

1 **Maize stubble as foraging habitat for wintering geese and swans in northern Europe**

2 Kevin K. Clausen^{1*}, Jesper Madsen¹, Bart A. Nolet^{2,3}, Lars Haugaard¹

3

4 ¹ Aarhus University, Department of Bioscience, Grenåvej 14, 8410 Rønne, Denmark.

5 ² Department of Animal Ecology, Netherlands Institute of Ecology (NIOO-KNAW), Wageningen, the
6 Netherlands

7 ³Theoretical and Computational Ecology, Institute for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Dynamics, University of
8 Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

9

10 *Corresponding author

11 Kevin K. Clausen

12 E-mail: kc@bios.au.dk

13 Address: Grenåvej 14, 8410 Rønne, Denmark

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 **Abstract**

27 Agricultural crops have become increasingly important foraging habitats to geese and swans in northern
28 Europe, and a recent climate-driven expansion in the area of maize fields has led to a rapid increase in the
29 exploitation of this habitat. However, due to the novelty of maize foraging in this region, little is known
30 about the abundance and energetic value of this resource to foraging birds. In this study we quantify food
31 availability, intake rates and energetic profitability of the maize stubble habitat, and describe the value of
32 this increasingly cultivated crop to wintering geese and swans in the region. Our results indicate that the
33 maize resource varies considerably among fields and years, but also that the energetic returns from maize
34 foraging is substantial. As such, fields with extensive spill allow foraging birds to fulfill their daily energetic
35 demands in 4 hours of active foraging. Both the area of cultivated maize fields and the importance of this
36 habitat to foraging birds are expected to increase in years to come. This may alleviate conflicts with other
37 more vulnerable crops such as winter cereals, and have the potential to affect migratory decisions, site use
38 and population dynamics of geese and swans wintering in northern Europe.

39

40 **Keywords:** Waterfowl; habitat use; intake rates; assimilation; Barnacle Goose; Pink-footed Goose; Bewicks'
41 Swan

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51 **1. Introduction**

52 During the last decades, wintering waterfowl across the northern hemisphere have increasingly exploited
53 agricultural areas as foraging habitats (Abraham *et al.*, 2005; Fox and Abraham, 2017). The shift in habitat
54 use from natural wetlands to farmed croplands has mainly been driven by differences in the accessibility
55 and quality of available foods (Madsen, 1985; Béchet *et al.*, 2004; Nolet *et al.*, 2014; Fox and Abraham,
56 2017), and has likely been a driving factor of recent population increase in many waterfowl species (Van
57 Eerden *et al.*, 1996; Fox and Madsen, 2017). Early evidence of waterfowl foraging on crops can be traced
58 back to the medieval period (Kear, 2001), but it was not before the twentieth century when large areas of
59 wetlands were reclaimed and inorganic fertilizer developed, that many waterfowl went through the
60 transition to forage mainly on agricultural land (Van Eerden *et al.*, 2005; Fox and Abraham, 2017).
61 Nowadays, the phenomenon has spread to cover many swan and goose species and a wide array of
62 different exploited crops (Madsen *et al.*, 1999; Chisholm and Spray, 2002; Nolet *et al.*, 2002).

63 In the U.S. and Southeast Europe waterfowl exploitation of maize (*Zea mays*) stubble fields
64 has taken place for many years (Glazener, 1946; Alisauskas *et al.*, 1988; Sutherland and Crockford, 1993),
65 but only recently, in response to a global warming-induced increase in maize cultivation in northern
66 Europe, has this food resource been exploited by waterfowl wintering in this region (Kenny and Harrison,
67 1992; Odgaard *et al.*, 2011). The first observations of swans on maize in Northwest Europe were reported
68 in Germany in the mid-1990s (Degen *et al.*, 1996) and the first substantial numbers of geese on maize
69 stubble was made in the Netherlands in 2008 (Cottaar, 2009) and in Denmark and Poland in 2009 (Rosin *et*
70 *al.*, 2012; Madsen *et al.*, 2015). Since then, the use of maize stubble has increased considerably in this
71 region, in parallel to a steep increase in the available area of maize stubble habitat (Clausen *et al.*, in press).

72 Due to the novelty of this food source in northern Europe little is known about the amount
73 of food available on harvested fields and the profitability of this habitat to wintering geese and swans in
74 this region. Studies from the U.S. suggest that waste maize can be a highly valuable food resource to
75 waterfowl (Alisauskas *et al.*, 1988; Gates *et al.*, 2001), but in northern Europe where maize is cultivated

76 close to its northern thermal limit, and used mainly for silage produced from immature cobs and vegetative
77 parts, energetic gains might be less profitable (Kenny and Harrison, 1992; Andersen, 2000). In this study we
78 investigated the profitability of maize stubble fields as a food resource to wintering waterfowl in northern
79 Europe. This was achieved by 1) Assessing the amount of food available on harvested fields, 2) Investigating
80 intake rates of wild birds foraging on maize stubble habitat and 3) Examining the energetic profitability of
81 maize consumed by captive birds. Collectively, this enabled us to evaluate the value of maize stubble as a
82 food resource in the north European agricultural landscape.

83

84 **2. Methods**

85 2.1 Food availability and its relationship with goose usage

86 Availability of spilled maize was investigated in Denmark at the three study sites Drenghsted (55.08 N, 8.86
87 E), Stadilø (56.17 N, 8.16 E) and Lund Fjord (57.10 N, 9.03 E, Table 1, Supplementary appendix, Picture 1) in
88 the autumns of 2015, 2016 and 2017. Drenghsted was visited in all three years to test for annual differences.
89 Food availability was estimated by counting the number of maize cobs in areas of 10 x 10 m on harvested
90 maize fields. Each field was randomly sampled several times (5 to 10 plots depending on size) to obtain an
91 overall average estimate of cob density. In two fields where the maize crop had been downed by an
92 October storm and subsequently harvested, the resource was manifold bigger compared to all other fields.
93 Due to time constraints food availability in these fields was assessed by estimating the number of cobs in 5-
94 10 samples of 9 m² (equivalent to the area between two rows of crops for 10 m).

95 Ten full cobs were collected at random to determine the mass of available maize grain on
96 individual cobs. The number of grain on individual cobs was determined, and 10 grains from each cob dried
97 at 80°C to constant weight to obtain the dry mass. The mass of available grain per cob was calculated by
98 multiplying the number of grains on individual cobs with the average dry weight of individual grains. Fields
99 were visited up to two weeks after harvest was completed, and on a few fields that had already been
100 visited by geese (seen by the presence of droppings), we accounted for the already exploited resource by

101 including empty cobs in our estimate of cob numbers (see Supplementary appendix, Picture 2). This
102 ensured that preceding exploitation by birds and small mammals was likely to only have had a limited
103 impact. However, both roe deer (*Capreolus capreolus*) and red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) may remove entire
104 cobs from harvested fields. The initial resource just after harvest might therefore have been slightly larger.

105 In 2015 some of the fields in Drenghsted were heavily used by Pink-footed Geese (*Anser*
106 *brachyrhynchus*) and Barnacle Geese (*Branta leucopsis*). On these fields we counted the number of
107 droppings and cobs in randomly placed circles with radius 1 m. These data were used to investigate
108 whether there was a relationship between food availability and goose usage of the maize stubble habitat.

109

110 2.2 Intake rates of maize-foraging wild birds

111 Intake rates of free-ranging birds were inferred from video recordings of foraging birds in actual maize
112 stubble fields at Stadilø in November 2015. We used a wireless surveillance system (ABUS TVAC 16000B
113 modified to our needs) to record the number of geese and time spent foraging in three sampling areas of
114 40 m² (8 x 5 m). The rectangular sampling areas were outlined with 4 small bamboo sticks, and baited with
115 a pre-determined amount of maize forage (from 25 to 90 entire cobs) to attract foraging geese
116 (Supplementary appendix, Picture 3). The small recorders were placed at one end of the sampling areas on
117 thin iron poles, and camouflaged with a few intact maize stems. The power supplies (car batteries) were
118 buried on the field beneath the video recorders. The setup was inspected at intervals of 2-3 days, and when
119 clear signs of foraging were observed data on ingested mass and foraging time were collected. Ingested
120 mass was derived by judging the proportions of each maize cob eaten and the knowledge of grain mass per
121 cob derived above. Foraging time was determined by assessing the number of geese present on the video
122 footage at intervals of 1 minute, and summarising across the entire foraging event to estimate the total
123 number of “goose minutes” spent foraging. Geese were always actively foraging when on the sampling
124 area, but our definition of “foraging time” includes finding and handling the food, in addition to occasional

125 aggressive encounters with conspecifics. We used our knowledge of ingested food mass and goose foraging
126 time to derive intake rates in the following way:

$$127 \quad \text{Intake rate (g dw/min)} = \frac{\text{Mass of maize grain eaten (g dw)}}{\text{Foraging time (min)}}$$

128

129 2.3 Energetic profitability of maize forage

130 Energy content of the maize forage at Stadilø was measured using a bomb calorimeter (C-
131 5000, IKA, Staufen). Assimilation efficiency was investigated using three wild-caught adult Bewicks' Swans
132 (*Cygnus columbianus*) held at Netherlands Institute of Ecology (NIOO) in Heteren, The Netherlands. The
133 swans had been acclimated to the experimental set-up by 7 – 9 identical measurements with other
134 carbohydrate-rich food sources prior to the maize measurements. Each swan was held in a two-chamber
135 metabolic cage with maize forage for four consecutive days in early December. Maize forage and water was
136 supplied ad libitum and weighed at 09:00 and 17:00 each day. A control food supply was also weighed to
137 correct for possible desiccation or water absorption. In order to minimize stress, the swans were not
138 handled during the trial. The swans were weighed each morning at 09:00 by allowing them to step into a
139 mobile weighing cage with an electronic balance (IB-34, Sartorius, Nieuwegein) underneath the floor. The
140 swans were then transported to the adjacent, clean chamber. The excreta in the first chamber were
141 collected from the tray below the grid floor (70 x 70 cm) and together with a sample of the maize forage
142 stored at -24°C until further analysis. The food sample and a 100 g sample of the excreta were freeze dried
143 at -80° C, the rest of the excreta was dried to constant weight at 70°C. For each day gross energy intake
144 (GEI, kJ/day) and excreted energy (EE, kJ/day) were calculated as the product of dry weight (ingested or
145 excreted per day) and the energy content as measured by the bomb calorimeter. Because the calculation
146 assumes energy balance, days with a body weight difference > 2% and with a GEI < 500 kJ were omitted,
147 leaving data of three trial days for each swan, for which GEI and EE were averaged. The assimilation
148 efficiency (AE) was calculated as:

149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173

$$AE (\%) = \frac{GEI - EE}{GEI} * 100$$

The maize forage used in the swan assimilation measurements originated from a field in the Netherlands similar to the ones where intake rates were measured at Stadilø, and we assumed the results to be transferrable.

3. Results

3.1 Food availability

Available maize forage was assessed in a total of 141 plots covering 17 fields. The average amount of spilled maize on harvested fields varied substantially. On normally harvested fields the average (mean \pm SE) was 3.42 ± 0.64 g dw/m², and the minimum and maximum amounted to 0.37 and 6.52 g dw/m² respectively (Table 1). The two fields with downed crops and suboptimal harvest had a maize resource > 100 times higher averaging 358.53 ± 41.69 g dw/m². Within the normally harvested fields the resource was very patchily distributed, and at the level of individual 10 x 10 m plots food availability ranged between 0 – 20.1 g dw/m² (corresponding to 0 – 38 entire cobs). Repeated assessments of plots in Drenghsted during 2015, 2016 and 2017 revealed annual differences in food availability ($F_{2,101} = 34.934$; $P < 0.001$). These were also significant when omitting the fields downed by wind in 2017 ($F_{2,85} = 11.252$; $P < 0.001$), and presumably related to differences in harvest conditions (Brian Bech, pers. comm.).

Density of droppings on the exploited fields in Drenghsted correlated positively with the number of spilled cobs ($F_{1,40} = 42.782$; $P < 0.001$), indicating that goose usage reflected the available amount of resource (Fig. 1).

3.2 Intake rates of maize-foraging wild birds

Maize-foraging at Stadilø was observed for several species of waterfowl, including Pink-footed Geese, Barnacle Geese, Whooper Swans (*Cygnus cygnus*) and Bewicks' Swans. Because the available area of good quality habitat (maize and cereal stubble fields) was large, it proved difficult to capture actively foraging

174 birds on the small sampling areas at the site. As a consequence, a total of 4 foraging events were recorded
175 inside the sampling areas during the period with large waterfowl numbers at Stadilø – all of Barnacle Geese
176 (Table 2). Intake rates varied between 0.82 – 1.17 g dw/min depending on available maize forage, and
177 seemed to indicate a classical type 2 functional response. Waterfowl foraging on grains and plant storage
178 organs generally exhibit type 2 functional responses (Nolet *et al.*, 2002; Amano *et al.*, 2004; Béchet *et al.*,
179 2004), and because our limited data seemed consistent with this pattern, we fitted a Holling's Disc Curve
180 (Holling, 1959) to the available data (Fig. 2). However, given the relatively few data points, this curve should
181 be interpreted with caution.

182 The footage revealed that geese foraged on individual cobs by tearing of the husk
183 (sometimes cooperating in pairs), and gnawing on the exposed grains. The gnawing led to an almost
184 complete removal of grains (Supplementary appendix, Picture 2). In addition to foraging on the cobs,
185 Barnacle Geese were seen pecking on the emerging undersown grass crop.

186

187 3.3 Energetic profitability of maize forage

188 Energy content of the maize from Stadilø where intake rates were investigated was 16.791 ± 0.114 kJ/g dw
189 (mean \pm SE). Assimilation efficiency (AE) of individual Bewicks' Swans varied between 79.4 % and 83.9 %,
190 with an overall average of 81.4 % (Table 3).

191

192 **4. Discussion**

193 In agreement with studies on maize in other parts of the world (Alisauskas *et al.*, 1988; Gates *et al.*, 2001),
194 our results indicate that in terms of energetic profitability maize stubble is high-quality food in line with
195 other carbohydrate-rich food sources (e.g. Nolet *et al.*, 2002; Fox and Abraham, 2017). The metabolizable
196 energy of maize in our study during late autumn amounts to 13.7 kJ/g, which is relatively large in
197 comparison with grass diets (6.7 - 7.5 kJ/g) and winter cereals (7.3 – 10.6 kJ/g) during the same season
198 (Prop & Vulink, 1992; Therkildsen and Madsen, 2000; Fox and Abraham, 2017). Although maize is currently

199 cultivated near its northern limits in northern Europe, energetic returns from maize foraging is therefore
200 very high. In addition, with current agricultural practice in this region, it is together with cereal stubble
201 fields quantitatively much more important than other agricultural crops.

202 The field work in this study was limited to Denmark, but we see no reason why the results
203 should not be representative of other north European countries where maize cultivation is likewise
204 expanding. The current northern boundary of maize cultivation coincides with Danish borders, and the
205 energetic value of this food resource in countries further south might, if anything, increase with a warmer
206 climate. We therefore expect maize stubble to be a valuable resource in the neighboring countries as well.

207 In theory, our estimation of intake rates could be affected by foraging of wildlife other than
208 Barnacle Geese during the period between two visits to the sampling areas. However, such events would
209 also have been captured by the video recorder. Our footage revealed active maize foraging by hare (*Lepus*
210 *europaeus*), roe deer and red deer, demonstrating that the resource was shared with other wildlife as well.
211 However, none of these events took place in time windows with foraging geese, why any impact from
212 foraging by other animals can be ruled out.

213 Baldassarre *et al.* (1983) found that waste maize availability varied greatly between fields in
214 Texas (roughly 5 - 120 g dw/m²), and showed that the amount of waste correlated inversely with crop
215 moisture. This is in good agreement with findings from our study, suggesting that maize stubble fields may
216 vary considerably in their value to waterfowl species depending on the effectiveness of the preceding
217 harvest. In a dry autumn with early harvest, very little spill will be available. However, delayed harvest and,
218 in particular, stochastic events like autumn storms before harvest may cause downing of maize fields on a
219 regional scale. As shown, this can lead to an enormous spill. Being highly mobile and exploratory, geese are
220 able to quickly identify and exploit such areas (Clausen and Madsen, 2016).

221 The area of cultivated maize is increasing in the agricultural landscape of northern Europe
222 (Fig. 3), and in light of the expected further warming of this region in the coming decades, there is every
223 reason to believe that it will increase even further (Odgaard *et al.*, 2011). Herbivorous waterfowl can

224 therefore be expected to intensify their use of maize stubble habitats, although the available resource
225 relies heavily on the efficiency and circumstances of the harvest (Baldassarre *et al.*, 1983; Krapu *et al.*,
226 2004). In northern Europe maize is cultivated mostly for silage production as forage for livestock, and the
227 increasing maize area has therefore replaced especially cultivated grasslands and to some extent sugar
228 beets. The attractiveness of these two crops varies between waterfowl species and across the non-
229 breeding season, but during autumn and winter, when maize is exploited, most species generally prefer
230 carbohydrate-rich forage. The increase in maize on the expense of grasslands has therefore likely resulted
231 in higher food availability at northern latitudes (Clausen *et al.*, 2018). Because foraging on maize stubble is
232 generally unproblematic in terms of waterfowl-agriculture conflicts, the potential increase in maize habitat
233 use may ease the pressure on more vulnerable crops such as winter cereals (Summers, 1990). Clausen *et al.*
234 (2018) found that the availability of maize habitat may be able to drive changes in wintering strategy and
235 migratory decisions of Pink-footed Geese, indicating that a northward expansion of maize crops might
236 ultimately lead to an equivalent northward shift in wintering site use of birds exploiting this resource.

237 The value of maize as a food resource to waterfowl is further enhanced by the temporal
238 accessibility of this crop. In northern Europe, maize is generally harvested from mid-September to mid-
239 October, i.e. 2 – 3 months later than other cereals such as wheat and barley. As a consequence, the maize
240 resource emerges at a time when other preferred food sources are increasingly depleted or decomposed
241 (Madsen, 2001). Moreover, the combination of a cool autumn environment and the protective husk around
242 the grains allow cobs to last for very long on harvested fields. As such, Baldassarre *et al.* (1983) found that
243 the nutritional quality of waste maize remained unchanged throughout an entire winter. Both sugar beets
244 and potatoes are potential food crops characterized by the same late-autumn harvest and winter
245 availability to birds. In a north European context however, the cultivated area of these crops is relatively
246 small (in Denmark 0.2 and 1.7 % of total arable land, Source: Statistics Denmark), and hence less important.

247 Owen *et al.* (1992) reported a daily energy expenditure of Barnacle Geese in
248 November/December of roughly 1000 kJ/day. As digestibility of grass is very similar for Bewicks' Swans and

249 Barnacle Geese (Ebbinge *et al.*, 1975; Van Gils *et al.*, 2008), we assumed that assimilation efficiency of
250 maize was likewise comparable. This allowed us to calculate the daily consumption of maize forage needed
251 to cover daily energetic costs of Barnacle Geese as approximately $1000 / (16.791 \times 0.814) = 73$ g dw. Under
252 the assumption that our functional response is reasonable, this allows us to calculate the necessary
253 foraging time for Barnacle Geese on maize stubble to fulfill daily energetic demands. Given a resource of
254 3.42 g dw/m² (average across normally harvested fields in our study) this can be obtained in approximately
255 6.8 hours of active foraging. However, in normally harvested fields with substantial spill (6.52 g dw/m²) this
256 can be reached in 4.0 hours of active foraging, and in fields downed by wind prior to harvest (358.53 g
257 dw/m²) in less than an hour. If energy acquisition is constraint by the digestive capacity of geese (a
258 digestive bottleneck, cf. Black *et al.*, 2014), total time spent on the feeding grounds may be somewhat
259 longer. This clearly demonstrates that access to the right fields may be worth very long flights, which may
260 be a contributing factor to explain the far-inland foraging flights of maize-foraging waterfowl observed
261 especially in Denmark in recent years. As such, Pink-footed Geese and Barnacle Geese have been observed
262 to travel up to 40 km inland from their coastal roosts to forage on maize stubble fields (Madsen *et al.*, 2015;
263 Clausen and Madsen, 2016).

264 Winter food availability is highly affected by snow cover in Northern Europe (Laubek, 1995),
265 but even in snow free conditions the energetic quality of available foods is important for the ability of
266 waterfowl to meet the energy demands associated with overwintering in this region. In this respect, the
267 temporal and spatial increase in food availability associated with a growing area of maize cultivation in
268 northern Europe is important, and might have the potential to drive further population growth among the
269 geese and swans able to exploit this increasing resource (Fox and Abraham, 2017). This may especially be
270 true if some of these species are presently limited by food availability during winter. It is currently unclear
271 to what extent the use of maize stubble fields may affect overall fitness for these species, but the topic
272 certainly merits further investigation.

273

274 **Acknowledgements**

275 Access to maize fields was kindly granted by Brian Bech (Drengsted), Kennet Koldby (Stadilø) and Jørgen
276 Faber (Lund Fjord). We are also thankful to Jens Peder Hounisen for assisting the collection of field data,
277 Bart van Lith for assisting the work on the captive swans and two anonymous reviewers for improving an
278 earlier draft. The study was funded by 15. Juni Fonden (project Forbedret Gåsejagt), the Danish
279 Environment Protection Agency and Aarhus University (grants to JM). The captive trials were performed
280 under licence CL98.01 of the Animal Welfare Committee of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and
281 Sciences.

282

283 **References**

- 284 Abraham, K.F., Jefferies, R.L., Alisauskas, R.T., 2005. The dynamics of landscape change and snow geese in
285 mid-continent North America. *Glob. Change Biol.* 11, 841-855.
- 286 Alisauskas, R.T., Ankney, C.D., Klaas, E.E., 1988. Winter Diets and Nutrition of Midcontinental Lesser Snow
287 Geese. *J. Wildl. Manage.* 52, 403-414.
- 288 Amano, T., Ushiyama, K., Fujita, G., Higuchi, H., 2004. Alleviating grazing damage by white-fronted geese:
289 an optimal foraging approach. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 41, 675–688.
- 290 Andersen, S., 2000. *Landbrugsplanterne*. DSR Forlag, Frederiksberg, Denmark.
- 291 Baldassarre, G.A., Whyte, R.J., Quinlan, E.E., Bolen, E.G., 1983. Dynamics and quality of waste corn available
292 to postbreeding waterfowl in Texas. *Wildl. Soc. B.* 11, 25–31.
- 293 Béchet, A., Giroux, J.F., Gauthier, G., 2004. The effects of disturbance on behaviour, habitat use and energy
294 of spring staging snow geese. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 41, 689-700.
- 295 Black, J.M., Prop, J., Larsson, K., 2014. *The Barnacle Goose*. T & AD Poyser, London.
- 296 Chisholm, H., Spray, C., 2002. Habitat usage and field choice by mute and Whooper Swans in the Tweed
297 Valley, Scotland. *Waterbirds* 25, 177-182.

298 Clausen, K.K., Madsen, J., 2016. Philopatry in a changing world: response of pink-footed geese *Anser*
 299 *brachyrhynchus* to the loss of a key autumn staging area due to restoration of Filso Lake, Denmark. *J.*
 300 *Ornithol.* 157, 229-237.

301 Clausen, K.K., Madsen, J., Cottaar, F., Kuijken, E., Verscheure, C. 2018. Highly dynamic wintering strategies
 302 in migratory geese: Coping with environmental change. *Glob. Change Biol.* (Early view),
 303 DOI:10.1111/gcb.14061: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/gcb.14061/full>.

304 Cottaar, F., 2009. Pink-footed Geese *Anser brachyrhynchus* exploit maize as a new food source in the
 305 Netherlands. *LIMOSA* 82, 23-25.

306 Degen, A., Flore, B.-O., Ludwig, J., Sudbeck, P., 1996. Rastbestände von Höcker-, Zwerg- und Singschwan
 307 (*Cygnus olor*, *C. columbianus bewickii*, *C. cygnus*) in Niedersachsen: Ergebnisse landesweiter
 308 Synchronzählungen im Januar and März 1995. *Vogelk. Ber. Niedersachs.* 28, 3-18.

309 Ebbinge, B., Canters, K., Drent, R., 1975. Foraging routines and estimated daily food intake in barnacle
 310 geese wintering in the northern Netherlands. *Wildfowl* 26, 5-19.

311 Fox, A.D., Abraham, K.F., 2017. Why geese benefit from the transition from natural vegetation to
 312 agriculture. *Ambio* 46, Supplement 2, 188–197.

313 Fox, A.D., Madsen, J., 2017. Threatened species to super-abundance: The unexpected international
 314 implications of successful goose conservation. *Ambio* 46, Supplement 2, 179–187.

315 Gates, R.J., Caithamer, D.F., Moritz, W.E., Tacha, T.C., 2001. Bioenergetics and nutrition of Mississippi Valley
 316 population Canada geese during winter and migration. *Wildl. Monogr.* 146, 1-65.

317 Glazener, W.C., 1946. Food Habits of Wild Geese on the Gulf Coast of Texas. *J. Wildl. Manage.* 10, 322-329.

318 Holling, C., 1959. Some Characteristics of Simple Types of Predation and Parasitism. *Can. Entomol.* 91, 385-
 319 398.

320 Laubek, B., 1995. Habitat use by Whooper Swans *Cygnus cygnus* and Bewick's Swans *Cygnus columbianus*
 321 *bewickii* wintering in Denmark: Increasing agricultural conflicts. *Wildfowl* 46, 8-15.

322 Kear, J., 2001. Three medieval accounts of agricultural damage by wild geese. *Arch. Nat. Hist.* 28, 245–255.

323 Kenny, G.J., Harrison, P.A., 1992. Thermal and moisture limits of grain maize in Europe: model testing and
324 sensitivity to climate change. *Clim Res* 2, 113-129.

325 Krapu, G.L., Brandt, D.A., Cox, R.R., 2004. Less waste corn, more land in soybeans, and the switch to
326 genetically modified crops: trends with important implications for wildlife management. *Wildl. Soc. B.*
327 32, 127-136.

328 Madsen, J., 1985. Relations between Change in Spring Habitat Selection and Daily Energetics of Pink-Footed
329 Geese *Anser-Brachyrhynchus*. *Ornis Scand.* 16, 222-228.

330 Madsen, J., 2001. Can geese adjust their clocks? Effects of diurnal regulation of goose shooting. *Wildl. Biol.*
331 7, 213-222.

332 Madsen, J., Christensen, T.K., Balsby, T.J.S., Tombre, I.M., 2015. Could Have Gone Wrong: Effects of Abrupt
333 Changes in Migratory Behaviour on Harvest in a Waterbird Population. *Plos One* 10, e0135100.

334 Madsen, J., Cracknell, G., Fox (eds.), A.D., 1999. Goose populations of the western Palearctic. A review of
335 status and distribution. Wetlands International Publ. No. 48, Wetlands International, Wageningen, The
336 Netherlands, National Environmental research institute, Rönne, Denmark.

337 Nolet, B.A., Bevan, R.M., Klaassen, M., Langevoord, O., Van der Heijden, Y.G.J.T., 2002. Habitat switching by
338 Bewick's swans: maximization of average long-term energy gain? *J. Anim. Ecol.* 71, 979-993.

339 Nolet, B.A., Gyimesi, A., van Lith, B., 2014. Lower foraging efficiency of offspring constrains use of optimal
340 habitat in birds with extended parental care. *Ibis* 156, 387-394.

341 Odgaard, M.V., Bocher, P.K., Dalgaard, T., Svenning, J.C., 2011. Climatic and non-climatic drivers of
342 spatiotemporal maize-area dynamics across the northern limit for maize production-A case study from
343 Denmark. *Agr. Ecosyst. Environ.* 142, 291-302.

344 Owen, M., Wells, R.L., Black, J.M., 1992. Energy Budgets of Wintering Barnacle Geese - the Effects of
345 Declining Food Resources. *Ornis Scand.* 23, 451-458.

346 Prop, J., Black, J.M., 1998. Food intake, body reserves and reproductive success of barnacle geese *Branta*
347 *leucopsis* staging in different habitats. *Norsk Polarinst. Skri.* 200, 175-193.

348 Prop, J., Vulink, T., 1992. Digestion by barnacle geese in the annual cycle - the interplay between retention
349 time and food quality. *Funct. Ecol.* 6, 180-189.

350 Rosin, Z.M., Skorka, P., Wylegala, P., Krakowski, B., Tobolka, M., Myczko, L., Sparks, T.H., Tryjanowski, P.,
351 2012. Landscape structure, human disturbance and crop management affect foraging ground selection
352 by migrating geese. *J. Ornithol.* 153, 747-759.

353 Summers, R.W., 1990. The Effect on Winter-Wheat of Grazing by Brent Geese *Branta-Bernicla*. *J. Appl. Ecol.*
354 27, 821-833.

355 Sutherland, W.J., Crockford, N.J., 1993. Factors Affecting the Feeding Distribution of Red-Breasted Geese
356 *Branta-Ruficollis* Wintering in Romania. *Biol. Conserv.* 63, 61-65.

357 Therkildsen, O.R., Madsen, J., 2000. Energetics of feeding on winter wheat versus pasture grasses: a
358 window of opportunity for winter range expansion in the pink-footed goose *Anser brachyrhynchus*.
359 *Wildl. Biol.* 6, 65-74.

360 Van Eerden, M.R., Drent, R.H., Stahl, J., Bakker, J.P., 2005. Connecting seas: western Palaearctic continental
361 flyway for water birds in the perspective of changing land use and climate. *Glob. Change Biol.* 11, 894-
362 908.

363 Van Eerden, M.R., Zijlstra, M., Van Roomen, M., Timmerman, A., 1996. The response of Anatidae to
364 changes in agricultural practice: Long-term shifts in the carrying capacity of wintering waterfowl. *Gibier*
365 *Faune Sauvage* 13, 681-706.

366 Van Gils, J.A., Beekman, J.H., Coehoorn, P., Corporaal, E., Dekkers, T., Klaassen, M., van Kraaij, R., de Leeuw,
367 R., de Vries, P.P., 2008. Longer guts and higher food quality increase energy intake in migratory swans. *J.*
368 *Anim. Ecol.* 77, 1234-1241.

369

370

371

372

373 Table 1. The amount of available maize forage on harvested maize fields at three study sites in Denmark. In
 374 Drengsted the same fields were visited for three consecutive years. * indicates that these fields were
 375 downed by a storm leading to suboptimal harvest and substantial spill.

Field	Available forage (g/m ²)	Location	Year
1	6.04	Drengsted	2015
2	3.42	Drengsted	2015
3	5.03	Drengsted	2015
4	6.52	Drengsted	2015
5	1.80	Stadilø	2015
6	3.71	Stadilø	2015
7	3.47	Lund Fjord	2015
8	2.46	Lund Fjord	2015
9	5.61	Lund Fjord	2015
10	0.85	Drengsted	2016
11	0.37	Drengsted	2016
12	1.22	Drengsted	2016
13	0.74	Drengsted	2017
14	1.48	Drengsted	2017
15	8.58	Drengsted	2017
16	400.22*	Drengsted	2017
17	316.84*	Drengsted	2017

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388 Table 2. The amount of maize forage eaten and the total feeding time for four foraging events of Barnacle
389 Geese (*Branta leucopsis*) recorded in the sampling areas at Stadilø, Denmark.

Foraging event	Species	Ingested mass (g)	Total feeding time (min)
1	Barnacle Goose	1339.2	1199
2	Barnacle Goose	769.2	884
3	Barnacle Goose	788.3	774
4	Barnacle Goose	50.9	62

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410 Table 3. Daily gross energy intake (GEI, kJ/day), daily excreted energy (EE, kJ/day) and assimilation
411 efficiency (AE, %) of three maize-foraging captive Bewicks' Swans (*Cygnus columbianus*).

Swan	GEI (kJ)	EE (kJ)	AE (%)
1	3047	586	80.8
2	2116	435	79.4
3	3405	549	83.9
Average			81.4

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432 Figure 1. Relation between number of spilled maize cobs and number of droppings on harvested maize
433 fields exploited by Pink-footed Geese (*Anser brachyrhynchus*) and Barnacle Geese (*Branta leucopsis*) at
434 Drengsted, 2015. Not all data points are visible due to overplotting, N = 42.

435

436 Figure 2. Type 2 functional response of maize-feeding Barnacle Geese (*Branta leucopsis*) at Stadilø,
437 Denmark, assuming an intake rate of zero when no food is present. The dashed line and associated
438 equation indicate the best fit (Holling's Disc Curve).

439

440 Figure 3. Development in the area of cultivated maize (thousands of ha) in Denmark during the period
441 1982-2016. Data acquired from Statistics Denmark.