Journal of International Wildlife Law & Policy, 13:274–292, 2010

ISSN: 1388-0292 print / 1548-1476 online
DOI: 10.1080/13880292.2010.524564

Impacts of Anthropogenic Noise on Wildlife: Research Priorities for the Development of Standards and Mitigation

JESSICA L. BLICKLEY[1]
GAIL L. PATRICELLI[2]

1. INTRODUCTION

Human development introduces anthropogenic noise sources into the environment across many elements of the modern terrestrial landscape, including roads, airports, military bases, and cities. The impacts of these introduced noise sources on wildlife are less well studied than many of the other effects human activities have on wildlife, the most well known of which are habitat fragmentation and the introduction of invasive species. A growing and substantial body of literature suggests, however, that noise impacts may be more important and widespread than previously imagined.[3] They range in effects from mild to severe. They can impact wildlife species at both the individual and population levels. The types of impacts run the gamut from damage to the auditory system, the masking of sounds important to survival and reproduction, the imposition of chronic stress and associated physiological responses, startling, interference with mating, and population declines.

Anthropogenic noise is a global phenomenon, with the potential to affect wildlife across all continents and habitat types. Despite the widespread

[1] Department of Evolution and Ecology, University of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA. E-mail: jlblickley@ucdavis.edu
[2] Department of Evolution and Ecology and Center for Population Biology, University of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA. E-mail: glpatricelli@ucdavis.edu. For helpful discussion both authors thank Tom Rinkes, Sue Oberlie, Stan Harter, Tom Christiansen, Alan Krakauer, Geoffrey Wandesforde-Smith, Paul Haverkamp, Margaret Swisher, Ed West, Dave Buehler, Fraser Schilling, and the UC Davis Road Ecology Center. Research funding is acknowledged from UC Davis, the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, National Fish & Wildlife Foundation, Wyoming Sage-Grouse Conservation Fund (Wind River/Sweetwater River Basin, Upper Green River, and Northeast Sage-Grouse Local Working Groups), and the Wyoming Community Foundation Tom Thorne Sage Grouse Conservation Fund.
[3] For a review of noise impacts on birds and other wildlife, see P. A. KASELOO & K. O. TYSON, SYNTHESIS OF NOISE EFFECTS ON WILDLIFE POPULATIONS (U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 2004); ROBERT J. DOOLING & ARTHUR N. POPPER, THE EFFECTS OF HIGHWAY NOISE ON BIRDS (California Department of Transportation, Division of Environmental Analysis, 2007).

distribution of noise, the bulk of research on the effects of noise on terrestrial wildlife has been limited to European countries and the United States. This geographic bias in research may limit the application of the results from previous studies on a global basis, since the impacts may differ among habitats and species.[4]

Since much human development involves the introduction of noise, separating out and understanding the impacts of noise pollution is a critical step in developing effective wildlife policy, particularly the setting of standards and the use of mitigation measures. The first step typically is to determine the overall impact on the population demography of a species, by measuring population declines and birth rates. Mitigation requires that the mechanisms of this effect then be understood. From an initial determination, for example, that roads decrease songbird population densities, there must next be an estimation of the extent to which noise, dust, chemical pollution, habitat fragmentation, invasive weeds, visual disturbance, or road mortality are partial and contributory causes of that impact before effective mitigation measures aimed at noise can be chosen. Quieter pavements will not help songbirds if the true cause of the problem is visual disturbance. The key challenge, then, is to measure the contribution of noise to observed impacts on animal populations while controlling for other variables.

In this article, we address three questions: what are the common sources of anthropogenic noise; what is known about the mechanisms by which noise impacts wildlife; and how can we use observational and experimental approaches to estimate the impacts of noise on whatever species are of concern?

In answering these questions we deal at length with both observational and experimental methods, the latter including both laboratory and field work. We describe observational field studies on animal abundance and reproduction in impacted areas and a method for estimating the potential of noise sources to mask animal vocalizations. We address both the feasibility and value of laboratory and field experiments and describe a case study based on an ongoing noise-playback experiment we have designed to quantify the impacts of noise from energy development on greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus)* in Wyoming.

[4] The geographic bias in research has lead to a focus on species that live in temperate zones, with little to no study of tropical species. Also of concern, many of the landscapes that have been the focus of research on noise and wildlife in these industrialized nations have already been profoundly influenced by human development such that the species or individuals living in these areas may be more tolerant of disturbance. Application of the results of studies from developed to less developed landscapes would potentially lead to an underestimation of the effects of noise. Anthropogenic changes to the environment are occurring at an unprecedented rate in developing nations in tropical latitudes, however, we do not yet know whether the results from existing research are applicable in these regions.

Our focus, then, is on noise impacts on animals in the terrestrial environment,[5,6] especially birds, which are the subjects of most terrestrial studies.[7] We also outline directions for future research and in a final section emphasize the importance of this research for developing flexible wildlife management strategies in landscapes that are increasingly subject to human encroachment.

2. SOURCES OF NOISE

Noise is associated with most phases in the cycle of human development activity, from early construction to the daily operation of a completed project. Transportation systems are one of the most pervasive sources of noise across all landscapes, including common sources like roads and their associated vehicular traffic, airports and airplanes, off-road vehicles, trains, and ships. Roads deserve special attention, because they are a widespread and rapidly increasing terrestrial noise source. Although the surface area covered by roads is relatively small, the ecological effects of roads, including noise, extend far beyond the road itself, impacting up to one-fifth of the land area of the United States, for example.[8] Industrial noise sources, such as military bases, factories, mining operations, and wind farms may be more localized in the landscape, but are problematic for wildlife because the noise produced can be very loud.

The characteristics of noise vary substantially among sources. Each source type exhibits variance in amplitude (i.e., loudness), frequency profile

[5] Many terrestrial noise sources produce noise that travels through the ground as well as the air. Seismic noise is likely to impact fossorial animals and animals that possess specialized receptors for seismic detection, many of which communicate by seismic signals. We do not address seismic noise in this paper, but it is an issue that warrants further discussion.

[6] For recent treatments of noise in the marine environment, its impacts on marine species, and legal and policy responses, see *Noise Pollution and the Oceans: Legal and Policy Responses Part 1*, 10 J. INT'L WILDLIFE L. & POL'Y (2007) 101–199 and *Noise Pollution and the Oceans: Legal and Policy Responses Part 2*, 10 J. INT'L WILDLIFE L. & POL'Y (2007) 219–288. See also, Committee on Characterizing Biologically Significant Marine Mammal Behavior, Marine Mammal Populations and Ocean Noise, DETERMINING WHEN NOISE CAUSES BIOLOGICALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS 142 (Ocean Studies Board, Division on Earth and Life Studies, National Research Council, The National Academies, 2005).

[7] Birds have often been used in noise research because birds are generally easy to study due to their high detectability, most species use vocal communication (making them likely to be impacted by noise) and they are generally of high conservation importance.

[8] R.T.T. Forman & R.D. Deblinger, *The Ecological Road-Effect Zone of a Massachusetts (U.S.A.) Suburban Highway*, 14 CONS. BIOL. 36–46 (2000); R.T.T. Forman, *Estimate of the Area Affected Ecologically by the Road System in the United States*, 14 CONS. BIOL. 31–35 (2000); R.T.T. Forman, B. Reineking, and A.M. Hersberger, *Road Traffic and Nearby Grassland Bird Patterns in a Suburbanizing Landscape*, 29 ENVT'L. MGMT. 782–800 (2002). Due to its ubiquity, road noise is the most commonly studied type of terrestrial noise. Road noise is, in general, similar to other types of anthropogenic noise and affects a wide range of species and habitat types, so the research techniques and results can be applied to many other types of anthropogenic noise.

(i.e., pitch), and spatial and temporal patterns. The interaction of these characteristics is what determines in a narrow sense the impact of noise on wildlife, setting aside the possibly confounding influence of contextual variables.

Intuitively, loud noise is more disruptive than quiet noise[9] and noise with frequencies similar to animal vocalizations is more likely to interfere with (i.e., mask) communication than noise with different frequencies.[10] Most anthropogenic noise sources have energy concentrated in low frequencies (<250 Hz), which can travel long distances with relatively little energy loss. Such noise is also more difficult to control using traditional noise-abatement structures, such as noise reflecting or absorbing walls along highways or surrounding other fixed noise sources, such as industrial sites.[11] Spatial patterning of noise may also affect the level of disturbance. A highly localized point source, like a drilling rig, will generally impact a smaller area than a linear source, such as a highway, although the area of impact will also depend on the amplitude and frequency structure of the noise. The temporal patterning of noise can also be important, because animal behaviors are often temporally patterned. Rush hour traffic, for example, often coincides with the dawn chorus of bird song,[12] an important time for birds because this is when mates are attracted and territories defended.[13]

Environmental noise is not an entirely new problem for animals, nor is human activity the exclusive cause of it. Natural environments have numerous sources of ambient noise, such as wind, moving water, and sounds produced by other animals. There is also evidence that animals living in naturally noisy areas have made adaptations through the use of signals and signaling behaviors to overcome the masking impacts of noise.[14] However, if anthropogenic noise

---

[9] M.E. Weisenberger et al., *Effects of Simulated Jet Aircraft Noise on Heart Rate and Behavior of Desert Ungulates*, 60 J. WILDLIFE MGMT. 52–61 (1996).

[10] Bernard Lohr et al., *Detection and Discrimination of Natural Calls in Masking Noise by Birds: Estimating the Active Space of a Signal*, 66 ANIMAL BEHAV. 703–710 (2003).

[11] S.P. SINGAL, NOISE POLLUTION AND CONTROL STRATEGY (2005).

[12] R.A. Fuller et al., *Daytime Noise Predicts Nocturnal Singing in Urban Robins*, 3 BIOL. LETTERS 368–370 (2007).

[13] C.K. CATCHPOLE & PETER J.B. SLATER, BIRD SONG: THEMES AND VARIATIONS (1995).

[14] For example, the structural and temporal properties of many acoustic signals are adapted—by evolution or through individual plasticity—to maximize the propagation distance and/or minimize interference from natural noise sources. R. Haven Wiley & Douglas G. Richards, *Adaptations for Acoustic Communication in Birds: Sound Transmission and Signal Detection*, *in* 1 ACOUSTIC COMMUNICATION IN BIRDS 131–181 (D. Kroodsma & E.H. Miller eds., 1982); H. Brumm, *Signalling through Acoustic Windows: Nightingales Avoid interspecific Competition by Short-Term Adjustment of Song Timing*, 192 J. COMP. PHYSIOL. A 1279–1285 (2006); Henrik Brumm & Hans Slabbekoorn, *Acoustic Communication in Noise*, 35 ADVANCES STUDY BEHAV. 151–209 (2005); Hans Slabbekoorn & Thomas B. Smith, *Habitat-Dependent Song Divergence in the Little Greenbul: An Analysis of Environmental Selection Pressures on Acoustic Signals*, 56 EVOLUTION 1849–1858 (2002); G.M. Klump, *Bird Communication in the Noisy World*, *in* ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTION OF ACOUSTIC COMMUNICATION IN BIRDS 321–338 (D. Kroodsma & E.H. Miller eds., 1996); Eugene S. Morton, *Ecological Sources of Selection on Avian Sounds*, 109 AM. NATURALIST 17–34 (1975).

differs enough from natural noise in frequency, amplitude, or daily/seasonal patterns, animal adaptations to natural noise can be overwhelmed. Furthermore, the extensive introduction of anthropogenic noise into the environment on a large scale is a relatively recent phenomenon, so that animals have had only a limited opportunity to adapt to widespread and sometimes drastic changes in their acoustic environments.[15]

3. THE POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF NOISE ON WILDLIFE

Animals exhibit a variety of responses to noise pollution (also called introduced noise), depending on the characteristics of the noise and the animal's ability to tolerate or adapt to it. Noise impacts on wildlife can be observed at the individual and population levels, which we now consider in turn.

3.1 Individual-Level Impacts

Some of the most dramatic impacts of noise on individuals are acute and need to be distinguished from chronic effects. Acute impacts include physiological damage, masking of communication, disruption of behavior, and startling. The most direct physiological impact affects an animal's ability to hear, either by permanently damaging the auditory system, in which case it produces what is called a permanent threshold shift (PTS) in hearing, or by causing temporary decreases in hearing sensitivity, which are called temporary threshold shifts (TTS).[16] The noise levels required for PTS and TTS are quite loud,[17] making hearing damage unlikely in most terrestrial situations. Even extremely loud sound sources will only cause PTS and TTS over a small area, because on land sound attenuates very quickly with distance.[18] This is why most studies

[15] G. Patricelli & J. Blickley, *Avian Communication in Urban Noise: Causes and Consequences of Vocal Adjustment*, 123 THE AUK 639–649 (2006); Paige S. Warren et al., *Urban Bioacoustics: It's Not Just Noise*, 71 ANIMAL BEHAV. 491–502 (2006); Lawrence A. Rabin et al., *Anthropogenic Noise and Its Effects on Animal Communication: An Interface Between Comparative Psychology and Conservation Biology*, 16 INT'L J. COMP. PSYCHOL. 172–192 (2003); Lawrence A. Rabin & Correigh M. Greene, *Changes to Acoustic Communication Systems in Human-Altered Environments*, 116 J. COMP. PSYCHOL. 137–141 (2002); H. Slabbekorn & E.A.P. Ripmeester, *Birdsong and Anthropogenic Noise: Implications and Applications for Conservation*, 17 MOLECULAR ECOLOGY 72–83 (2008).

[16] P. Marler et al., *Effects of Continuous Noise on Avian Hearing and Vocal Development*, 70 PROC. NAT'L ACAD. SCI. 1393–1396 (1973); J. Saunders & R. Dooling, *Noise-Induced Threshold Shift in the Parakeet (*Melopsittacus undulatus), 71 PROC. NAT'L ACAD. SCI. 1962–1965 (1974); Brenda M. Ryals et al., *Avian Species Differences in Susceptibility to Noise Exposure*, 131 HEARING RES. 71–88 (1999).

[17] PTS in birds may result from sound levels of ∼125 dBA SPL for multiple impulsive sounds and ∼140 dBA SPL for a single impulsive sound. TTS can result from continuous noise levels of ∼93 dBA SPL. The term "dBA SPL" refers to the A-weighted decibel, the most common unit for noise measurements. It adjusts for human perception of sound and is scaled relative to the threshold for human hearing.

[18] Sound levels drop by approximately 6 dB (measured using dBA SPL, or any other decibel measure), which represents a halving of loudness, with every doubling in distance from a point source, and 3 dB with every doubling of distance from a linear source, such as a highway.

of impacts from highway and urban noise do not directly address PTS and TTS, although they may need to be considered in extremely noisy areas.

Other acute impacts of noise, such as masking and behavioral disruption, occur over a much larger area. Masking occurs when the perception of a sound is affected by the presence of background noise, with high levels of background noise decreasing the perception of a sound.[19] One possible consequence of masking is a decrease in the efficacy of acoustic communication. Many animals use acoustic signals to attract and retain mates, settle territorial disputes, promote social bonding, and alert other individuals to predators. Disruption of communication can, therefore, have dramatic impacts on survival and reproduction.[20] In one laboratory study, high environmental noise reduced the strength of the pair bond in monogamous zebra finches, *Taeniopygia guttata,* likely because females either had increased difficulty identifying mates or pair-bond maintenance calls were masked.[21] The broader consequence of this finding is that females in noisy areas may be more likely to copulate with extra-pair partners, and this in turn can change the social and genetic dynamics of a population.

In other research, birds have been found to change their songs and calls in response to noise in urban areas, which may reduce masking of communication.[22] However, the consequences of this vocal adjustment on reproduction in a species remain unclear. One outcome may be that populations using urban dialects have a better chance to thrive in urban areas. But by the same token they may experience a decrease in mate recognition and/or gene flow with populations in non-urban areas.[23]

Beyond interfering with communication, introduced background noise can also mask the sounds of approaching predators or prey, and increase the perception of risk from predation. Studies have yet to compare predation rates or hunting success in noisy and quiet areas while controlling for other confounding factors. The degree to which noise affects predator/prey relations

[19] Lohr et al.*,* *supra* note 5.

[20] M.A. Bee & E.M. Swanson, *Auditory Masking of Anuran Advertisement Calls by Road Traffic Noise*, 74 ANIMAL BEHAV. 1765–1776 (2007); Henrik Brumm, *The Impact of Environmental Noise on Song Amplitude in a Territorial Bird*, 73 J. ANIMAL ECOLOGY 434–440 (2004); L. Habib et al., *Chronic Industrial Noise Affects Pairing Success and Age Structure of Ovenbirds* Seiurus aurocapilla, 44 J. APPLIED ECOLOGY 176–184 (2007); Frank E. Rheindt, *The Impact of Roads on Birds: Does Song Frequency Play a Role in Determining Susceptibility to Noise Pollution?*, 144 J. ORNITHOLOGIE 295–306 (2003).

[21] J.P. Swaddle & L.C. Page, *Increased Amplitude of Environmental White Noise Erodes Pair Preferences in Zebra Finches: Implications for Noise Pollution*, 74 ANIMAL BEHAV. 363–368 (2007).

[22] Slabbekorn & Ripmeester, *supra* note 10; Brumm, *supra* note 15; Hans Slabbekoorn & Margriet Peet, *Birds Sing at a Higher Pitch in Urban Noise*, 424 NATURE 267 (2003); William E. Wood & Stephen M. Yezerinac, *Song Sparrow (*Melozpiza melodia*) Song Varies with Urban Noise*, 123 THE AUK 650–659 (2006).

[23] Patricelli & Blickley, *supra* note 10; Warren et al. *supra* note 10; Slabbekoorn & Peet, *supra* note 17.

in any species, therefore, remains largely unexplored.[24] One study found that birds nesting near noisy natural gas pads had higher nesting success, likely due to reduced presence of the most common nest predator, the western scrub jay.[25] As suggested by these authors, the higher nesting success of birds in noisy areas provides a mechanism by which noise-tolerant species could become more common in a noisy world. Noise also causes short-term disruptions in behavior, such as startling or frightening animals away from food or other resources.[26]

In addition to the acute effects of noise, animals may suffer chronic effects, including elevated stress levels and associated physiological responses. Over the short term, chronic stress can result in elevated heart rate.[27] Longer-term stress can be associated with the ability to resist disease, survive, and successfully reproduce.[28] Good measures of chronic stress come from elevated stress hormones, like corticosterone, in blood or fecal samples.[29] In noise-stressed laboratory rats, elevated corticosterone was linked with reduced food consumption and decreased weight gain,[30] raising the possibility that for some individuals there may be longer-term welfare and survival consequences from the elevated stress associated with noise introduction.

3.2 Population Level Impacts

The cumulative impacts of noise on individuals can manifest at the population level in various ways that can potentially range from population declines up to

[24] Quinn found that chaffinchs (*Fringilla coelebs*) perceived an increased risk of predation while feeding in noisy conditions, likely due to a reduced ability to detect auditory cues from potential predators. L. Quinn et al., *Noise, Predation Risk Compensation and Vigilance in the Chaffinch* Fringilla coelebs, 37 J. AVIAN BIOL. 601–608 (2006). Research on greater sage-grouse also highlights the potential for noise to contribute to predation. One of the methods for capturing sage-grouse is to mask the sound of researcher footfalls using a noise source such as a stereo or a chain saw. With such masking, the grouse can be easily approached and netted in their night roosts for banding or blood sampling. Presumably, predators would be equally fortunate in noisy areas, though the ability of predators to use acoustic cues for hunting could be diminished by masking as well.

[25] Clinton D. Francis et al., *Noise Pollution Changes Avian Communities and Species Interactions*, 19 CURRENT BIOL. 1–5 (2009).

[26] Dooling & Popper, *supra* note 1; N. Kempf & O. Huppop, *The Effects of Aircraft Noise on Wildlife: A Review and Comment*, 137 J. ORNITHOLOGIE 101–113 (1996); D.K. Delaney et al., *Effects of Helicopter Noise on Mexican Spotted Owls*, 63 J. WILDLIFE MGMT. 60–76 (1999); L.A. Rabin, R.G. Coss, & D.H. Owings, *The Effects of Wind Turbines on Antipredator Behavior in California Ground Squirrels* (Spermophilus beecheyi), 131 BIOL. CONS. 410–420 (2006).

[27] Weisenberger et al., *supra* note 4.

[28] J.C. Wingfield & R.M. Sapolsky, *Reproduction and Resistance to Stress: When and how*, 15 J. NEUROENDOCRINOL, 711 (2003); A. Opplinger et al., *Environmental Stress Increases the Prevalence and Intensity of Blood Parasite Infection in the Common Lizard* Lacerta vivipara, 1 ECOLOGY LETTERS 129–138 (1998).

[29] Wingfield & Sapolsky, *supra* note 23; S.K. Wasser et al., *Noninvasive Physiological Measures of Disturbance in the Northern Spotted Owl*, 11 CONS. BIOL. 1019–1022 (1997); D.M. Powell et al., *Effects of Construction Noise on Behavior and Cortisol Levels in a Pair of Captive Giant Pandas (*Ailuropoda melanoleuca*)*, 25 ZOO BIOL. 391–408 (2006).

[30] P. Alario et al., *Body Weight Gain, Food Intake, and Adrenal Development in Chronic Noise Stressed Rats*, 40 PHYSIOL. BEHAV. 29–32 (1987).

regional extinction. If species already threatened or endangered due to habitat loss avoid noisy areas and abandon otherwise suitable habitat because of a particular sensitivity to noise, their status becomes even more critical. As discussed below, numerous studies have documented reduced habitat use and lower breeding success in noisy areas by a variety of animals.[31]

4. MEASURING THE IMPACTS OF NOISE ON SPECIES OF CONCERN

Species vary widely in their ability to tolerate introduced noise and can exhibit very different responses to altered acoustic environments. This variability in response to noise makes generalizations about noise impacts among species and among noise sources difficult. Generalizations relevant to a single species can also be hard to make, because the ability to tolerate noise may vary with reproductive status, prior exposure to noise, and the presence of other stressors in the environment. This is why more measurements of noise impacts and associated variables are needed for a wider range of species.

Measuring the effects of noise at the individual and population levels is, however, extremely challenging. As we noted earlier, noise is typically accompanied by other changes in the environment that may also have physiological, behavioral, and population level effects. For example, habitat fragmentation is a side effect of road development, and fragmentation alone has been shown to cause population declines and changes in communication and other behaviors.[32] So, can we measure the impacts of noise on wildlife in ways that will support biologically relevant noise standards?

[31] Affected animals include birds, mammals, reptiles, and amphibians. Forman et al., *supra* note 6; Rheindt, *supra* note 15; Rien Reijnen et al., *The Effects of Car Traffic on Breeding Bird Populations in Woodland. III. Reduction of Density in Relation to the Proximity of Main Roads*, 32 J. APPLIED ECOLOGY 187–202 (1995); Rien Reijnen et al., *The Effects of Traffic on the Density of Breeding Birds in Dutch Agricultural Grasslands*, 75 BIOL. CONS. 255–260 (1996); S.J. Peris & M. Pescador, *Effects of Traffic Noise on Passerine Populations in Mediterranean Wooded Pastures*, 65 APPLIED ACOUSTICS 357–366 (2004); R.T.T. Forman & L.E. Alexander, *Roads and Their Major Ecological Effects*, 29 ANN. REV. ECOLOGY SYSTEMATICS 207–231 (1998); E. Stone, *Separating the Noise from the Noise: A Finding in Support of the "Niche Hypothesis," That Birds Are Influenced by Human-Induced Noise in Natural Habitats*, 13 ANTHROZOOS 225–231 (2000); Ian Spellerberg, *Ecological Effects of Roads and Traffic: A Literature Review*, 7 GLOBAL ECOLOGY BIOGEOG. LETTERS 317–333 (1998); David Lesbarrères et al., *Inbreeding and Road Effect Zone in a Ranidae: The Case of Agile Frog,* Rana dalmatina *Bonaparte 1840*, 326 COMPTES RENDUS BIOLOGIES 68–72 (2003).

[32] See, *e.g.*, Jeffrey A. Stratford & W. Douglas Robinson, *Gulliver Travels to the Fragmented Tropics: Geographic Variation in Mechanisms of Avian Extinction*, 3 FRONTIERS ECOLOGY & ENV'T 91–98 (2005); P. Laiolo & J. L. Tella, *Erosion of Animal Cultures in Fragmented Landscapes*, 5 FRONTIERS ECOLOGY & ENV'T 68–72 (2007).

4.1 The Observational Approach

4.1.1 Relating wildlife abundance to noise levels

Much of the evidence for noise impacts on animals comes from field observations of animal density, species diversity, and/or reproductive success in relation to noise sources. Most studies focus on the presence or absence of wildlife near roads, finding lower population densities of many birds,[33] lower overall diversity for birds, reptiles, and amphibians,[34] and road avoidance in large mammals.[35] Most of this work does not separate the impacts of noise from other road effects or measure spatial and temporal variations in noise levels along transects where animals were studied.

One influential series of studies in the Netherlands did find, however, a negative relationship between noise exposure along roadways and both bird diversity and breeding densities.[36] Noise exposure better explained decreased density and diversity than either visual or chemical disturbance. These Dutch studies have been criticized for research design and statistical analysis problems,[37] underscoring the fact that researchers in different countries have different assumptions about how to measure noise and evaluate its impacts.[38] On their own, the Dutch studies are an inadequate basis for establishing internationally standardized noise regulations, but they are among the few analyses that set measurements of noise levels beside data on species presence/absence and diversity.

---

[33] Forman & Deblinger, *supra* note 3; Rheindt, *supra* note 15; Peris & Pescador, *supra* note 26; M. Kuitunen et al., *Do Highways Influence Density of Land Birds?* 22 ENVTL. MGMT. 297–302 (1998); A.N. van der Zande et al., *The Impact of Roads on the Densities of Four Bird Species in an Open Field Habitat—Evidence of a Long-Distance Effect*, 18 BIOL. CONS. 299–321 (1980).

[34] C.S. Findlay & J. Houlahan, *Anthropogenic Correlates of Species Richness in Southeastern Ontario Wetlands*, 11 CONS. BIOL. 1000–1009 (1997).

[35] Studies in large mammals typically find road avoidance, but many small mammals are found in higher densities near roads, due to increased dispersal and reduced numbers of predators. Forman & Deblinger, *supra* note 3; F. J. Singer, *Behavior of Mountain Goats in Relation to US Highway 2, Glacier National Park, Montana*, 42 J. WILDLIFE MGMT. 591–597 (1978); G.R. Rost & J.A. Bailey, *Distribution of Mule Deer and Elk in Relation to Roads*, 43 J. WILDLIFE MGMT. 634–641 (1979); L.W. Adams & A.D. Geis, *Effects of Roads on Small Mammals*, 20 J. APPLIED ECOLOGY 403–415 (1983).

[36] Reijnen et al*., supra* note 29; R. Foppen & R. Reijnen, *The Effects of Car Traffic on Breeding Bird Populations in Woodland. II. Breeding Dispersal of Male Willow Warblers (*Phylloscopus trochilus*) in Relation to the Proximity of a Highway*, 31 J. APPLIED ECOLOGY 95–101 (1994).

[37] N. Sarigul-Klign, D.C. Karnoop, & F.A. Bradley, *Environmental Effect of Transportation Noise. A Case Study: Criteria for the Protection of Endangered Passerine Birds, Final Report* (Transportation Noise Control Center (TNCC), Department of Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering, University of California, Davis, 1977); G. Bieringer & A. Garniel, Straßenalärm und Vögel—eine kurze Übersicht über die Literatur mit einer Kritik einflussreicher Arbeiten. Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Innovation und Technologie. Schriftenreihe Straßenforschung. Unpublished manuscript, Vienna, 2010 (copy on file with the authors).

[38] Noise is commonly measured in dBA SPL, a unit that is measured differently in different countries, making extrapolation difficult. Bieringer & Garniel, *supra* note 32.

The value of observational studies of presence/absence and diversity also needs to be assessed in context. One would not want to use information about reduced occupancy of a noisy area, for example, as the only indication that noise was having population-level impacts. It is conceivable that, if noise results in increased mortality or decreased reproduction, noisy areas could become population sinks,[39] and a detriment to conservation efforts across the range of the species. But this conclusion would be premature unless the presence/absence data are assessed in the context of other measures of impact, such as breeding success, stress response, startling and other behavioral changes.

So, while observational studies can be and have been helpful in identifying noise as a conservation problem, their policy relevance and value is constrained if they are unable to separate the effects of noise from the many other confounding disturbances that can affect animal densities near roads and other human development. When Fahrig et al.[40] documented reduced densities of frogs and toads near high traffic roads compared to low traffic roads, noise was a potential causal factor. After controlling for other variables, however, their evidence suggested that differences in density more likely reflected varying levels of traffic-associated road mortality.

One way to reduce, though not eliminate, the problem of confounding variables is to compare behaviors and other response variables in the presence and absence of noise. Animals can be observed, for example, before and after noise sources are introduced, or when noise is intermittent. This approach has been used to demonstrate the impact (or lack of impact) of noise from aircraft, machinery, and vehicles on animal behavior and reproductive success.[41] Spatial variation in noise may also allow researchers to control for some confounding factors. One study examined ovenbirds (*Seiurus aurocapilla)* along the edges of clearings containing either compressor stations or gas-producing wells.[42] Both clearings had a similar level of surface disturbance and human activity, but compressors produced high-amplitude noise whereas the wells were relatively quiet. Near compressors, the analysis found reduced pairing success and evidence that the habitat was non-preferred.[43]

[39] Sinks are areas where successful reproduction is insufficient to maintain the population without immigration. H.R. Pulliam, *Sources, Sinks, and Population Regulation*, 132 AM. NATURALIST 652–661 (1988).

[40] L. Fahrig et al., *Effect of Road Traffic on Amphibian Density*, 73 BIOL. CONS. 177–182 (1995).

[41] Delaney et al*., supra* note 24; D. Hunsaker, J. Rice, & J. Kern, *The Effects of Helicopter Noise on the Reproductive Success of the Coastal California Gnatcatcher*, 122 J. ACOUSTICAL SOC. AM. 3058 (2007); Jennifer W. C. Sun & Peter M. Narins, *Anthropogenic Sounds Differentially Affect Amphibian Call Rate*, 121 BIOL. CONS. 419–427 (2005).

[42] L. Habib, E.M. Bayne, & S. Boutin, *Chronic Industrial Noise Affects Pairing Success and Age Structure of Ovenbirds* Seiurus aurocapilla, 44 J. APPLIED ECOLOGY 176–184 (2007).

[43] Habib et al. found an increased proportion of juveniles in noisy areas, suggesting that the area is undesirable for breeding adults. *Id.*

An additional observational approach is to include noise as a factor in habitat-selection models. These spatially explicit models, typically produced in GIS (Geographic Information Systems), relate species distribution data to information about landscape characteristics in order to determine the impact of disturbance or habitat quality on habitat usage by wildlife.[44] Multiple habitat layers can be added to the model to determine what factors best predict habitat usage. While few studies have incorporated noise into these types of models, GIS layers of noise can readily be created using commercially available and freeware programs. These types of models may be the best option for measuring noise impacts on a large scale and can also be useful in predicting future areas of conflict with human activities.

Ideally, future observational studies encompassing a variety of noise sources, habitats, and species will measure noise exposure levels and then relate observed impacts to noise exposure while controlling for confounding variables. When effects cannot properly be controlled for in a single study design, a second-best choice is to use replicated studies and let statistical modeling separate out the impacts of noise. To date, only a handful of studies follow this approach.[45]

4.1.2 Estimating the masking potential of noise

There is a relatively simple technique for addressing possible noise impacts on signal detection. It involves estimating the potential of a noise source to mask communication signals and other important sounds, such as the sounds of predators or prey. Masking occurs when background noise is loud relative to the signal, such that it cannot be detected by the receiver.

The estimation of masking requires knowledge of the physiology and behavior of the organism and the nature of the noise. Masking is frequency-specific, so an acoustic signal will only be masked by the portion of the background noise that is in a similar frequency band as the signal.[46] An

[44] J.B. Dunning et al., *Spatially Explicit Population Models: Current Forms and Future Uses*, 5 ECOLOGICAL APPLICATIONS 3–11 (1995).

[45] Forman, Reineking, & Hersberger, *supra* note 6; Reijnen et al. (1995), *supra* note 29; Reijnen et al. (1996), *supra* note 29; Foppen & Reijnen, *supra* note 34; R. Reijnen & R. Foppen, *The Effects of Car Traffic on Breeding Bird Populations in Woodland. I. Evidence of Reduced Habitat Quality for Willow Warblers (*Phylloscopus trochilus*) Breeding Close to a Highway*, 31 J. APPLIED ECOLOGY 95–101 (1994).

[46] Lohr et al*., supra* note 8; E.A. Brenowitz, *The Active Space of Red-Winged Blackbird Song*, 147 J. COMP. PHYSIOLOGY 511–522 (1982); R.J. Dooling & B. Lohr, *The Role of Hearing in Avian Avoidance of Wind Turbines, in* PROC. NAT'L AVIAN-WIND PLANNING MEETING IV 115–134 (S.S. Schwartz ed., for the Avian Subcommittee, National Wind Coordinating Committee, 2001).

estimation of masking requires,[47] first, the audiogram of the focal species;[48] second, the absolute amplitude and frequency spectrum of the noise;[49] third, the absolute amplitude and frequency spectrum of the vocalization or sound of interest; and fourth, the critical ratio for the focal species.[50]

With this information, masking is estimated by determining how introduced noise changes the "active space" of the signal, which is the area around the sender where the signal can be detected by receivers.[51] Intuitively, there is less masking when signals have a different frequency profile than noise, when noise is quiet, when signals are loud and/or when animals are close together when communicating. Conversely, masking is most problematic when signal and noise have similar frequency profiles, when noise is loud, when calls are quiet, and/or when calls are used over large distances.[52]

There are, however, limitations to masking estimations. The method described addresses only the potential impacts of masking animal vocalizations or other sounds and cannot estimate other impacts of noise, such as startling or chronic stress. Further, in the absence of specific information about the auditory physiology and behaviors of the focal species, estimates of masking using this method may be either too conservative or too liberal. Estimates can be too conservative, for example, in situations in which the mere detection of a vocalization is an insufficient basis for extracting necessary information from the sound.[53] Estimates can be too liberal if as part of their communication

[47] For detailed methods on calculating masking potential, *see* R.J. Dooling & J.C. Saunders, *Hearing in the Parakeet (*Melopsittacus undulatus*): Absolute Thresholds, Critical Ratios, Frequency Difference Limens, and Vocalizations*, 88 J. COMP. PHYSIOL. 1–20 (1975).

[48] A measure of how hearing sensitivity varies with the frequency of the sound. In general, birds do not hear as well as mammals in very low or high frequencies, or use them to communicate. Dooling & Popper, *supra* note 1.

[49] A measure of how much energy is present in each frequency band of the sound.

[50] This is the difference in amplitude between signal and noise necessary for detection of the signal. For a generalized bird, the critical threshold ranges from approximately 26 to 28 dB between 2 and 3 kHz, meaning that a typical bird cannot hear a 2–3 kHz vocalization unless the vocalization exceeds the background noise in that frequency range by 26–28 dB. In general, birds have higher critical ratios than mammals, making them worse at discriminating signals in noise. If measurements for these parameters are not available for the focal species, then information from closely related species may be used as a substitute. However, this may be misleading if the species of interest has particularly strong or poor hearing capabilities relative to the substitute species. Dooling & Popper, *supra* note 1; Lohr et al., *supra* note 8; Dooling & Saunders, *supra* note 45.

[51] Lohr et al*., supra* note 5; Brenowitz, *supra* note 39.

[52] Lohr et al*., supra* note 5; Bee & Swanson, *supra* note 15; G. Ehret & H.C. Gerhardt, *Auditory Masking and Effects of Noise on Responses of the Green Treefrog (*Hyla cinerea*) to Synthetic Mating Calls*, 141 J. COMP. PHYSIOL. A 13–18 (1980); T. Aubin & P. Jouventin, *Cocktail-Party Effect in King Penguin Colonies* 265 PROC. R. SOC. B 1665–1673 (1998).

[53] This would happen when humans can detect human voices, but not discriminate the identity of the speaker or the words being said. *See* Lohr et al., *supra* note 5, for a discussion of the difference between detection and discrimination.

animals use spatial cues,[54] co-modulation of frequencies,[55] or adjust their vocalizations to reduce masking.[56]

Because so many factors affect the degree of masking, there is a critical need for additional field studies to validate estimation techniques. The available work relating the potential for masking to observed individual- and population-level impacts[57] is just not a sufficient basis for knowing whether masking potential is a reliable predictor of how noise will impact wildlife. If the predictive power of measuring masking potential can be shown, researchers will then have a low-cost tool for predicting impacts in species about which little is known. Otherwise, masking analysis is most informative when used in concert with field studies that assess actual noise impacts. If a disruption of communication or decreased rates of prey capture in noisy areas can be demonstrated, then an analysis of the masking potential of a new noise source could be used to determine the area over which individuals are likely to be affected by that new source.[58]

4.2 The Experimental Approach

Experimental manipulations of noise in the laboratory and the field are more powerful than observational studies in isolating the effects of noise and identifying the underlying causes of noise impacts because they deal more effectively with the problem of controlling for confounding variables. The following sections discuss their advantages and limitations.

4.2.1. Laboratory experiments

Laboratory studies introduce noise to captive animals and measure the impacts in a controlled environment. Studies using captive animals are the basis for much of what we know about the hearing range and sensitivity of a number of animal taxa[59] and about the ability of animals to detect and

[54] The ability to hear sounds is improved if they are separated spatially. M. Ebata, T. Sone, & T. Nimura, *Improvement of Hearing Ability by Directional Information*, 43 J. ACOUSTICAL SOC. AM. 289–297 (1968); J.J. Schwartz & H.C. Gerhardt, *Spatially Mediated Release From Auditory Masking in an Anuran Amphibian*, 166 J. COMP. PHYSIOL. A 37–41 (1989).

[55] Masking is reduced when the noise has amplitude modulation patterns that make it distinct from the signal. G.M. Klump & U. Langemann, *Co-Modulation Masking Release in a Songbird*, 87 HEARING RES. 157–164 (1995).

[56] Patricelli & Blickley, *supra* note 10; Rabin & Greene, *supra* note 10; Warren et al., *supra* note 10; Slabbekoorn & Peet, *supra* note 17.

[57] Rheindt, *supra* note 18.

[58] Lohr et al., *supra* note 8.

[59] Dooling & Saunders, *supra* note 45; K. Okanoya & Robert F. Dooling, *Hearing in the Swamp Sparrow,* Melospiza georgiana, *and the Song Sparrow,* Melospiza melodia, 36 ANIMAL BEHAV. 726–732 (1988); H.E. Heffner et al., *Audiogram of the Hooded Norway Rat*, 73 HEARING RES. 244–247 (1994); H.E. Heffner & R.S. Heffner, *Hearing Ranges of Laboratory Animals*, 46 J. AM. ASS'N LABORATORY ANIMAL SCI. 20–22 (2007).

discriminate sounds in the presence of background noise.[60] These psychoacoustic studies are critical for assessing masking potential, and provide a physiological and morphological basis for predicting which species are most likely to be impacted by introduced noise.[61] Laboratory studies also provide insight into the physiological and behavioral impacts of noise, and the potential consequences of masking for breeding individuals.[62] As noted earlier, they demonstrate impacts on pair-bonding[63] and the amplitude at which vocalizations are produced.[64] They do not address, however, the long-term consequences of these behavioral changes, which remain unclear and need further study both in the laboratory and in the field.

Traditionally, psychoacoustic studies use white noise or pure tones to measure hearing ability and noise effects.[65] Recent studies also address the effects of anthropogenic noise directly, increasing their relevance to conservation. Lohr and colleagues, for example, measured the masked thresholds of natural contact calls for budgerigars (*Melopsittacus undulates)* and zebra finches, in the lab using simulated traffic noise, allowing them to predict how traffic noise affects the distance at which vocalizations can be detected by receivers.[66]

The environmental control that gives laboratory studies their analytic power can also be a disadvantage, if there is reason to believe that the response of animals to noise in a laboratory setting will be different from that of animals in the wild, where natural variations in the environment and in animal populations can affect the impact of noise. When increased physiological stress from noise is experienced, for example, in combination with habitat loss, synergistic effects on animals will magnify the overall impact of development.

Laboratory studies also must be careful not to extrapolate findings from animals that thrive in captivity to endangered animals, particularly since the

---

60 Lohr et al*.*, *supra* note 8; Dooling & Saunders, *supra* note 45; Klump & Langemann, *supra* note 53; L. Wollerman, *Acoustic Interference Limits Call Detection in a Neotropical frog* Hyla ebraccata, 57 ANIMAL BEHAV. 529–536 (1999).

61 Dooling & Popper, *supra* note 1.

62 Marler et al*.*, *supra* note 14; Ryals et al*.*, *supra* note 14; J. Syka & N. Rybalko, *Threshold Shifts and Enhancement of Cortical Evoked Responses After Noise Exposure in Rats*, 139 HEARING RES. 59–68 (2000); D. Robertson & B.M. Johnstone, *Acoustic Trauma in the Guinea Pig Cochlea: Early Changes in Ultrastructure and Neural Threshold*, 3 HEARING RES. 167–179 (1980).

63 Swaddle & Page, *supra* note 19.

64 J. Cynx, et al., *Amplitude Regulation of Vocalizations in Noise by a Songbird,* Taeniopygia guttata, 56 ANIMAL BEHAV. 107–113 (1998); Marty L. Leonard & Andrew G. Horn, *Ambient Noise and the Design of Begging Signals*, 272 PROC. R. SOC. B 651–656 (2005). This finding has been corroborated with studies of birds in the field in Brumm, *supra* note 18.

65 Dooling & Saunders, *supra* note 45; Klump & Langemann, *supra* note 53; Wollerman, *supra* note 53; J.B. Allen & S.T. Neely, *Modeling the Relation between the Intensity Just-Noticeable Difference and Loudness for Pure Tones and Wideband Noise*, 102 J. ACOUSTICAL SOC. AM. 3628–3646 (1997).

66 Lohr et al*.*, *supra* note 8. For other studies that introduce anthropogenic noise, see Weisenberger et al*.*, *supra* note 7; Bee & Swanson, *supra* note 18.

animals chosen for laboratory study are often domesticated or otherwise show tolerance for human disturbance. Endangered animals, by contrast, are often driven to rarity due to their inability to tolerate environmental change, which may include sensitivity to noise.[67] The use of surrogate species would be unnecessary if the species of concern could be tested in the lab for noise response. But small population sizes and narrow tolerances often make it impossible to bring threatened or endangered species into the lab for such tests.

The use of anthropogenic noise in laboratory studies of noise effects, particularly noise that is likely to be affecting wild animals, increases the conservation applicability of such research and should be a future priority. Laboratory experiments must also be supplemented with field studies and other methods to fully understand the impacts of noise on wildlife.

4.2.2. Noise introduction experiments in the field

Field experiments are another method for isolating and quantifying the impacts of noise on animals under natural conditions. The controlled introduction of noise can be accomplished either by creating noise in the field or by playing back the associated noise through speakers. The first approach has been used to investigate the impacts on wildlife of aircraft, machinery, and vehicles.[68] As is the case with observational studies, interpretations of this type of research are complicated by the problem of controlling for confounding variables, such as the visual and other disturbances, in addition to noise, associated with many sorts of environmental change. Compared to observational studies, however, field experiments offer greater opportunities to examine interactions among multiple associated stressors. They are also generally a more efficient use of scarce research resources and provide the ability to control for (or examine) seasonal effects, time-of-day effects, and other factors influencing responses to noise.

The second experimental approach, playing back noise that has been recorded from a source of interest or synthesized to match that source,[69] has the advantage that noise effects can be easily separated from other aspects of disturbance. Because noise introduction on a large spatial and temporal scale is logistically challenging in natural habitats, studies to date have been short-term and relatively small in scale. A short-term experiment may be appropriate

[67] T. Caro, J. Eadie, & A. Sih, *Use of Substitute Species in Conservation Biology*, 19 CONS. BIOL. 1821–1826 (2005).

[68] Delaney, et al., *supra* note 24; P. R. Krausman, et al., *Effects of Jet Aircraft on Mountain Sheep*, 62 J. WILDLIFE MGMT. 1246–1254 (1998); A. Frid, *Dall's Sheep Responses to Overflights by Helicopter and Fixed-Wing Aircraft*, 110 BIOL. CONS. 387–399 (2003).

[69] Sun & Narins, *supra* note 39; A.L. Brown, *Measuring the Effect of Aircraft Noise on Sea Birds*, 16 ENV'T INT'L 587–592 (1990).

for studying dynamic behaviors, such as call rate, startling, or avoidance,[70] but cannot address the longer-term individual- or population-level consequences of noise.

To illustrate study design for a long-term and large-scale noise introduction experiment, we describe our ongoing experiment in Wyoming, addressing the noise impacts of energy development on greater sage-grouse.

4.2.2.1 Noise impacts on sage-grouse: A long-term field experiment

Populations of this species are declining throughout their range in the interior West of the United States,[71] enough to merit consideration for listing under the federal Endangered Species Act. Coal-bed methane (CBM) and deep natural gas extraction are increasing rapidly in sage-grouse habitats, and recent studies document dramatic declines in sage-grouse populations in areas of energy development.[72] However, incomplete knowledge of the causes of these declines is hampering the creation of effective management strategies.

Among the number of disturbances associated with energy development that impact sage-grouse, noise is particularly problematic in breeding areas downwind of development when it causes declines in male attendance, although attendance was not affected by visual disturbance from development.[73] In addition, the life history of sage-grouse makes them particularly vulnerable to disturbance from noise pollution. In the breeding season, males gather on communal breeding grounds (leks) to perform complex acoustic displays, used by females to locate leks and choose mates. The risk is that anthropogenic noise in sage-grouse habitat masks male vocalizations and interferes with reproduction. While there are rules governing the noise emitted during drilling of natural gas wells, exemptions are often granted and there has been little research demonstrating that stipulated noise levels reduce the impacts of development on sage-grouse, as well as other sensitive species.

Our multi-year, noise-introduction experiment on sage-grouse leks in an otherwise undisturbed area tries to separate the impacts of noise from other potential impacts of energy development. Two types of noise are of

---

70 Weisenberger et al., *supra* note 7; Sun & Narins, *supra* note 39; Leonard & Horn, *supra* note 62; Brown, *supra* note 67.

71 J.W. Connelly et al., Conservation Assessment of Greater Sage-Grouse and Sagebrush Habitats, Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. Unpublished Report. Cheyenne, Wyoming, 2004. Copy online at http://www.ndow.org/wild/conservation/sg/resources/greate_sg_cons_assessment.pdf

72 M.J. Holloran, Greater Sage-Grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) Population Response to Natural Gas Field Development in Western Wyoming (2005) (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wyoming) (accessible online from http://www.sagebrushsea.org/th_energy_sage_grouse_study2.htm); Brett L. Walker et al., *Greater Sage-Grouse Population Response to Energy Development and Habitat Loss*, 71 J. WILDLIFE MGMT. (2007); Dooling & Popper, *supra* note 1.

73 Other factors at work include habitat loss, fragmentation, dust, air pollution, and West Nile virus. Connelly et al, *supra* note 64; Holloran, *supra* note 70; D.E. Naugle et al., *West Nile Virus: Pending Crisis for Greater Sage-Grouse*, 7 ECOLOGY LETTERS 704–713 (2004).

primary interest, road noise and drilling noise. Both types are dominated by low frequencies, but drilling noise is high intensity, continuous noise, whereas road noise is intermittent with gradual increases and decreases in amplitude. Monitored leks are divided into pairs of control leks and leks with experimentally introduced noise.[74] Ideally, noise would be introduced at different levels on different leks to determine the noise threshold at which an impact can be observed. However, such a "dose-response" experiment would require a large sample of leks and that is logistically infeasible. The experiment, instead, creates a noise gradient across each lek, so that the effect of noise level on microhabitat use and behavior can be measured and noise-tolerance thresholds estimated.

This experimental approach isolates and makes it possible to assess the impacts of noise on lekking sage-grouse at both the individual and population levels. The individual effects are analyzed from audio and video recordings, to determine whether individuals change the rate, frequency structure, and amplitude of their displays in the presence of noise, as has been found in other species.[75] A non-invasive technique compares the relative stress levels of birds on experimental and control leks through analysis of stress hormones in feces.[76] Population-levels effects of noise derive from comparison of lek attendance patterns on experimental and control leks over multiple seasons. This allows detection of noise impacts while controlling for natural variations in behavior, physiology, and larger-scale fluctuations in the population.

Although introducing noise in the wild is a powerful tool for measuring noise impacts on animals, it is only appropriate in certain circumstances. Noise introduction requires access, for example, to a population of animals residing in a relatively undisturbed area. Such a population may be unavailable in some species of concern, or the species may be too sensitive or rare to risk such an experimental manipulation. In addition, animals must be at fairly high densities in order to collect sufficient data for analysis, because it is difficult to create a noise disturbance over a large area using speakers.[77] During the breeding season, noise introduction can rely on battery-powered speakers, because leks are relatively small and have a high density of birds. This same

[74] Paired leks have similar size and location and are visited by researchers for counts on the same days. Noise is introduced at 70 dBF SPL (unweighted decibels) at 16 meters using three to four battery-powered outdoor speakers. This is similar to noise levels measured at $\frac{1}{4}$-mile from drilling rigs and main haul roads in Pinedale, Wyoming. Control leks have dummy speakers and are visited for "battery changes" with the same frequency as experimental leks.

[75] Patricelli & Blickley, *supra* note 13; Warren et al., *supra* note 13; Rabin et al., *supra* note 13; Rabin & Greene, *supra* note 13; Slabbekoorn & Peet, *supra* note 20.

[76] *See*, *e.g.,* Wasser et al., *supra* note 27.

[77] Most anthropogenic noise sources are very large, and it is extremely difficult to replicate loud noise over a large area from small speakers, since amplitude (and thus propagation) is limited by source size. This challenge is even greater when speakers are powered by batteries in remote field locations.

approach is less able, however, to address noise impacts on nesting or over-wintering behaviors, when sage-grouse are more dispersed.

In some situations, the use of semi-captive populations reaps some of the benefits of both field and laboratory studies, by increasing animal density in a more natural setting than is afforded by laboratory animal colonies. This approach is outside the scope of our current study. Another limitation of the experimental approach is that it underestimates (or even misses) the impacts of noise that occur in interaction with other forms of disturbance, such as the combination of noise pollution with an increase of raptor perches in energy development areas.[78] The combined effects will be larger than that attributable to either disturbance alone, but they can only be examined in observational studies and noise-source introduction experiments. This highlights, again, the need for multiple research approaches to measuring wildlife noise impacts.

There are very few experimental studies that use either noise-source introductions or noise playbacks, even though these experimental tools, used in a field setting or in naturalistic captive settings, are among the most powerful for understanding noise impacts on wild populations. Large-scale field experiments are expensive and logistically challenging. They do, however, appear to be warranted, particularly when observational studies and measurements of masking potential suggest a likely role for noise in impacting wild animals. Future field research should also focus on validating results and methods from laboratory studies, thus increasing the ability to apply lab studies and estimates of masking potential to the development of effective mitigation measures and predictions about the impacts future development is likely to have on wildlife.

5. FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND POLICY RELEVANCE

Even though the rapid spread of human development and associated anthropogenic noise have impacts on wildlife, it is not always logistically, politically, or economically feasible to eliminate or even minimize noise. The more common policy approach is to set noise standards, in the hope of limiting the levels of noise that development produces. The production of noise can then be reduced structurally[79] or operationally[80] to meet these standards. Road noise, for example, can be reduced through the use of certain types of asphalt, although these road surfaces can also have lower durability, lower traction, and higher cost than noisier varieties. Road noise can also be decreased by noise barriers, but these may cut off migration routes and exacerbate rather than

[78] Connelly et al., *supra* note 69.

[79] Noise can be reduced structurally by using alternative materials and architecture, such as noise barriers, to reduce sound production and propagation.

[80] Noise can be reduced operationally through limitations on the timing and frequency of noisy activities, for example, by avoiding shift changes that occur at 7:00 a.m., in the peak lekking hours of sage-grouse.

reduce overall road impacts.[81] Regulations necessarily balance the economic and environmental trade-offs involved in allowing development to proceed and as a general rule the more information that can be brought to bear on this balancing process the better.

There can be no doubt that the first priority in the development of most current noise standards is the protection of human welfare. They use human criteria of disturbance, generated primarily in areas where humans are impacted.[82] These standards protect animal species with noise tolerances and distributions similar to those of humans. They are not effective, however, in reducing the impacts of noise on sensitive species of wildlife. So what should be our goal in the development of effective noise standards for the protection of wildlife? Environmental managers typically prefer a single noise standard that covers all situations. But since species differ in their ability to tolerate noise, a single noise standard is bound to be conservative for some species and insufficient for others. [83] Simply erring on the side of more conservative standards could do more harm than good in cases where it diverts money from more appropriate types of mitigation, and when noise mitigation measures introduce other environmental and economic costs, as discussed above. Rather than a single standard, a set of standards is needed, based on the measured sensitivities of indicator species and species of concern in a particular habitat type or location. Recently, a panel of experts developed a set of general and species-specific recommendations for marine mammal noise exposure criteria.[84] The development of such a set of standards for terrestrial species will require information about sensitivity to noise pollution in both abundant and rare species; the research priorities outlined here will help to achieve this goal.

[81] Forman, Reineking, and Hersberger, *supra* note 6.

[82] Dooling & Popper, *supra* note 1; SINGAL, *supra* note 9.

[83] A single noise standard, for example, might establish a maximum acceptable noise level of 49 dBA at a one quarter mile from a noise source.

[84] B.L. Southall, A.E. Bowles, & W.T. Ellison, *Marine Mammal Noise Exposure Criteria: Initial Scientific Recommendations*, 125 J. ACOUSTICAL SOC. AM. 2517 (2009). There is no equivalent set of recommendations for terrestrial animals.