



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE Mountain-Prairie Region



IN REPLY REFER TO:
FWS/R6
ES

MAILING ADDRESS:
P.O. Box 25486, DFC
Denver, Colorado 80225-0486

STREET LOCATION:
134 Union Boulevard
Lakewood, Colorado 80228-1807

'FEB 04 2010

Memorandum

To: Field Office Project Leaders, Ecological Services, Region 6
Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas

From: Assistant Regional Director, Ecological Services, Region 6

Subject: Region 6 Guidance for Minimizing Effects from Power Line Projects Within the Whooping Crane Migration Corridor

This document is intended to assist Region 6 Ecological Services (ES) biologists in power line (including generation lines, transmission lines, distribution lines, etc.) project evaluation within the whooping crane migration corridor. The guidance contained herein also may be useful in planning by Federal action agencies, consultants, companies, and organizations concerned with impacts to avian resources, such as the Avian Power Line Interaction Committee (APLIC). We encourage action agencies and project proponents to coordinate with their local ES field office early in project development to implement this guidance.

The guidance includes general considerations that may apply to most, but not every, situation within the whooping crane migratory corridor. Additional conservation measures may be considered and/or discretion may be applied by the appropriate ES field office, as applicable. We believe that in most cases the following measures, if implemented and maintained, could reduce the potential effects to the whooping crane to an insignificant and/or discountable level. Where a Federal nexus is lacking, we believe that following these recommendations would reduce the likelihood of a whooping crane being taken and resulting in a violation of Endangered Species Act (ESA) section 9. If non-Federal actions cannot avoid the potential for incidental take, the local ES field office should encourage project proponents to develop a Habitat Conservation Plan and apply for a permit pursuant to ESA section 10(a)(1)(B).

Finally, although this guidance is specific to impacts of power line projects to the whooping crane within the migration corridor, we acknowledge that these guidelines also may benefit other listed and migratory birds.

If you have any questions, please contact Sarena Selbo, Section 7 Coordinator, at (303) 236-4046.

Region 6 Guidance for Minimizing Effects from Power Line Projects Within the Whooping Crane Migration Corridor

- 1) Project proponents should avoid construction of overhead power lines within 5.0 miles of designated critical habitat and documented high use areas (these locations can be obtained from the local ES field office).
- 2) To the greatest extent possible, project proponents should bury all new power lines, especially those within 1.0 mile of potentially suitable habitat¹.
- 3) If it is not economically or technically feasible to bury lines, then we recommend the following conservation measures be implemented:
 - a) Within the 95-percent sighting corridor (see attached map)
 - i) Project proponents should mark² new lines within 1.0 mile of potentially suitable habitat and an equal amount of existing line within 1.0 mile of potentially suitable habitat (preferably within the 75-percent corridor, but at a minimum within the 95-percent corridor) according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) recommendations described in APLIC 1994 (or newer version as updated).
 - ii) Project proponents should mark replacement or upgraded lines within 1.0 mile of potentially suitable habitat according to the USFWS recommendations described in APLIC 1994 (or newer version as updated).
 - b) Outside the 95-percent sighting corridor within a State's borders

Project proponents should mark new lines within 1.0 mile of potentially suitable habitat at the discretion of the local ES field office, based on the biological needs of the whooping crane.
 - c) Develop compliance monitoring plans

Field offices should request written confirmation from the project proponent that power lines have been or will be marked and maintained (i.e., did the lines recommended for marking actually get marked? Are the markers being maintained in working condition?)


¹ Potentially suitable migratory stop over habitat for whooping cranes includes wetlands with areas of shallow water without visual obstructions (i.e., high or dense vegetation) (Austin & Richert 2001; Johns et al. 1997; Lingle et al. 1991; Howe 1987) and submerged sandbars in wide, unobstructed river channels that are isolated from human disturbance (Armbruster 1990). Roosting wetlands are often located within 1 mile of grain fields. As this is a broad definition, ES field office biologists should assist action agencies/applicants/companies in determining what constitutes potentially suitable habitat at the local level.

² Power lines are cited as the single greatest threat of mortality to fledged whooping cranes. Studies have shown that marking power lines reduces the risk of a line strike by 50 to 80 percent (Yee 2008; Brown & Drewien 1995; Morkill & Anderson 1991). Marking new lines and an equal length of existing line in the migration corridor maintains the baseline condition from this threat.




U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

United States Central Flyway Whooping Crane Migration Corridor *



Produced for Ecological Services
 Grand Island, NE
 Current to: 2008
 Basemap (Date): U.S. Counties
 Meridian:
 File:



Literature Cited

- Armbruster, M.J. 1990. Characterization of habitat used by whooping cranes during migration. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Biological Report 90(4). 16 pp.
- Austin, E.A., and A.L. Richert. 2001. A comprehensive review of observational and site evaluation data of migrant whooping cranes in the United States, 1943-99. U.S. Geological Survey. Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center, Jamestown, North Dakota, and State Museum, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska. 157 pp.
- Avian Power Line Interaction Committee. 1994. Mitigating bird collisions with power lines: the state of the art in 1994. Edison Electric Institute. Washington, D.C. 99 pp.
- Brown, W.M., and R.C. Drewien. 1995. Evaluation of two powerline markers to reduce crane and waterfowl collision mortality. Wildlife Society Bulletin 23(2):217-227.
- Howe, M.A. 1987. Habitat use by migrating whooping cranes in the Aransas-Wood Buffalo corridor. Pp 303-311, in J.C. Lewis and J.W. Ziewitz, eds. Proc. 1985 Crane Workshop. Platte River Whooping Crane Habitat Maintenance Trust and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Grand Island, Nebraska.
- Johns, B.W., E.J. Woodsworth, and E.A. Driver. 1997. Habitat use by migrant whooping cranes in Saskatchewan. Proc. N. Am. Crane Workshop 7:123-131.
- Lingle, G.R., G.A. Wingfield, and J.W. Ziewitz. 1991. The migration ecology of whooping cranes in Nebraska, U.S.A. Pp 395-401 in J. Harris, ed. Proc. 1987 International Crane Workshop, International Crane Foundation, Baraboo, Wisconsin.
- Morkill, A.E., and S.H. Anderson. 1991. Effectiveness of marking powerlines to reduce sandhill crane collisions. Wildlife Society Bulletin 19:442-449.
- Yee, M.L. 2008. Testing the effectiveness of an avian flight diverter for reducing avian collisions with distribution power lines in the Sacramento Valley, California. California Energy Commission; Publication CEC-500-2007-122.