We use cookies to personalise content and ads, to provide social media features and to analyse our traffic. We also share information about your use of our site with our social media, advertising and analytics partners in accordance with our <u>Privacy</u> <u>Policy</u>. You can manage your preferences in 'Manage Cookies'.

Common nesting birds may provide a convenient way to track environmental clean-up efforts.

Nesting birds that feed on insects that hatch in lake or stream-bed sediments may make good biomonitors for pollution, says Thomas Custer of the US Geological Survey's Upper Midwest Environmental Sciences Center in La Crosse, Wisconsin. That's because any contamination in the sediment will make its way into the birds and into their eggs and young.

An example, says Custer, is the tree swallow (*Tachycineta bicolor*), which still showed "significant quantities" of toxic chemicals called polychlorinated biphenols in its eggs and chicks seven years after remediation efforts started at a former capacitor-manufacturing plant in Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge in southern Illinois¹. The findings "prompted further sediment removal", he says.

Speaking at the annual meeting of the Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry in Long Beach, California, last week, Custer described how his group has also used swallows to monitor a 2010 project intended to remove contaminated sediments from Ohio's Ottawa River near Toledo. Not all the data are in yet, but things look good, he says. "From the standpoint of the birds, this is not a hotspot."

One advantage of using swallows for such work is that they are known to forage over fairly small distances, rarely more than 500 metres from their nests. "They represent very localized contamination," Custer says.

Also, researchers can attract them to areas of interest simply by putting out nesting boxes on poles, because nesting sites are the birds' most important environmental limit, Custer says.

Roger Helm, head of the environmental contaminants programme for the US Fish and Wildlife Service (which administers the country's national wildlife refuges) in Arlington, Virginia, agrees. A huge advantage of using swallows, he says, is that they provide a "replicable" experimental approach, which is much better than gathering "bits of data" from randomly collected animals.

Furthermore, he adds, it can even help the birds, because the presence of nesting boxes improves the birds' habitat. And the loss of a few eggs and nestlings to researchers isn't likely to hurt the species, Helm says. "It is extremely rare for more than 50% of the nestlings to survive, anyway," he says. "The wonderful thing about this kind of work is you can say something meaningful. The worst kind of science does a fair amount of harm and has nothing to say because you don't have the sample size to draw a reasonable conclusion. You kill a bunch of things, and what do you know?"



Arterra Picture Library/Alamy

Homing pigeons can be used to monitor air pollution in the cities where they live.

Related stories

- Human drugs make fish flounder
- Megacities pose serious
 health challenge
- Test lakes face closure

> Manage Cookies

 \checkmark OK

We use cookies to personalise content and ads, to		
provide social media features and to analyse our		
traffic. We also share information about your use of		
our site with our social media, advertising and	> Manage Cookies	√ OK
analytics partners in accordance with our Privacy		
<u>Policy</u> . You can manage your preferences in		
'Manage Cookies'.		

health-related differences that were apparently related to air quality. In Beijing and Manilla, for example, he found black lungs and enlarged testes. In one case, a testicle was so huge it was one-fifth the weight of the entire bird. But in less polluted cities elsewhere in China and in the United States, the birds' organs were much healthier.

Plus, the lungs and livers from the birds from Beijing contained three or four times more polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, common by-products of fossil-fuel burning, than did those from areas with better air quality. "This suggests that other species, including humans, may also have adverse effects" from these environmental contaminants, he says.

Nature doi:10.1038/nature.2012.11848

References

1. Spears, B. L., Brown, M. W. & Hester, C. M. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* 27, 2512–2520 (2008). Show context Article PubMed ISI ChemPort

Related stories and links

From nature.com

- Human drugs make fish flounder
 16 November 2012
- Megacities pose serious health challenge
 12 October 2012
- Test lakes face closure 21 August 2012

For the best commenting experience, please login or register as a user and agree to our Community Guidelines. You will be redirected back to this page where you will see comments updating in real-time and have the ability to recommend comments to other users.

Commenting is currently unavailable.

Nature ISSN 0028-0836 EISSN 1476-4687

© 2019 Macmillan Publishers Limited, part of Springer Nature. All Rights Reserved. partner of AGORA, HINARI, OARE, INASP, CrossRef and COUNTER