROVIDED BY JOURNAL>; also available at  
[https://espis.boem.gov/final%20reports/BOEM\\_2019-017.pdf](https://espis.boem.gov/final%20reports/BOEM_2019-017.pdf) (December 2019).

## Acknowledgments

We appreciate the suggestions of reviewers and the Associate Editor, which helped to improve an earlier draft. We offer our perspectives within the context of the commendable effort by hundreds of researchers who work cooperatively within Motus. Thanks to Stuart Mackenzie and Birds Canada for coordinating those efforts, and to all those who contribute to the creation and maintenance of the network. Stuart also provided helpful comments on the draft manuscript and facilitated access to Florida detection data. We also recognize the invaluable contribution of USFWS colleague Cindy Fury for her uncanny ability to identify potential partners and convince them of their need for Motus equipment. Gianfranco Basili facilitated the installation of several northeast Florida stations with multiple non-USFWS partners. Bryant Dossman generously visited southwest Florida to share technical advice. Our participation in growing the Motus network in Florida has been supported by Florida Gulf Coast University, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and numerous other colleagues.

Any use of trade, product, website, or firm names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

## References

- Baldwin JW, Leap K, Finn JT, Smetzer JR. 2018. Bayesian state-space models reveal unobserved off-shore nocturnal migration from Motus data. *Ecological Modelling* 386:38-46.
- Bayly NJ, Rosenberg KV, Easton WE, Gomez C, Carlisle J, Ewert DN, Drake A, Goodrich L. 2018. Major stopover regions and migratory bottlenecks for Nearctic-Neotropical landbirds within the Neotropics: a review. *Bird Conservation International* 28:1-26.

- 259 Birds Canada. 2019a. The Motus Wildlife Tracking System. Available at <https://motus.org>  
260 (December 2019).
- 261 Birds Canada. 2019b. Motus receiver deployments. Data accessed from the Motus Wildlife  
262 Tracking System. Available at [https://motus.org/data/downloads/api-](https://motus.org/data/downloads/api-proxy/receivers/deployments?fmt=csv)  
263 [proxy/receivers/deployments?fmt=csv](https://motus.org/data/downloads/api-proxy/receivers/deployments?fmt=csv) (December 2019). (see Supplemental Material, Data  
264 S1, <URL TO BE PROVIDED BY JOURNAL>).
- 265 Birds Canada. 2019c. Motus tag detections by Florida receivers. Data accessed from the Motus  
266 Wildlife Tracking System. Available at  
267 [https://motus.org/downloads/SmithAndLefevre2019\\_US.FL.xlsx](https://motus.org/downloads/SmithAndLefevre2019_US.FL.xlsx). (December 2019). (see  
268 Supplemental Material, Data S1, <URL TO BE PROVIDED BY JOURNAL>).
- 269 Bridge ES, Thorup K, Bowlin MS, Chilson PB, Diehl RH, Fléron RW, Hartl P, Kays R, Kelly  
270 JF, Robinson WD, Wikelski M. 2011. Technology on the move: recent and forthcoming  
271 innovations for tracking migratory birds. *Bioscience* 61:689-698.
- 272 Cohen EB, Barrow Jr WC, Buler JJ, Deppe JL, Farnsworth A, Marra PP, McWilliams SR,  
273 Mehlman DW, Wilson RR, Woodrey MS, Moore FR. 2017. How do en route events around  
274 the Gulf of Mexico influence migratory landbird populations? *The Condor* 119:327-343.
- 275 Cohen EB, Rushing CR, Moore FR, Hallworth MT, Hostetler JA, Ramirez MG, Marra PP. 2018.  
276 The strength of migratory connectivity for birds en route to breeding through the Gulf of  
277 Mexico. *Ecography* 42:1–12.
- 278 Cooper NW, Hallworth MT, Marra PP. 2017. Light-level geolocation reveals wintering  
279 distribution, migration routes, and primary stopover locations of an endangered  
280 long-distance migratory songbird. *Journal of Avian Biology* 48:209-219.
- 281 Cooper NW, Ewert DN, Hall KR, Rockwell SM, Currie D, Wunderle Jr JM, White JD, Marra  
282 PP. 2018. Resighting data reveal weak connectivity from wintering to breeding grounds in a  
283 range-restricted and endangered long-distance migratory passerine. *Avian Conservation and*  
284 *Ecology* 13(1):9.

- 285 Faaborg J, Holmes RT, Anders AD, Bildstein KL, Dugger KM, Gauthreaux SA, Heglund P,  
286 Hobson KA, Jahn AE, Johnson DH, Latta SC. 2010. Recent advances in understanding  
287 migration systems of New World land birds. *Ecological Monographs* 80:3-48.
- 288 Greenberg R, Marra PP, editors. 2005. *Birds of two worlds: the ecology and evolution of*  
289 *migration*. Baltimore, Maryland: John Hopkins University Press.
- 290 Horton KG, Van Doren BM, La Sorte F A, Cohen EB, Clipp HL, Buler JJ, Fink D, Kelly JF,  
291 Farnsworth A. 2019. Holding steady: little change in intensity or timing of bird migration  
292 over the Gulf of Mexico. *Global Change Biology* 25:1106-1118.
- 293 Hovick TJ, Allred BW, Mcgranahan DA, Palmer MW, Elmore RD, Fuhlendorf SD. 2016.  
294 Informing conservation by identifying range shift patterns across breeding habitats and  
295 migration strategies. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 25:345-356.
- 296 Hutchins M, Marra PP, Diebold E, Kreger MD, Sheppard C, Hallager S, Lynch C. 2018. The  
297 evolving role of zoological parks and aquariums in migratory bird conservation. *Zoo Biology*  
298 37:360-368.
- 299 Johnson AF, Barbour MG. 1990. Dunes and maritime forests. Pages 429–480 in Myers R, Ewel  
300 J, editors. *Ecosystems of Florida*. Orlando, Florida: University of Central Florida Press.
- 301 Kautz RS. 1993. Trends in Florida wildlife habitat 1936–1987. *Florida Scientist* 56:7–24.
- 302 Kays R, Tilak S, Crofoot M, Fountain T, Obando D, Ortega A, Kuemmeth F, Mandel J, Swenson  
303 G, Lambert T, Hirsch B, Wikelski M. 2011. Tracking animal location and activity with an  
304 automated radio telemetry system in a tropical rainforest. *The Computer Journal* 54:1931-  
305 1948.
- 306 Kays R, Crofoot MC, Jetz W, Wikelski M. 2015. Terrestrial animal tracking as an eye on life and  
307 planet. *Science* 348:1222-1223.
- 308 Knight SM, Bradley DW, Clark RG, Gow EA, Bélisle M, Berzins LL, Blake T, Bridge ES,  
309 Burke L, Dawson RD, Dunn PO, Garant D, Holroyd GL, Hussell DJT, Lansdorp O, Laughlin  
310 AJ, Leonard ML, Pelletier F, Shutler D, Siefferman L, Taylor CM, Trefry HE, Vleck CM,  
311 Vleck D, Winkler DW, Whittingham LA, Norris DR. 2018. Constructing and evaluating a

- 312 continent-wide migratory songbird network across the annual cycle. *Ecological Monographs*  
313 88: 445-460.
- 314 Kranstauber B, Cameron A, Weinzerl R, Fountain T, Tilak S, Wikelski M, Kays R. 2011. The  
315 Movebank data model for animal tracking. *Environmental Modelling and Software* 26:834-  
316 835.
- 317 Lafleur JM, Buler JJ, Moore FR. 2016. Geographic position and landscape composition explain  
318 regional patterns of migrating landbird distributions during spring stopover along the  
319 northern coast of the Gulf of Mexico. *Landscape Ecology* 31: 1697-1709.
- 320 Lester LA, Ramirez MG, Kneidel AH, Heckscher CM. 2016. Use of a Florida Gulf Coast barrier  
321 island by spring trans-gulf migrants and the projected effects of sea level rise on habitat  
322 availability. *PloS One* 11: e0148975.
- 323 Loring P, Ronconi R, Welch L, Taylor P, Mallory M. 2017. Postbreeding dispersal and staging  
324 of Common and Arctic Terns throughout the western North Atlantic. *Avian Conservation*  
325 and Ecology 12(2): 20.
- 326 Loring, PH, Paton PWC, McLaren JD, Bai H, Janaswamy R, Goyert HF, Griffin CR, Sievert PR.  
327 2019. Tracking offshore occurrence of Common Terns, endangered Roseate Terns, and  
328 threatened Piping Plovers with VHF arrays. Sterling, VA: US Department of the Interior,  
329 Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. OCS Study BOEM 17: 140 p. (see Supplemental  
330 Material, Reference S1, <URL TO BE PROVIDED BY JOURNAL>).
- 331 Lovette IJ, Fitzpatrick JW, editors. 2016. The cornell lab of ornithology handbook of bird  
332 biology. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- 333 Martin TG, Chadès I, Arcese P, Marra PP, Possingham HP, Norris DR. 2007. Optimal  
334 conservation of migratory species. *PLoS One* 2: e751.
- 335 Mackenzie S. 2018. Possibilities for wildlife tracking with Motus are expanding, thanks to  
336 CANARIE. Update from Birds Canada, December 2018. Available at  
337 [https://www.birdscanada.org/news/possibilities-for-wildlife-tracking-with-motus-are-](https://www.birdscanada.org/news/possibilities-for-wildlife-tracking-with-motus-are-expanding-thanks-to-canarie)  
338 [expanding-thanks-to-canarie](https://www.birdscanada.org/news/possibilities-for-wildlife-tracking-with-motus-are-expanding-thanks-to-canarie) (December 2019).

- 339 McKinnon EA, Love OP. 2018. Ten years tracking the migrations of small landbirds: Lessons  
340 learned in the golden age of bio-logging. *The Auk* 135: 834-856.
- 341 NASA. 2004. July, Blue Marble Next Generation with topography. Available at  
342 <https://visibleearth.nasa.gov/images/74393/july-blue-marble-next-generation-w-topography>  
343 (December 2019).
- 344 Perkins S. 2019. Inner workings: ramping up the fight against Florida's red tides. *PNAS* 116:  
345 6510-6512.
- 346 R Core Team (2019). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for  
347 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. Available at <https://www.R-project.org> (December  
348 2019).
- 349 Řeřucha S, Bartonička T, Jedlička P, Čížek M, Hlouša O, Lučan R, Horáček I. 2015. The  
350 BAARA (Biological AutomAted RADiotracking) system: new approach in ecological field  
351 studies. *PLoS ONE* 10: e0116785.
- 352 Rodewald A, Rosenberg K. 2018. Bottlenecks, refueling stations, and fire escapes: 3 types of  
353 stopover sites migrants really need. *Living Bird*, Spring 2018. Available at  
354 [https://www.allaboutbirds.org/news/bottlenecks-refueling-stations-and-fire-escapes-3-types-](https://www.allaboutbirds.org/news/bottlenecks-refueling-stations-and-fire-escapes-3-types-of-stopover-sites-migrants-really-need/)  
355 [of-stopover-sites-migrants-really-need/](https://www.allaboutbirds.org/news/bottlenecks-refueling-stations-and-fire-escapes-3-types-of-stopover-sites-migrants-really-need/) (December 2019).
- 356 Stevens PW, Fox SL, Montague CL. 2006. The interplay between mangroves and saltmarshes at  
357 the transition between temperate and subtropical climate in Florida. *Wetlands Ecology and*  
358 *Management* 14: 435-444.
- 359 Taylor P, Crewe T, Mackenzie S, Lepage D, Aubry Y, Crysler Z, Finney G, Francis CM,  
360 Guglielmo CG, Hamilton DJ, Holberton RL, Loring PH, Mitchell GW, Norris D, Paquet J,  
361 Ronconi RA, Smetzer J, Smith PA, Welch LJ, Woodworth BK. 2017. The Motus wildlife  
362 tracking system: a collaborative research network to enhance the understanding of wildlife  
363 movement. *Avian Conservation and Ecology* 12(1):8
- 364 Toledo S, Kishon O, Orchan Y, Shohat A, Nathan R. 2016. Lessons and experiences from the  
365 design, implementation, and deployment of a wildlife tracking system. Pages 51-60 in

- 366        Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on software science, technology and  
367        engineering (SWSTE).
- 368        U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (2019). Administrative flyways. Available at  
369        <https://www.fws.gov/birds/management/flyways.php> (December 2019).
- 370        Webb SD. 1990. Historical biogeography. Pages 70-100 in Myers R, Ewel J, editors. Ecosystems  
371        of Florida. Orlando, Florida: University of Central Florida Press.
- 372        Webster MS, Marra PP, Haig SM, Bensch S, Holmes RT. 2002. Links between worlds:  
373        unraveling migratory connectivity. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 17:76-83.
- 374        Wikelski M, Kays R. 2012. Movebank: archive, analysis and sharing of animal movement data.  
375        World Wide Web electronic publication. <http://www.movebank.org>, accessed on December  
376        17, 2019.
- 377        Wikelski M, Kays RW, Kasdin NJ, Thorup K, Smith J A, Swenson GW. 2007. Going wild: what  
378        a global small-animal tracking system could do for experimental biologists. *Journal of*  
379        *Experimental Biology* 210:181-186.
- 380        Wilson S, Anderson EM, Wilson AS, Bertram DF, Arcese P. 2013. Citizen science reveals an  
381        extensive shift in the winter distribution of migratory western grebes. *PLoS One* 8: e65408.
- 382        Wright JR, Powell LL, Tonra CM. 2018. Automated telemetry reveals staging behavior in a  
383        declining migratory passerine. *The Auk* 135:461-476.
- 384

## **Figure Captions**


Figure 1. Distribution of Motus Wildlife Tracking System's automated telemetry stations in eastern North America that were active on (a) 1 December 2013 and (b) 1 December 2019. Point size is not indicative of the detection range of each station, which varies with the type and arrangement of antennas. Note that not all stations from 2013 were active in 2019, because not all stations in the network are permanent (stations can be activated strategically for shorter-term studies). Receiver station location data obtained from Birds Canada (2019b); also see Data S1. The precise locations and metadata for any stations, throughout the System's history, can be accessed at <https://motus.org/data/receiversMap> (Motus 2019).

Figure 2. Schematic representation of the approximate tagging locations for 296 of the birds cumulatively detected by Motus receiving stations in Florida from the network's inception in 2013 through 1 December 2019. Arcs are stylized and do not indicate migratory paths. Additional detected birds ( $n = 55$ ) are not displayed due to incomplete metadata or issues of data privacy. Motus tag detection data obtained from Birds Canada (2019c); also see Data S1. Earth topobathy from NASA (2004).





(a) 1 December 2013



(b) 1 December 2019

