Conservation Buffer Distance Estimates for Greater Sage-Grouse—A Review

By Daniel J. Manier, Zachary H. Bowen, Matthew L. Brooks, Michael L. Casazza, Peter S. Coates, Patricia A. Deibert, Steven E. Hanser, and Douglas H. Johnson

Open-File Report 2014–1239

U.S. Department of the Interior
U.S. Geological Survey

TBPA - 00035158

U.S. Department of the Interior
SALLY JEWEL, Secretary

U.S. Geological Survey
Suzette M. Kimball, Acting Director

U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia: 2014

For more information on the USGS—the Federal source for science about the Earth,
its natural and living resources, natural hazards, and the environment—visit
http://www.usgs.gov or call 1–888–ASK–USGS

For an overview of USGS information products, including maps, imagery, and publications,
visit *http://www.usgs.gov/pubprod*

To order this and other USGS information products, visit *http://store.usgs.gov*

Cover. Photographs clockwise from top left by Cameron Aldridge and Daniel Manier (USGS),
Gary Kramer (USGS), and Cameron Aldridge; graphic design by Mari Kauffman (USGS).

Suggested citation:
Manier, D.J., Bowen, Z.H., Brooks, M.L., Casazza, M.L., Coates, P.S., Deibert, P.A., Hanser, S.E., and Johnson, D.H., 2014, Conservation buffer distance estimates for Greater Sage-Grouse—A review: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2014–1239, 14 p., *http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/ofr20141239*.

ISSN 2331-1258 (online)

Contents

Table

Conversion Factors

Inch/Pound to SI

Multiply	By	To obtain
	Length	
foot (ft)	0.3048	meter (m)
mile (mi)	1.609	kilometer (km)
yard (yd)	0.9144	meter (m)
	Area	
acre	4,047	square meter (m^2)
acre	0.4047	hectare (ha)
acre	0.004047	square kilometer (km^2)
section (640 acres or 1 square mile)	259.0	square hectometer (hm^2)
square mile (mi^2)	259.0	hectare (ha)
square mile (mi^2)	2.590	square kilometer (km^2)

SI to Inch/Pound

Multiply	By	To obtain
	Length	
meter (m)	3.281	foot (ft)
kilometer (km)	0.6214	mile (mi)
meter (m)	1.094	yard (yd)
	Area	
square meter (m^2)	0.0002471	acre
hectare (ha)	2.471	acre
square kilometer (km^2)	247.1	acre
square hectometer (hm^2)	0.003861	section (640 acres or 1 square mile)
hectare (ha)	0.003861	square mile (mi^2)
square kilometer (km^2)	0.3861	square mile (mi^2)

Conservation Buffer Distance Estimates for Greater Sage-Grouse—A Review

By Daniel J. Manier, Zachary H. Bowen, Matthew L. Brooks, Michael L. Casazza, Peter S. Coates, Patricia A. Deibert, Steven E. Hanser, and Douglas H. Johnson

Introduction

This report was prepared at the request of the U.S. Department of the Interior and is a compilation and summary of published scientific studies that evaluate the influence of anthropogenic activities and infrastructure on Greater Sage-Grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*; hereafter, sage-grouse) populations. The purpose of this report is to provide a convenient reference for land managers and others who are working to develop biologically relevant and socioeconomically practical buffer distances around sage-grouse habitats. The framework for this summary includes (1) addressing the potential effects of anthropogenic land use and disturbances on sage-grouse populations, (2) providing ecologically based interpretations of evidence from the scientific literature, and (3) informing implementation of conservation buffers around sage-grouse communal breeding locations—known as leks.

We do not make specific management recommendations but instead provide summarized information, citations, and interpretation of findings available in scientific literature. We also recognize that because of variation in populations, habitats, development patterns, social context, and other factors, for a particular disturbance type, there is no single distance that is an appropriate buffer for all populations and habitats across the sage-grouse range. Thus, we report values for distances upon which protective, conservation buffers might be based, in conjunction with other considerations (table 1). We present this information for six categories of land use or disturbance typically found in land-use plans which are representative of the level of definition available in the scientific literature: surface disturbance (multiple causes; immediate and cumulative influences); linear features (roads); energy development (oil, gas, wind, and solar); tall structures (electrical, communication, and meteorological); low structures (fences and buildings); and activities (noise and related disruptions). Minimum and maximum distances for observed effects found in the scientific literature, as well as a distance range for possible conservation buffers based on interpretation of multiple sources, expert knowledge of the authors regarding affected areas, and the distribution of birds around leks are provided for each of the six categories (table 1). These interpreted values for buffer distances are an attempt to balance the extent of protected areas with multiple land-use requirements using estimates of the distribution of sage-grouse habitat. Conservation efforts may then focus on the overlap between potential effect zone and important habitats. We provide a brief discussion of some of the most relevant literature for each category. References associated with the minimum and maximum values in table 1 are identified in the References Cited section with corresponding symbols.

Distances in this report reflect radii around lek locations because these locations are typically (although not universally) known, and management plans often refer to these locations. Lek sites are most representative of breeding habitats, but their locations are focal points within populations, and as such, protective buffers around lek sites can offer a useful solution for identifying and conserving seasonal habitats required by sage-grouse *throughout* their life cycle. However, knowledge of local and regional patterns of seasonal habitat use may improve conservation of those important areas, especially regarding the distribution and utilization of nonbreeding season habitats (which may be underrepresented in lek-based designations).

Analytical Realities and Additional Background

Understanding the effects of multiple human land uses on sage-grouse and their habitats is complicated by the combination of environmental, ecological, and socioeconomic conditions across the species range, which includes parts of 11 U.S. States and 2 Canadian Provinces in western North America. Responses of individual birds and populations, coupled with variability in land-use patterns and habitat conditions, add variation in research results. This variability presents a challenge for land managers and planners seeking to use research results to guide management and plan for sage-grouse conservation measures.

Variability between sage-grouse populations and their responses to different types of infrastructure can be substantial across the species' range. Our interpretations attempt to encompass variability in populations (for example, migratory versus nonmigratory) and rangewide response patterns of sage-grouse to various human activities. Logical and scientifically justifiable departures from the "typical response," based on local data and other factors, may be warranted when implementing buffer protections or density limits in parts of the species' range.

Natural movement behaviors of sage-grouse have been documented by multiple studies that provide direct evidence of inter- and intraseasonal movements from a few kilometers (km) (nonmigratory populations; Berry and Eng, 1985; Connelly and others, 2004) to 20–30 km or more (Connelly and others, 2004; Fedy and others, 2012; Tack and others, 2012). An influential, telemetry-based, tracking project in central Montana indicated more than 90 percent of *breeding season* movements by male grouse were within 1.3 km (0.8 mi) of a lek and 76 percent were within 1 km of a lek (0.6 mi; Wallestad and Schladweiler, 1974). The 1-km (0.6-mi) buffer used in many management efforts was based upon this research. More recent analyses have indicated that 90–95 percent of habitat use at the population level was focused within approximately 8 km (5 miles [mi]) of several California and Nevada lek sites (Coates and others, 2013), and 95 percent of all nests were located within approximately 5 km (3.1 mi) of leks. Holloran and Anderson (2005) found that 64 percent of nests in Wyoming occurred within 5 km (3.1 mi) of leks, suggesting considerable protection of sage-grouse within these proximate habitats. In contrast, home ranges as large as 2,975 km^2 (1,149 mi^2) have been documented (Connelly and others, 2000, 2004) in some portions of the species' range. These larger distances suggest that for some populations, the minimum distance inferred here (5 km [3.1 mi]) from leks may be insufficient to protect nesting and other seasonal habitats. Based on the collective information reviewed for this study, conservation practices that address habitats falling within the interpreted distances may be expected to protect as much as 75 percent (Doherty and others, 2010) to 95 percent (Coates and others, 2013) of local population's habitat utilization.

Habitat condition, composition, structure, and distribution are important potential modifiers of the effect of human infrastructure and activities on sage-grouse populations (Dinkins and others, 2014; Walters and others, 2014). The distribution of sagebrush (*Artemisia* spp.) is a well-known biological and statistical predictor of sage-grouse response to their environment (for example, Connelly and others, 2004; Aldridge and Boyce, 2007; Hagen and others, 2007; National Technical Team, Sage Grouse, 2011; Wisdom and others, 2011; Kirol and others, 2012; Beck and others, 2014; Smith and others, 2014). Differences among sagebrush communities within a population range may also affect the impact of infrastructure. For example, primary productivity of sites is typically greater in mountain big sagebrush (*A. tridendata* ssp. *vaseyana*) communities than Wyoming big sagebrush (*A. t.* ssp. *wyomingensis*) communities (Davies and Bates, 2010).

Sage-grouse depend on sagebrush, so buffer protections may be most effective when focused on avoidance of disturbance to sagebrush that provides the keystone to sage-grouse habitat. Important sage-grouse habitats include those with >40 percent sagebrush landcover (within 5 km [3.1 mi] radial assessment area; Knick and others, 2013), sagebrush patch sizes greater than 1 km^2 (0.4 mi^2) (Aldridge and Boyce, 2007), and plot-level composition of approximately 10–30 percent sagebrush cover and >15 percent grasses and forbs (Connelly and others, 2004; Stiver and others, 2006). Avoidance of activities that increase distance between sagebrush patches or that impose barriers to dispersal could also help maintain populations (Wisdom and others, 2011; Knick and Hanser, 2011).

Various protection measures have been developed and implemented, including complete closure of important habitats, distance buffers that restrict disturbing activities within designated distances, and development-disturbance density limits within habitats (for examples see, "Policy and Rules for Development" at *http://utahcbcp.org/htm/tall-structure-info*). Timing restrictions have also commonly been employed at lek sites, primarily to reduce disturbance to breeding sage-grouse. Although specific details and implementation of these different approaches have varied, each approach has the ability (alone or in concert with others) to protect important habitats, sustain populations, and support multiple-use demands for public lands. As such, local and regional differences in design and implementation of conservation plans should be assessed with explicit attention to the details and cumulative impact of a suite of actions, including but not limited to the buffer distances, which are the focus of this report.

Surface Disturbance

Surface disturbance represents a combination of human activities that alter or remove the natural vegetation community on a site. Isolating the potential effects of human land-use patterns on sage-grouse is challenging because causal factors are frequently interrelated and interactive (for example roads and distribution lines or roads and well pads) making a general discussion of "development effects" necessary. In cases where better discrimination is available, those specific types of surface disturbances are addressed in the following sections. The values in this section reflect a nondiscriminatory understanding of the independent and interactive and cumulative effects of activities that remove sagebrush cover and other natural vegetation, and often include continual and (or) intermittent activities, such as running motors and pumps, vehicle visits, and equipment servicing. The collective influence of human activity on the landscape, often referred to as the human footprint (Leu and others, 2008), has been associated with negative trends in sage-grouse lek counts (Johnson and others, 2011) and population persistence (Aldridge and others, 2008; Wisdom and others, 2011). A multiscale assessment of factors associated with lek abandonment between 1965 and 2007 found that the level of the human footprint within 5 km (3.1 mi) of the lek was negatively associated with lek persistence (Knick and Hanser, 2011). Agricultural activities, including tilling, seeding, and other highly managed activities, are a component of the human footprint and clearly fall into the category of surface disturbance (removal of native vegetation); however, agriculture is a special case because, although agriculture occupies large areas with transformed conditions, these lands are typically privately owned and the habitat value of agricultural areas is not zero because these lands can provide cover and forage for some populations in some seasons (Fischer and others, 1996). For example, sage-grouse have been known to use agricultural lands in late summer and early spring (Fischer and others, 1996). Though we found no direct evidence for spacing recommendations between agricultural lands and leks or other sage-grouse habitat, the conversion of sagebrush to agriculture within a landscape has been shown to lead to decreased abundance of sage-grouse in many portions of their range (Swenson and others, 1987; Smith and others, 2005; Aldridge and Boyce, 2007; Aldridge and others, 2008). A potential mechanism for this decrease in abundances, besides the direct loss of habitat, is the association of generalist predators (Common Raven [*Corvus corax*] and Black-billed Magpie [*Pica hudsonia*]) with agricultural infrastructure (Vander Haegen and others, 2002) and subsequent predation on sage-grouse (Connelly and others, 2004; Coates and Delehanty, 2010).

Estimated distance effects were translated to a 5- to 8-km (3.1- to 5-mi) radius around each lek to describe a possible conservation buffer area (interpreted range) based on interpretation of two principal factors: the potential effect area and the potential distribution of habitat use within affected areas. The need for protection of populations that are not well understood requires some generalization, and this distance range is proposed because research suggests that a majority of sage-grouse distributions and movements (within and between seasons) occur within this range (for example, Berry and Eng, 1985; Lyon and Anderson, 2003; Holloran and Anderson, 2005; Walker and others, 2007; Aldridge and others, 2008; Knick and others, 2011; Naugle and others, 2011; Coates and others, 2013). Importantly, due to variability among individuals and populations, some individuals in most populations (migratory and nonmigratory) may move greater distances than those included in the buffer, but specific protections cannot, practically, be determined for all individuals and all behavioral patterns. Although leks are generally recognized as the center of breeding and nesting habitats, recent utilization distribution analyses have helped to refine understanding of sage-grouse habitat-use patterns throughout the year. Based on this approach, Coates and others (2013) suggested that an 8-km (5-mi) protection area centered on an active lek location should encompass the seasonal movements and habitat use of 90–95 percent of sage-grouse associated with the lek. Longer distance movements are not always explicitly protected in this context, and habitats associated with previously unidentified leks may not be protected. However, final settling locations for more mobile individuals may be associated with quality habitats protected by buffers around adjacent lek sites. Furthermore, buffer distances beyond 8 km (5 mi) result in a decreasing benefit (cost-benefit trade-off) of increasing protection in areas that are less commonly used by sage-grouse. Without population-specific information regarding the location of habitats and movement of birds, which may be utilized when available (for an example see, Colorado Greater Sage-grouse Steering Committee, 2008), this generalized protection area (circular buffer around active leks with radius of 8 km [5mi]) offers a practical tool for determining important habitat areas. (Note: the Colorado Plan [Colorado Greater Sage-grouse Steering Committee, 2008] recommended a 6.4-km [4-mi] circular buffer, which may be well suited for those populations and falls within the range identified here.)

Importantly, similar results and interpretations to those derived from California and Nevada populations (Coates and others, 2013) were attained from the eastern portion of sage-grouse range; namely, Holloran and Anderson (2005) reported 64 percent of monitored nests fell within 5 km (3.1 mi) of a lek, and response to industrial development (decreased nesting rates and success rates) was observable to distances between 5 and 10 km (3.1–6.2 mi) from a lek suggesting that similar buffer distances are as relevant in Wyoming as in the Great Basin. In Utah, approximately 90 percent of nests (not all movements) were located within 5 km (3 mi) of a lek and threshold distance increased with greater contiguity of habitats. The smallest effect distance (3.2 km [2 mi] from a lek) described by Naugle and others (2011) was previously described and tested in field research by Holloran and Anderson (2005) and Walker and others (2007); these studies were designed to evaluate the effectiveness of existing stipulations. However, recent evaluation of different effect areas (Gregory and Beck, 2014) suggested significant immediate effects on lek attendance with one well pad within 2 km (1.2 mi) of a lek and time-lagged effects due to industrial development within 10 km (6.2 mi) of a lek indicating a habitat within the 8 km (5 mi) identified here may still experience an influence of development on some landscapes. Although considerable protections would be afforded by using a greater buffer distance from leks, research has indicated population effects are variable, and the cumulative effect of development may extend across the landscape many kilometers (>10 km [6 mi]) beyond the immediately affected areas. Diminishing gain analysis (Coates and others, 2013) suggested that sustained gains from habitat protection (based on percent of *highly used areas* protected versus *total* area protected) diminished after 8 km (5 mi)(radius) from leks, which helped to establish a ceiling on interpretations for habitat buffers seeking to maximize conservation benefits and minimize impacts on land uses.

Linear Features

Roads, especially active roads such as collectors, major haul, and service roads, as well as county, State, and Federal highways, create many of the same “aversion” factors described previously that are related to traffic noise on roadways and interactions with infrastructure associated with corridors (such as fences, poles, and towers). One potential mechanism behind road-aversion behavior by sage-grouse could be the intermittent noise produced by passing traffic. Blickley and others (2012) discovered that noise-disturbance simulations that mimicked intermittent sources (road noise), or separately, drilling noises (continuous), generated a significant reduction in lek attendance of sage-grouse (73-percent reduction with road noise, 29 percent with drilling noise).

Most planning related to linear features applies to new construction, that is, avoidance of placing new roads or transmission lines in important habitats, but existing roads might also be addressed by considering seasonal closures, or removal, of roads within protective buffer areas. Fragmentation of habitats related to the network of roads and other linear features (potential for cumulative effects) may have negative effects on sage-grouse populations by reducing and fragmenting sagebrush habitat. When compared to extirpated leks, occupied leks have twice the cover of sagebrush (46 percent versus 24 percent) and ten times larger average sagebrush patches (4,173 hectares [ha] [10,310 acres] versus 481 ha [1,190 acres]) (Wisdom and others, 2011). However, it is important to recognize that previous assessments of relations between sage-grouse distributions and roads include a combination of positive and negative relations (Johnson and others, 2011), and local effects may be restricted to visible (or audible) range. Correlations between the distribution of roads with the distribution of quality sagebrush habitats (due to moderate topographic relief), interactions between influence of roads and infrastructure with topography and habitat conditions (visibility and audibility), and differences in traffic volumes may all contribute to population effects on sage-grouse; not all roads have the same effect (Carpenter and others, 2010; Dinkins and others, 2014). Because roads and other linear features can have different effects on sage-grouse behavior, regional models of distributions and population dynamics have attempted to capture some differences; for example, roads closer to lek locations and other seasonal habitats may have greater effects than those occurring farther from important habitats (Hanser and others, 2011). Effects of pipelines and powerline corridors were tested but were not found to have clear, rangewide effects on lek trends (Johnson and others, 2011). However, it has become evident that interactions and co-location of linear features (for example, power distribution lines along roads and railroads) can make separation of effects difficult (Walters and others, 2014); power lines are addressed in a following section (Tall Structures).

Because of general concerns about habitat fragmentation and loss due to transportation networks, rangewide assessment of the effects of distributed human features, including road proximity (distance) and density, on trends in sage-grouse populations (based on lek counts), were conducted (Johnson and others, 2011). Incremental effects of accumulating length of roads in proximity to leks were apparent rangewide, although limited to major roads (State and Federal highways and interstates). This effect was demonstrated by decreasing lek counts when there were more than 5 km (3.1 mi) of Federal or State highway within 5 km (3.1 mi) of leks and when more than 20 km (12.4 mi) of highway occurs within an 18-km (11.2-mi) window (Johnson and others, 2011). Regional assessments (sage-grouse management zones, MZs; see Stiver and others, 2006) indicated downward trends in northern Great Basin (MZ4 and a portion of MZ5) populations when road density within 5-km (3.1-mi) radius of lek exceeded 30 km (18.6 mi). In Great Plains populations (MZ1), lek trends declined within a 10 km (6.2 mi) radius of a major road. It is important to note that many of the regional assessments did not indicate decreasing lek trends associated with the various size-classes of roads that were assessed (Johnson and others, 2011). In separate analyses in Wyoming, probability of sage-grouse habitat use (based on pellet-count surveys) declined around major roads (State and Federal highways and interstates) when assessed using a 1-km (0.6-mi) exponential decay function ($\exp^{(\text{distance} /-1\text{km})}$; Hanser and others, 2011). Assessment of lek trends in proximity to a large, interstate highway (I-80) indicated that all formerly recorded lek sites within 2 km (1.25 mi) of the highway were unoccupied, and leks within 7.5 km (4.7 mi) of the highway had declining attendance (Connelly and others, 2004).

Radio-telemetry (Very High Frequency, VHF) studies are often used to help track and document animal movements and habitat use, and some have reflected affinity of sage-grouse to roads (for example, Carpenter and others, 2010; Dinkens and others, 2014). However, this pattern may be due to search patterns employed by road-bound investigators (Fedy and others, 2014) or the distribution of roads across quality habitats in flat and lower elevation terrain (Carpenter and others, 2010; Dinkins and others, 2014) as opposed to selection of roads as preferred habitats. Seasonal, Statewide habitat models in Wyoming indicated a difference in seasonal sensitivity to density of paved roads, suggesting a decaying effects function approaching zero as distance approaches 3.2 km (2 mi) of leks (negative exponential) during the nesting and summer seasons, and a decay function approaching zero as distance approaches 1.5 km (0.9 mi) of leks during winter (Fedy and others, 2014). However, Dinkins and others (2014) found decreased risk of death for hens with *increasing* road density, but they also noted that the co-location of road distribution and quality habitat may have influenced this result. Although noise has been clearly demonstrated to influence sage-grouse (Blickley and others, 2012), the influence of individual roads or networks of roads on sage-grouse habitat use and demographic parameters remains a research need. This is a good example of the challenge associated with making clear interpretations of the effect area (and therefore, a definitive buffer distance) for these types of infrastructure.

Energy Development

Research and applications addressing surface disturbances in sagebrush ecosystems have been commonly conducted in relation to energy development activities. Lands affected by these activities have been the focus of many studies investigating the effects of anthropogenic activities on sage-grouse behavior and population dynamics, so the previous section (Surface Disturbance) contains much of the information relevant here.

Direct impacts of energy development on sage-grouse habitats and populations, such as loss of sagebrush canopy or nest failure, have been estimated to occur within a 1.2-ha (3-acre) area of leks (radius: 62 m [68 yards]); indirect influences, such as habitat degradation or utilization displacement, have been estimated to extend out to 19 km (11.8 mi) from leks (Naugle and others, 2011). Regional analyses of well-density and distance effects (Johnson and others, 2011) suggested negative trends in populations (lek counts) when distance was less than 4 km (2.5 mi) to the nearest producing well; whereas density effects were evident rangewide based on decreasing population trends when greater than eight active wells occurred within 5 km (3.1 mi) of leks, or when more than 200 active wells occurred within 18 km (11 mi)of leks. In Wyoming, significant negative relations between use of seasonal habitats and well densities have been demonstrated. Fedy and others (2014) found a significant negative relation between well density and probability of sage-grouse habitat selection during nesting (3.2-km [2-mi] radius) and winter (6.44-km [4-mi] radius) seasons. In the Powder River Basin, wintering sage-grouse were negatively associated with increasing coalbed natural gas well densities within a 2-km × 2-km (1.24-mi × 1.24-mi) window (Doherty and others 2008). Also, Gregory and Beck (2014) documented lek attendance decline when energy development averaged 0.7 well pads/km^2 (1.81 well pads/mi^2; using a 10-km × 10-km [6.2-mi × 6.2-mi] assessment window) across multiple populations and different development patterns.

A key consideration, besides the impacts of the development footprint on habitat condition and predation potential, is the effect of intermittent noise on behavior (avoidance) as evident from work by Blickley and others (2012) who found decreased lek activity due to mimicked drilling and road noise produced at close range (volume level equivalent to a road or well 400 m [1300 ft] away). A precise distance for noise effects has not been determined, but this value likely varies depending on the source (equipment, vehicles) and the terrain.

Less information is available about the effects of renewable energy development, such as wind-turbine arrays, on sage-grouse. LeBeau and others (2014) monitored effects during breeding season (95 nests and 31 broods) and found a linear decline of 7.1 percent in nest failure and 38 percent in brood failure with each 1-km (0.6-mi) increase in distance from wind energy infrastructure (less effect with greater distance). Changes in mortality were not attributed to direct collisions but to increased predation. It is notable that one study on prairie chickens (a related galliform, *Tympanuchus cupido*) found *increased* nest success rates adjacent to recent wind-energy facilities (Winder and others, 2014).

Suggestions that sage-grouse instinctively avoid wind turbines (tall

TBPA - 00035168

structures) to avoid predators are debated because of the difficulty in directly connecting predation risk to infrastructure, which often includes a combination of features (Walters and others, 2014). A further discussion of this topic is contained in the Tall Structures section below. It is notable that use of wind turbines as perches has not been documented.

Tall Structures

It is important to recognize that the effect of tall structures remains debated, and this category contains a wide array of infrastructure including poles that support lights, telephone and electrical distribution, communication towers, meteorological towers, and high-tension transmission towers. Determining effects of these structures has remained difficult due to limited research and confounding effects (for example, towers and transmission lines are typically associated with other development infrastructure; Messmer and others, 2013; Walters and others, 2014). Lacking precise information regarding the influence of tall structures on the foraging behavior of corvids and raptors, management plans have adopted similar buffer distances to other infrastructure, for example a 1-km (0.6-mi) buffer of avoidance around lek sites. The general assumption is that these structures offer opportunities for increased predator use and thereby generate aversion behaviors among prey species (that is, sage-grouse); however, other effects, such as electro-magnetic radiation, have not been eliminated, and effects on predation rates have not been confirmed (Messmer and others, 2013). Habitat alteration, akin to other linear features (see previous section), may also be considered an important component of interactions between powerline corridors and sage-grouse populations. The 1-km (0.6-mi) buffer indicated here (table 1) was based upon Wallestad and Schladweiler (1974) who observed that more than 90 percent of breeding season movements by male grouse were within 1.3 km (0.8 mi) of a lek (76 percent of movements occurred within 1 km [0.6 mi]). Subsequently, Connelly and others (2000, p. 977) suggested, "avoid building powerlines and other tall structures that provide perch sites for raptors within 3 km of seasonal habitats... lines should be buried or posts modified to prevent use as perches...” Recent research has added important information to previous speculations and estimations, specifying concentrated foraging behaviors by common ravens (a common predator of sage-grouse nests) at 2.2 km (1.4 mi) from electrical transmission towers with the observed foraging area extending out to 11 km (6.8 mi; Coates, and others, 2014a). According to estimates, the greatest potential impact on sage-grouse nests occurs within 570 m (0.35 mi) of structures (Howe and others, 2014). Negative trends in lek counts were associated with increasing number of communication towers within 18km of leks range wide (Johnson and others 2011). Johnson and others (2011) also documented negative trends in lek counts for Great Plains populations within 20 km (12.4 mi) of a power transmission line or when the linear density of powerlines within 5 km (3.1 mi) of leks was greater than 10 km (6.2 mi)—notably, affected areas may be greater in these habitats (compared to other intermountain communities) because visibility is often greater in gentle terrain.

Although considerable attention has been paid to the influence of tall structures (both anthropogenic and trees) on the quality of sage-grouse habitat (for example, Connelly and others, 2000; Connelly and others, 2004; Stiver and others, 2006; National Technical Team, Sage-Grouse, 2011; Manier and others, 2013), solid evidence that sage-grouse instinctively avoid tall structures to avoid predators remains debated because of the difficulty in connecting predation risk to various combinations of infrastructure (Walters and others, 2014). However some evidence exists; in Wyoming the risk of death for sage-grouse hens was greater near potential raptor perches (Dinkins and others, 2014), and in Idaho common raven abundance was greater near energy infrastructure (2.2 km [1.4 mi]; Coates and others 2014a,b). Coates and others (2014b) found different effects of infrastructure on three species of raptor (*Buteo* spp.) and common ravens, with clear increases in raven abundance with infrastructure but less consistent results with raptors. Also, in Wyoming, common raven habitat use was greatest within 3 km (1.8 mi) of human activity centers, and raven occupancy was correlated with nest failure (Bui and others, 2010). These studies suggest a potential increase in predators of sage-grouse, in particular ravens, which may influence predation pressure more than raptors.

Low Structures

Collisions of flying sage-grouse with fences have been associated with mortality (Beck and others, 2006; Stevens and others, 2012a,b). Incidents were focused within 1.6–3.2 km (1–2 mi) of leks on flat to rolling terrain and fences with wide spacing of poles and (or) less visible 't-posts' (as opposed to wooden posts) (Stevens and others 2012a,b). Importantly, the effect of fences was apparently less in rougher terrain, presumably due to differences in flight behaviors in the birds. Marking fences helps flying grouse avoid these collisions; therefore, marking or removal of fences within 2 km (1.2 mi) of leks on flat or rolling terrain can reduce sage-grouse mortality associated with collisions. In a review of previous research, including theses and reports, Connelly and others (2004, p. 4–2) described findings of Rogers (1964) who stated that only 5 percent of leks were found within 200 m (656 ft) of a building, which suggests structures, even without regular activity and (or) noise, may have produced aversion behavior in historic sage-grouse populations. Recent research provides evidence that ravens forage at distances as far as 5.1 km (3.2 mi) from buildings in sagebrush environments (Coates and others, 2014a) suggesting that a wide distribution of infrastructure that can supply nesting or resting sites for ravens could have negative effects on sage-grouse populations.

Activities (Without Habitat Loss)

Tests using recorded noises and wild sage-grouse populations (Blickley and others, 2012) suggest that loud noises transmitted at decibels (70 dB at 0 m; 40 dB at 100 m [328 ft]) to approximate a noise source 400 m (1300 ft) from leks caused decreased activity on leks. Though they did not test the range of potential noise volumes or activities (different noises) associated with recreation or other (nonindustrial) activities, this research is our best evidence of the effect of noise (independent from infrastructure) on sage-grouse behavior. The upper limit (4.8 km [3 mi]) is the value being used by the State of Nevada for reducing noise effects on sage-grouse due to locations of geothermal energy facilities (Nevada Governor's Sage-Grouse Conservation Team, 2010). Better understanding of the type, frequency, and volume of noise effects on sage-grouse behavior will enhance our ability to define effect areas.

References Cited

Symbols in this section refer to citations in Table 1.

Aldridge, C.L., and Boyce, M.S., 2007, Linking occurrence and fitness to persistence—Habitat-based approach for endangered Greater Sage-Grouse: Ecological Applications, v. 17, p. 508–526.

Aldridge, C.L., Nielsen, S.E., Beyer, H.L., Boyce, M.S., Connelly, J.W., Knick, S.T., and Schroeder, M.A., 2008, Range-wide patterns of Greater Sage-Grouse persistence: Diversity and Distributions, v. 14, p. 983–94.

Beck, J.L., Booth, D.T., and Kennedy, C.L., 2014, Assessing Greater Sage-Grouse breeding habitat with aerial and ground imagery: Rangeland Ecology and Management, v. 67, p. 328–332.

Beck, J.L., Reese, K.P., Connelly, J.W., and Lucia, M.B., 2006, Movements and survival of juvenile Greater Sage-Grouse in southeastern Idaho: Wildlife Society Bulletin v. 34, p. 1070–1078.

Berry, J.D., and Eng, R.L., 1985, Interseasonal movements and fidelity to seasonal use areas by female sage-grouse: Journal of Wildlife Management, v. 49, p. 237–40.

‡ Blickley, J.L., Blackwood, D., Patricelli, G.L., 2012, Experimental evidence for the effects of chronic anthropogenic noise on abundance of greater sage-grouse at leks: Conservation Biology, v. 26, p. 461–471.

Bui, T.V.D., Marzluff, J.M., Bedrosian, B., 2010, Common raven activity in relation to land use in western Wyoming: implications for greater-sage grouse reproductive success: Condor, v. 112, p. 65–78.

Carpenter, J., Aldridge, C.L., and Boyce, M.S., 2010, Sage-grouse habitat selection during winter in Alberta: Journal of Wildlife Management, v. 74, p. 1806–1814.

Coates, P.S. and Delehanty, D.J., 2010, Nest predation of Greater Sage-Grouse in relation to microhabitat factors and predators: Journal of Wildlife Management, v. 74, p. 240–248.

Coates, P.S., Casazza, M.L., Blomberg, E.J., Gardner, S.C., Espinosa, S.P., Yee, J.L., Wiechman, L., and Halstead. B.J., 2013, Evaluating Greater Sage-Grouse seasonal space use relative to leks: Implications for surface use designations in sagebrush ecosystems: Journal of Wildlife Management, v. 77, p. 1598–1609.

Coates, P.S., Howe, K.B., Casazza M.L., and Delehanty, D.J., 2014a, Common raven occurrence in relation to energy transmission line corridors transiting human-altered sagebrush steppe: Journal of Arid Environments, v. 111, p.68–78.

Coates, P.S., Howe, K.B., Casazza, M.L., and Delehanty D.J., 2014b, Landscape alterations influence differential habitat use of nesting buteos and ravens within sagebrush ecosystem: Implications for transmission line development: Condor, v. 116, p. 341–356.

Connelly, J. W., Schroeder, M. A., Sands, A. R., and Braun, C. E., 2000, Guidelines to manage sage grouse populations and their habitats: Wildlife Society Bulletin, v. 28, p. 967–985.

§ Connelly, J. W., Knick, S.T., Schroeder, M. A. and Stiver, S. J., 2004, Conservation assessment of greater sage-grouse and sagebrush habitats: Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA), 600 p.

Colorado Greater Sage-grouse Steering Committee, 2008, Colorado Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan. Colorado Division of Wildlife, Denver, Colorado, USA.

Davies, K.W. and Bates, J.D., 2010, Vegetation Characteristics of Mountain and Wyoming Big Sagebrush Plant Communities in the

TBPA - 00035171

Northern Great Basin: Rangeland Ecology and Management, v. 63, p. 461–466.

Dinkins, J.B., Conover, M.R. Kirol, C.P. Beck, J. L. and Frey S.N,. 2014, Greater sage-grouse hen survival: effects of raptors, anthropogenic and landscape features, and hen behavior: Canadian Journal of Zoology, v. 92, p. 319–330.

Doherty, K.E., Naugle, D.E., Walker, B.L., and Graham J.M., 2008, Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat Selection and Energy Development: Journal of Wildlife Management, v. 72, p. 187–95.

Doherty, K.E., Naugle, D.E., and Walker B.L., 2010, Greater Sage-Grouse nesting habitat: the importance of managing at multiple scales: Journal of Wildlife Management, v. 74, p. 1544–1553.

Fedy, B.C., Aldridge, C.L., Doherty, K.E., O'Donnell, M., Beck, J.L., Bedrosian, B., Holloran, M.J., Johnson, G. D., Kaczor, N.W., Kirol, C.P., Mandich, C.A., Marshall, D., McKee, G., Olson, C., Swanson, C.C. and Walker, B.L., 2012, Interseasonal Movements of Greater Sage-Grouse, Migratory Behavior, and an Assessment of the Core Regions Concept in Wyoming: Journal of Wildlife Management, v. 76, p. 1062–1071.

Fedy, B.C., Doherty, K.E., Aldridge, C.L., O’Donnell, M., Beck, J.L., Bedrosian, B., Gummer, D., Holloran, M.J., Johnson, G.D., Kaczor, N.W., Kirol, C.P., Mandich, D.A., Marshall, D., McKee, G., Olson, C., Pratt, A.C., Swanson, C.C.,Walker, B.L., 2014, Habitat prioritization across large landscapes, multiple seasons, and novel areas: An example using Greater Sage-Grouse in Wyoming: Wildlife Monographs, v. 190, p. 1–39.

Fischer, R.A., Reese, K.P., and Connelly, J.W., 1996, Influence of vegetal moisture content and nest fate on timing of female sage grouse migration: Condor, v. 98, p.868–872.

Gregory, A.J., and Beck, J.L., 2014, Spatial heterogeneity in response of male greater sage-grouse lek attendance to energy development: PLoS ONE, v. 9, e97132.

Hagen, C.A., Connelly, J.W., Schroeder, M.A., 2007, A meta-analysis of greater sage-grouse Centrocercus urophasianus nesting and brood-rearing habitats: Wildlife Biology, v. 13, p. 42–50

Hanser, S.E., Aldridge, C.L., Leu, M., Rowland, M.M., Nielsen, S.E., and Knick S.T., 2011, Greater Sage-Grouse: General Use and Roost Site Occurrence with Pellet Counts as a Measure of Relative Abundance, p. 112–140 *in* S. E. Hanser, M. Leu, S. T. Knick, and C. L. Aldridge, eds., Sagebrush ecosystem conservation and management: ecoregional assessment tools and models for the Wyoming Basins: Allen Press, Lawrence, KS.

* Holloran, M.J., and Anderson. S.H., 2005, Spatial Distribution of Greater Sage-Grouse Nests in Relatively Contiguous Sagebrush Habitats: Condor, v. 107, p. 742–52.

° Howe, K.B., Coates, P.S., and Delehanty, D.J., 2014, Selection of anthropogenic features and vegetation characteristics by nesting Common Ravens in the sagebrush ecosystem: Condor, v. 116, p. 25–49.

◊ Johnson, D. H., Holloran, M. J. Connelly, J. W. Hanser, S. E. Amundson, C. L. andKnick S. T., 2011, Influences of Environmental and Anthropogenic Features on Greater Sage-Grouse Populations, 1997–2007, Chapter 17 *In* S. T. Knick and J. W. Connelly, eds., Greater Sage-Grouse: Ecology of a Landscape Species and Its Habitats, Studies in Avian Biology No. 38: University of California Press: Berkeley, CA, p. 407–450.

Kirol, C.P., Beck, J.L., Dinkins, J.B., and Conover, M.R., 2012, Microhabitat selection for nesting and brood-rearing by the Greater Sage-Grouse in xeric big sagebrush: Condor, v. 114, p.75–89.

Knick, S.T., 2011, Historical development, principal federal legislation, and current management of sagebrush habitats: implications for conservation. *in* S. T. Knick and J. W. Connelly, eds. Greater Sage-Grouse: ecology and conservation of a landscape species and its habitats. Studies in Avian Biology No. 38, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA. p. 13–31.

Knick, S.T., and Hanser, S.E., 2011, Connecting pattern and process in Greater Sage-Grouse populations and sagebrush landscapes, *in* S. T. Knick and J. W. Connelly, eds., Greater Sage-Grouse: ecology and conservation of a landscape species and its habitats. Studies in Avian Biology No. 38: University of California Press, Berkeley, CA. p. 383–405.

Knick, S.T., Hanser, S.E., and Preston, K.L,. 2013, Modeling ecological minimum requirements for distribution of greater sage-grouse leks: implications for population connectivity across their western range, U.S.A.: Ecology and Evolution, v. 3, p.1539–1551.

Knick, S.T., Hanser, S.E. Miller, R.F., Pyke, D.A., Wisdom, M.J., Finn, S. P., Rinkes, E.T. and Henny C.J., 2011, Ecological Influence and Pathways of Land Use in Sagebrush, *In* S. T. Knick and J. W. Connelly, eds., Greater Sage-Grouse: Ecology of a Landscape Species and Its Habitats, Studies in Avian Biology No.38: University of California Press: Berkeley, CA, p. 203–252.

LeBeau, C.W., Beck, J.L., Johnson G.D. and Holloran, M.J., 2014, Short-term impacts of wind energy development on Greater Sage-Grouse fitness: Journal of Wildlife Management, v. 78, p. 522–530.

Leu, M., Hanser, S.E., and Knick S.T., 2008, The human footprint in the West: a large-scale analysis of anthropogenic impacts, Ecological Applications, v. 18, p. 119–1139.

Lyon, A.G., and Anderson S.H,. 2003, Potential Gas Development Impacts on Sage Grouse Nest Initiation and Movement. Wildlife Society Bulletin, v. 31, p. 486–91.

Manier, D.J., Wood, D.J.A., Bowen, Z.H., Donovan, R.M., Holloran, M.J., Juliusson, L.M., Mayne, K.S., Oyler-McCance, S.J., Quamen, F.R., Saher, D.J., and Titolo, A.J., 2013, Summary of science, activities, programs, and policies that influence the rangewide conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*): U.S. Geological Survey Open–File Report 2013–1098, 331 p.

Messmer, T.A., Hasenyager, R. Burruss, J. and Liguori S., 2013, Stakeholder contemporary knowledge needs regarding the potential effects of tall structures on sage-grouse. Human-Wildlife Interactions, v. 7, p. 273–298.

National Technical Team, Sage-Grouse, 2011, A report on national Greater Sage-Grouse conservation measures. Bureau of Land Management: Technical Report. Washington, D.C. and Denver, Colorado. 74p.

ǂ Naugle, D. E., Doherty, K.E. Walker, B.L. Holloran, M.J. and Copeland H.E., 2011, Energy Development and Greater Sage-Grouse. In Greater Sage-Grouse: Ecology of a Landscape Species and Its Habitats, edited by S.T. Knick and Connelly J.W. Studies in Avian Biology No. 38, University of California Press: Berkeley, CA, p. 489–504.

ψ Nevada Governor's Sage-Grouse Conservation Team, 2010, Nevada energy and infrastructure development standards to conserve Greater Sage-Grouse populations and their habitats. State of Nevada, Reno, 58 p.

Rogers, G.E., 1964, Sage-grouse investigations in Colorado. Colorado Game and Fish Department, Technical Publication No. 16, Fort Collins, Colo.

Smith, J.T., Flake, L.D., Higgins, K F., Kobriger, G.D., and Homer C.G., 2005,

TBPA - 00035173

Evaluating lek occupancy of Greater Sage-Grouse in relation to landscape cultivation in the Dakotas: Western North American Naturalist, v. 65, p. 310–320.

Smith, K.T., Kirol, C.P., Beck, J.L, .and Blomquist, F.C., 2014, Prioritizing winter habitat quality for greater sage-grouse in a landscape influenced by energy development: Ecosphere, vol. 5, article 15

Stevens, B.S., Reese, K.P. Connelly, J.W., and Musil D.D., 2012a, Greater sage-grouse and fences: Does marking reduce collisions? Wildlife Society Bulletin, v. 36, p. 297–303.

« Stevens, B.S., Connelly, J.W. and Reese K.P., 2012b, Multi-scale assessment of greater sage-grouse fence collision as a function of site and broad scale factors.: Journal of Wildlife Management, v. 76, p. 1370–1380.

Stiver, S.J., Apa, A.D., Bohne, J.R., Bunnell, S.D., Deibert, P.A., Gardner, S.C., Hilliard, M.A., McCarthy C.W., and Schroeder M.A., 2006, Greater Sage-grouse Comprehensive Conservation Strategy. Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. WAFWA Report, Cheyenne, Wyoming. Available online: *http://www.wafwa.org/documents/pdf/GreaterSage-grouseConservationStrategy2006.pdf*

Swenson, J. E., Simmons, C.A. and Eustace C.D., 1987, Decrease of Sage Grouse Centrocercus urophasianus after ploughing of sagebrush steppe: Biological Conservation, v. 41, p. 125–132.

Tack, J.D., Naugle D.E., Carlson J.C. and Fargey P.J., 2012,. Greater sage-grouse (Centrocercus urophasianus) migration links the USA and Canada: a biological basis for international prairie conservation: Oryx, vol. 46, p. 64–68.

Vander Haegen, W.M., Schroeder M.A. and DeGraaf R.M.. 2002. Predation on real and artificial nests in shrub steppe landscapes fragmented by agriculture: Condor, v. 104, p. 496–506.

* Walker, B. L., Naugle, D. E. and Doherty K. E.. 2007. Greater Sage-Grouse population response to energy development and habitat loss: Journal of Wildlife Management, v. 71, p. 2644–2654.

Wallestad, R. O., and Schladweiler, P, 1974. Breeding season movements and habitat selection of male sage grouse: Journal of Wildlife Management, v.38, p. 634–637.

Walters, K., Kosciuch K., and Jones, J., 2014, Can the effect of tall structures on birds be isolated from other aspects of development: Wildlife Society Bulletin, vol. 38, p. 250–256.

Winder, V.L., McNew, L.B., Gregory, A.J., Hunt, L.M., Wisely, S.M., and Sandercock, B.K., 2014, Effects of wind energy development on survival of female greater prairie- chickens: Journal of Applied Ecology, v. 51, p. 395–405.

Wisdom, M. J., Meinke, C. W. Knick, S. T. and Schroeder, M. A., 2011, Factors associated with extirpation of sage-grouse. *In* Knick, S. T. and Connelly, J. W., eds. Greater Sage-Grouse: ecology of a landscape species and its habitats. Studies in Avian Biology No. 38, University of California Press: Berkeley, California, p. 451–472**.**

ISSN 2331-1258 (online)
http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/ofr20141239

Table 1. Lek buffer-distance estimates for six categories of anthropogenic land use and activity. Literature minimum and maximum values are distances for observed effects found in the scientific literature. Interpreted ranges indicate potential conservation buffer distances based on multiple sources. [Citations for literature minimum and maximum values are denoted using corresponding symbols in the References Cited section.]

Category	Literature minimum	Interpreted range (lower)	Interpreted range (upper)	Literature maximum
Surface disturbance	3.2km (2mi) *	5km (3.1mi)	8km (5mi)	20km (12.4mi) ◊
Linear features	400m (0.25mi) ‡	5km (3.1mi)	8km (5mi)	18km (11.2mi) ◊
Energy development	3.2km (2mi) †	5km (3.1mi)	8km (5mi)	20km (12.4mi) ◊
Tall structures	1km (0.6mi) °	3.3km (2mi)	8km (5mi)	18km (11.2mi) ◊
Low structures	200 m (0.12 mi) §	2 km (1.2mi)	5.1 km (3.2mi)	5.1 km (3.2mi) «
Activities	400 m (0.25 mi) ‡	400 m (0.25 mi)	4.8 km (3mi)	4.8 km (3mi) Ψ