

# Pennsylvania Energy Impacts Assessment

## *Report 1: Marcellus Shale Natural Gas and Wind*



---

# Pennsylvania Energy Impacts Assessment

## *Report 1: Marcellus Shale Natural Gas and Wind*

November 15, 2010

Author and Team Leader: Nels Johnson<sup>1</sup>

Assessment Team: Tamara Gagnolet<sup>1</sup>, Rachel Ralls<sup>1</sup>, Ephraim Zimmerman<sup>2</sup>, Brad Eichelberger<sup>2</sup>, Chris Tracey<sup>2</sup>, Ginny Kreitler<sup>3</sup>, Stephanie Orndorff<sup>3</sup>, Jim Tomlinson<sup>3</sup>, Scott Bearer<sup>1</sup>, and Sarah Sargent<sup>3</sup>

The Nature Conservancy gratefully acknowledges generous financial support for this assessment from the Heinz Endowments, the R.K. Mellon Foundation, and the William Penn Foundation.

1. The Nature Conservancy – Pennsylvania Chapter
2. Western Pennsylvania Conservancy – Pennsylvania Natural Heritage Program
3. Audubon Pennsylvania

Cover photos: Marcellus gas drilling rig in Lycoming County © Tamara Gagnolet / TNC; wind turbine in Tioga County © Nels Johnson / TNC; log pile © TNC; electric transmission lines in Clinton County © George C. Gress / TNC



---

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	3
Marcellus Shale Natural Gas .....	8
What is Marcellus Shale Natural Gas? .....	8
Current and Projected Marcellus Shale Natural Gas Development .....	9
Conservation Impacts of Marcellus Shale Natural Gas Development.....	18
Key Findings.....	29
Additional Information.....	30
Wind .....	31
What is Wind Energy? .....	31
Current and Projected Wind Energy Development .....	32
Conservation Impacts of Wind Energy Development .....	38
Key Findings.....	44
Additional Information.....	45

---

## Executive Summary

---




Forest landscape along the West Branch Susquehanna River, Clinton County. © George C. Gress / TNC

Within a few weeks during the summer of 2000, eight towers rose two hundred feet above an agricultural field on a low ridge top along the Pennsylvania Turnpike. Not long after, large blades began sweeping the Somerset County sky as Pennsylvania's first industrial wind facility went on line. Several years later and an hour drive to the west, an unusual natural gas well was drilled over a mile down and pumped full of water. That well in Washington County yielded a surprising amount of gas flowing from fractures in a shale formation that geologists had long suspected held plenty of gas but has been too expensive to develop. Meanwhile, a Canadian company bought a small sawmill in Mifflintown and started producing wood pellets for

stoves, boilers, and electric plants. It soon became one of the region's largest producers of wood biomass energy supplies. In the decade since, these three new energy technologies have expanded rapidly across the state. By the end of this year, 500 wind turbines will be turning on Pennsylvania ridgelines, nearly 2,000 Marcellus natural gas wells will be scattered across rolling fields and forests, and over 50 facilities will be producing wood pellets or burning wood for energy. Thousands of miles of pipelines and powerlines already crisscross the state to get energy supplies to major markets in the Northeast.

Each of these energy sources carries both promise and risk for people and nature. The promise is that wind, natural gas, and wood biomass energy can reduce greenhouse gas emissions, generate jobs, and increase energy security. The risk is that extensive land use change and loss of natural habitats could accompany new energy development and transmission lines. Impacts to priority conservation habitats across the state have been modest thus far. For example, aerial photo analysis indicates Marcellus gas development has so far cleared just 3,500 acres of forest (about 1,000 acres for wind turbines). An additional 8,500 acres of forest is now within 300 feet of new fragmenting edges created by well pads, and associated roads and infrastructure (5,000 acres for wind turbines). This fragmentation deprives "interior" forest species, such as black-throated blue warblers, northern goshawks, salamanders, and many woodland flowers, of the shade, humidity and tree canopy protection that only deep forest environments can provide.



Black-throated blue warblers and other interior forest species could be impacted by forest fragmentation caused by energy development. © Gary Irwin

---

By all accounts, each of these energy types is likely to grow substantially in Pennsylvania during the next two decades. The Marcellus shale formation, which underlies two-thirds of the state, is now believed to be one of the largest unconventional shale gas reserves in the world. The Pennsylvania Alternative Energy Portfolio Standards Act of 2004, along with state and federal incentives, will likely boost expansion of wind, wood biomass, and other alternative energy types over the next two decades. But, how much of each energy type might be developed? What transmission infrastructure will be needed to get more electric power and natural gas to consumers? And, where are these energy types most likely to be developed? How does the likely scale and location of future energy development overlap with priority conservation areas? The Pennsylvania Energy Impacts Assessment seeks answers to these questions so that conservationists can work more effectively with energy companies and government agencies to avoid, minimize or mitigate habitat impacts in the future.



Nine Mile Run Creek in PA's North Central Highlands  
© George C. Gress / TNC.

**Assessment Goal:** Develop credible energy development projections and assess how they might affect high priority conservation areas across Pennsylvania. Marcellus natural gas, wind, wood biomass, and associated electric and gas transmission lines were chosen as the focus since these energy types have the most potential to cause land-use change in the state over the next two decades. The conservation impacts focus is on forest, freshwater, and rare species habitats. The assessment **does not** address other potential environmental impacts, including water withdrawal, water quality, air quality and migratory pathways for birds and bats. The assessment also does not address a range of other social, economic, and climate characteristics of these energy types.

**Key Assumptions:** Any assessment of future trends must include certain assumptions. Among the most important assumptions of the Pennsylvania Energy Impacts Assessment are the following:

- A 20-year time period is used to assess potential cumulative habitat impacts from energy development;
- Given uncertainties about how energy prices could change, it was assumed that prices and capital investment (and policy and social conditions) will be sufficient to promote steady development growth for each energy type during the next two decades;
- Given uncertainty about how technology changes could affect spatial footprints, it was assumed that spatial footprints per well pad, turbine, and mile of transmission line will not change significantly during the next two decades;
- Given the proprietary nature of data on leases, Marcellus Shale porosity, fine resolution wind power, etc., all projections are based on publicly available information;
- It was assumed that recent trends and patterns of energy development will continue for the next two decades absent significant changes in government policies and industry practices;

---

Energy projections contained in this assessment are informed scenarios – **not predictions** – for how much energy development might take place and where it is more and less probable. Projected impacts, however, are based on measurements of actual spatial footprints measured for hundreds of well pads and wind turbines.

**Analytical Steps:** Key analytical steps for the Pennsylvania Energy Assessment included:

- 1) *Data collection* – Over 50 spatial data layers on energy resources, development permits, road and transmission infrastructure, physical features, and conservation priorities were compiled for the assessment;
- 2) *Spatial footprint analysis* – Spatial footprints for Marcellus gas well and wind turbine pads, associated roads, associated pipelines, associated electric transmission lines, and associated other clearings (e.g., gas containment pits, equipment staging areas, electrical substations) were digitized using aerial photos of sites before and after construction;
- 3) *Scale projections* – Low, medium, and high scenarios for **how much** Marcellus Shale natural gas, wind, wood biomass, and transmission line development might occur were based as much as possible on existing projections and data from credible sources.
- 4) *Geographic projections* – Projections of **where** new Marcellus natural gas and wind energy development is more and less likely to occur were based on modeling the probability of a map pixel’s land-use change to energy production based on sets of drivers and constraints developed for each energy type. Geographic projections for wood biomass and energy transmission were not modeled due to a lack of data. Conclusions about regional patterns of wood biomass and transmission development and potential conservation impacts will be presented in Report 2 of the Pennsylvania Energy Impacts Assessment.
- 5) *Conservation impacts analysis* – The potential impacts of future energy development were assessed for forest and freshwater habitats across the state. In addition, sites recognized as important for species of conservation concern were assessed. Conservation datasets for these assessments included, among others, large forest patches from The Nature Conservancy and the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, habitat areas for rare species from the Pennsylvania Natural Heritage Program, densities for interior forest nesting bird species from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Pennsylvania Breeding Bird Atlas, and intact watersheds for native brook trout populations from the Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture.
- 6) *Review* – A dozen energy experts in government, industry, and research organizations provided technical review of the energy projections.

**Energy Projections:** The Pennsylvania Energy Impacts Assessment developed low, medium and high scenarios for the amount of energy development that might take place in Pennsylvania by 2030. The projections include:

- *Marcellus Shale* – Sixty thousand wells could be drilled on between 6,000 and 15,000 new well pads (there are currently about 1,000), depending on how many wells are placed on each pad. Gas development will occur in at least half of the state’s counties, with the densest development likely in 15 counties in southwest, north central, and northeast Pennsylvania.
- *Wind* – Between 750 and 2,900 additional wind turbines could be built (there are currently about 500), depending on the wind share of electric generation by 2030. Most turbines would be built along the Allegheny Front in western Pennsylvania and on high Appalachian ridgetops in the central and northeastern parts of the state.

- 
- *Wood Biomass* – Wood biomass energy demand could double or even triple today’s wood energy use, depending on whether and how many coal power plants co-fire with wood biomass. Wood biomass energy development is likely to be widespread across the state in all three scenarios.
  - *Transmission Lines* – Preliminary findings indicate between 10,000 and 15,000 miles of new high-voltage power lines and gas pipelines (especially gathering lines) could be built during the next twenty years. There is considerable uncertainty about exactly where these lines will be built but recently proposed electric and gas transmission lines provide insights into potential habitat impacts.

**Conservation Impacts:** This first Pennsylvania Energy Impacts Assessment report focuses on the overlap between likely Marcellus gas and wind development areas and Pennsylvania’s most important natural habitats. A second report will focus on the potential for additional impacts from new wood biomass energy plants, electric power lines, and natural gas pipelines. Key findings for impacts from Marcellus natural gas and for wind development include:

**Forests.** By 2030, a range of between 38,000 to 90,000 acres of forest cover could be cleared by new Marcellus gas development in the state. Forest clearing for the wind development scenarios is much smaller, ranging from 1,900 to 5,200 acres. Such clearings would create new forest edges where the risk of predation, changes in light and humidity levels, and expanded presence of invasive species could threaten forest interior species in 91,000 to 220,000 forest acres adjacent to Marcellus development and 13,400 to 36,000 forest acres adjacent to wind development. Forest impacts will be concentrated in the north central and southwest parts of the state where many of the state’s largest and most intact forest patches could be fragmented into smaller patches by well pads, roads, and other infrastructure. Impacts to forest interior species will vary depending on their geographic distribution and density. Some species, such as the black-throated blue warbler, could see widespread impacts to their relatively restricted breeding habitats in the state while widely distributed species, such as the Scarlet Tanager, would be relatively less affected. Locating energy infrastructure in open areas or toward the outer edges of large patches can significantly reduce impacts to important forest areas.

**Freshwater.** Aquatic habitats are at risk too. Once widespread, healthy populations of native eastern brook trout in Pennsylvania are now largely confined to small mountain watersheds. Nearly 80 percent of the state’s most intact brook trout watersheds could see at least some Marcellus gas and wind development during the next twenty years. Strongholds for brook trout are concentrated in north central Pennsylvania, where Marcellus development is projected to be relatively intensive in over half of the state’s best brook trout watersheds. Exceptional Value streams – the Department of Environmental Protection’s highest quality designation – could see hundreds of well pads (perhaps 300 - 750) and dozens of wind turbines (perhaps 50 – 200) located within one-half mile under the projections. Because many intact brook trout



Brook trout © TNC

---

and EV streams are in steep terrain, rigorous sediment controls, and possibly additional setback measures, are needed to help conserve these sensitive habitats.

**Rare Species.** Nearly 40 percent of Pennsylvania’s globally rare and Pennsylvania threatened species can be found in areas with high potential for Marcellus gas development. These species tend to be associated with riparian areas, streams, and wetlands, while others are concentrated in unusually diverse areas such as the Youghiogheny Gorge. A handful of rare species have most or all of their known locations in high potential areas for Marcellus gas development. For example, three-fourths of all known snow trillium populations are in high potential Marcellus development areas as are all known populations for the green salamander. A much smaller number of known locations for globally and state rare species overlap with high potential wind development sites and they tend to be associated with rocky outcrops and ridgetop barrens habitats. Species with the greatest overlaps include timber rattlesnakes, Allegheny woodrats, and northern long-eared Myotis bats. More intensive surveys for globally rare and state critically endangered species in high potential Marcellus and wind development areas could help to minimize impacts before development begins. The Pennsylvania Game Commission is working with wind companies and other researchers to assess impacts to migratory pathways for birds and bats.

**Recreation.** Extensive overlaps are projected between Marcellus development and state forests, state parks, and state game lands. Just over ten percent of Pennsylvania’s public lands are legally protected from gas development, most of it within State Wild and Natural Areas or in state parks where the Commonwealth owns the mineral rights. The state does not own mineral rights for 80% of State Park and State Game Lands, nearly 700,000 acres of State Forests have already been leased, and only about 300,000 acres of the remaining State Forest Lands are legally off-limits to future leases. Projections indicate between 900 and 2,200 well pads could be developed across all state lands, with most going on State Forest Lands, followed by State Game Lands, and State Parks. Wind development was not projected on state lands, though some facilities are projected near highly visited sites, including natural vistas.

Clearly, the heart of some of Pennsylvania’s best natural habitats lies directly in the path of future energy development. Integrating information on conservation priorities into energy planning, operations, and policy by energy companies and government agencies sooner rather than later could dramatically reduce these impacts. Many factors – including energy prices, economic benefits, greenhouse gas reductions, and energy independence – will go into final decisions about where and how to proceed with energy development. Information about Pennsylvania’s most important natural habitats should be an important part of the calculus about trade-offs and optimization as energy development proceeds. Would Pennsylvania’s conservation pioneers, including Gifford Pinchot, Maurice Goddard, and Rachel Carson, expect anything less?



---

## Marcellus Shale Natural Gas

---

Once thought to be inaccessible, deep shale formations with tightly held natural gas have become the most rapidly growing source of energy in North America. New technologies and methods have allowed companies to drill 6,000 to 10,000 feet down to reach the Marcellus shale, turn the well horizontally to follow the shale layer for a mile or more, and then pump in millions of gallons of water to fracture the shale and release the natural gas. Pennsylvania is at the epicenter of the Marcellus formation, one of the world's largest unconventional shale natural gas reserves. Situated right next door to huge markets in the Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern states, Marcellus gas development has expanded at a furious pace since the first wells were drilled just few years ago in Washington County. There are now approximately 2,000 drilled wells, most of them concentrated in the southwestern and northeastern parts of the state.

The Marcellus boom is bringing rapid economic growth to many rural communities that have been in economic decline for decades. Natural gas is also displacing higher carbon coal and oil supplies thus slowing the rise in greenhouse gas emissions. These benefits are real but not without costs. Large amounts of water must be withdrawn to frac each well (about 5 million gallons). The return flow water that comes back up from the well contains varying levels of chemicals, heavy metals, and even radioactive materials, and must be handled carefully to avoid spills when recycled or disposed. Heavy trucks and compressor stations rumble constantly in gas development areas putting heavy strains on roads, bridges and air quality. Because of known and perceived risks to environmental quality and human health, water use, air emissions and transportation demands are receiving growing attention from government agencies, researchers and energy companies. Thus far, relatively little attention, however, has been focused on Marcellus gas development impacts to natural habitats across the state.

### What is Marcellus Shale Natural Gas?

The Marcellus is the largest gas-bearing shale formation in North America in both area and potential gas volume. It spans over 150,000 square miles across 5 states including the southern tier of New York, the northern and western half of Pennsylvania, the eastern third of Ohio, most of West Virginia, and a small slice of western Virginia. Estimates of the potential recoverable volume have increased steadily. The latest estimates by the U.S. Department of Energy are nearly 300 trillion cubic feet – enough to supply all natural gas demand in the United States for at least 10 years.



Map showing the extent of the Marcellus Shale formation.  
Data source: United States Geological Survey.


---


Geologists have long known the Marcellus formation is an organically-rich shale with potentially large amounts of natural gas, but it was too deep, too thin, and too dense to exploit. In 2005, Range Resources drilled the first production Marcellus well using horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing methods. The horizontal drilling is necessary because the shale is typically thin and vertical wells will only intercept a small part of the formation. Hydraulic fracturing (or “fracing”) is a process that uses large volumes of water, sand, lubricants, and other chemicals to create small fissures in the shale rock. Hydro-fracing is necessary to release the gas which is tightly held in the dense black shale. These methods, first perfected for deep shale gas in the Barnett formation of Texas, unlocked the tremendous gas reserves in the Marcellus and other “unconventional” shale formations previously thought to be out of economic reach.

In contrast to shallow gas deposits in western Pennsylvania, the Marcellus is developed with multiple horizontal wells that can reach out 5,000 feet or more from one well pad. Everything about Marcellus development is bigger than conventional shallow gas plays. The well pads are more expansive (averaging just over 3 acres compared to a small fraction of an acre), the water used to frac wells is much greater (5 million gallons versus a hundred thousand gallons), and the supporting infrastructure is much larger in scale (24” diameter pipelines to gather gas from wells versus 2” or 4” pipelines in shallow fields). Individual wells are also vastly more productive (5 – 10 million cubic feet per day versus less than 100,000 cubic feet in peak early production). While the larger pad, greater water use, and more extensive infrastructure pose more challenges for conservation than shallow gas, the area “drained” by wells on each Marcellus pad is much larger than from shallow gas pads (500-1,000 acres versus 10-80 acres) since there are typically multiple lateral wells on a Marcellus pad versus a single vertical well on a shallow gas pad. The lateral reach of Marcellus wells means there is more flexibility in where pads and infrastructure can be placed relative to shallow gas. This increased flexibility in placing Marcellus infrastructure can be used to avoid or minimize impacts to natural habitats in comparison to more densely-spaced shallow gas fields.

## Current and Projected Marcellus Shale Natural Gas Development

Projections of future Marcellus gas development impacts depend on robust spatial measurements of existing Marcellus well pads and infrastructure. By comparing aerial photos of Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) Marcellus well permit locations taken before and after development, we precisely documented the spatial foot print of 242 Marcellus well pads (totaling 435 drilling permits) in Pennsylvania visible in 2008 aerial imagery from the National Agriculture Imagery Program. The ground excavated for wells and associated infrastructure is the most obvious spatial impact. For each well site, areas cleared for the well pad, new or expanded roads, gathering pipelines, and water impoundments were digitized and measured.





Aerial photos before and after development of a Marcellus gas well pad site in Susquehanna County, PA. To assess the impacts of this type of energy development, we digitized the spatial footprint of 242 gas well pad sites and associated infrastructure.


Average Spatial Disturbance for Marcellus Shale Well Pads in Forested Context (acres)		
Forest cleared for Marcellus Shale well pad	3.1	8.8
Forest cleared for associated infrastructure (roads, pipelines, water impoundments, etc.)	5.7	
Indirect forest impact from new edges	21.2	
<b>TOTAL DIRECT AND INDIRECT IMPACTS</b>	<b>30</b>	

Well pads occupy 3.1 acres on average while the associated infrastructure (roads, water impoundments, pipelines) takes up an additional 5.7 acres, or a total of nearly 9 acres per well pad.

Adjacent lands can also be impacted, even if they are not directly cleared. This is most notable in forest settings where clearings fragment contiguous forest patches, create new edges, and change habitat conditions for sensitive wildlife and plant species that depend on “interior” forest conditions.


Forest ecologists call this the “edge effect.” While the effect is somewhat different for each species, research has shown measurable impacts often extend at least 330 feet (100 meters) forest adjacent to an edge. Interior forest species avoid edges for different reasons. Black-throated blue warblers and other interior forest nesting birds, for example, avoid areas near edges because of the increased risk of predation. Tree frogs, flying squirrels and certain woodland flowers are sensitive to forest fragmentation because of changes in canopy cover, humidity and light levels. Some species, especially common species such as whitetail deer and cowbirds, are attracted to forest edges – often resulting in increased competition, predation, parasitism, and herbivory. Invasive plant species, such as tree of heaven, stilt grass, and Japanese barberry, often thrive on forest edges and can displace native forest species. As large forest patches become progressively cut into smaller patches, populations of forest interior species decline.

To assess the potential interior forest habitat impact, we created a 100 meter buffer into forest patches from new edges created by well pad and associated infrastructure development. For those well sites developed in forest areas or along forest edges (about half of assessed sites), an average of 21 acres of interior forest habitat was lost.




The number of Marcellus wells drilled in Pennsylvania during the next two decades will expand steadily. Just how many wells are drilled will be driven by various factors including natural gas prices, technological improvements, human resources, regulatory changes in Pennsylvania and beyond (e.g., end of New York drilling moratorium), and social preferences. Assessing how these factors will change over the next two decades is very difficult; therefore our projections assume economic, policy, and social conditions remain stable enough to promote steady expansion of Marcellus gas development in the state. The first key variable in our projection is the number of drilling rigs that

will be operating in Pennsylvania. By October 2010, the industry had moved just over 100 rigs into Pennsylvania to drill Marcellus wells according to the Baker-Hughes weekly rig count. Given the high productivity of the Marcellus and its proximity to major northeastern markets, most industry observers expect this number to continue growing steadily. The number of horizontal drill rigs operating in the Barnett Shale has peaked at about 200, but the



We project 60,000 Marcellus wells will be drilled during the next twenty years based on company investor presentations and academic assessments of gas development potential. Depending on how many wells on average are placed on the same pad site (see illustration below), we project between 7,000 and 16,000 total well pad sites will be developed in Pennsylvania by 2030.



---

Marcellus Shale is much larger and could reach 300 rigs in Pennsylvania alone. We chose a conservative estimate of 250 maximum horizontal drill rigs for each scale projection scenario. Assuming that each rig can drill one well per month, 3,000 wells are estimated to be drilled annually. At that rate, 60,000 new wells would be drilled by the year 2030.

The second key variable, especially for determining land-use and habitat impacts, is the number of wells on each pad. Because each horizontal well can drain gas from 80 to 170 acres (depending on the lateral well length), more wells per pad translates to less disturbance and infrastructure on the landscape. It is technically possible to put a dozen or more Marcellus wells on one pad. So far, the average in Pennsylvania is two wells per pad as companies quickly move on to drill other leases to test productivity and to secure as many potentially productive leases as possible (leases typically expire after 5 years if there is no drilling activity). In many cases, the gas company will return to these pads later and drill additional wells. The low scenario (6,000 well pads) assumes that each pad on average will have ten wells. Because many leases are irregularly shaped, in mixed ownership, or the topography and geology impose constraints, it is unlikely this scenario will develop. It would take relatively consolidated leaseholds and few logistical constraints for this scenario to occur. The medium scenario for well pads assumes 6 wells on average will be drilled from each pad, or 10,000 new well pads across the state. Industry staff generally agree that six is the most likely number of wells they will be developing per pad for most of their leaseholds, at least where lease patterns facilitate drilling units of 600 acres or larger. The high scenario assumes each pad will have 4 wells drilled on average, or 15,000 well pads across the state. This scenario is more likely if there is relatively little consolidation of lease holds between companies in the next several years.

The number of well pads is less important than where they are located, at least from a habitat conservation perspective. To understand which areas within Pennsylvania's Marcellus formation are more and less likely to be developed, we used a machine-based learning modeling approach known as maximum entropy (Maxent 3.3.3a, Princeton University). Maximum entropy was used to find relationships between 1,461 existing and permitted well pad locations and variables that might be relevant to a company's decision to drill a Marcellus well. Such variables were chosen based on data availability and included Marcellus Shale depth, thickness and thermal maturity as well as percent slope, distance to pipelines, and distance to roads. The model produces a raster surface that represents the probability of an area to potentially support future gas well development. An additional 487 existing and permitted well pads were used to test the validity of the model's probability surface and the model was found to be 80% accurate in predicting existing and permitted wells from randomly sampled undeveloped areas. The resulting probability map indicates wide variation across the Marcellus formation in terms of the likelihood of future gas well development.

To get a better sense of where gas development is most likely, we searched for the highest probability areas where well pads in each scenario might be located. The probability raster was re-sampled to a resolution that reflects the minimum separation distance between well pads for each of the three impact scenarios (low – 1,590 m; medium – 1,260 m; high – 1,020 m). The minimum separation distance depends on the number of wells drilled per pad and accounts for the average gas drainage area assumed for each of the three scenarios. Areas incompatible for future gas exploration (existing drilled Marcellus Shale wells, Pennsylvania State Wild Areas and Natural Areas, and water bodies) were excluded from being selected as probable pixels. For each scenario, the highest probable pixels were selected until the pad threshold was reached (low – 6,000 well pads; medium – 10,000 well pads; high – 15,000 well pads). The highest probable pixels were then converted into points for map display purposes.


---

While the geographic area with projected well pads expands from low to high scenarios, the overall geographic pattern is not cumulative due to the differences in minimum separation distance between the three scenarios. Overall, hotspots for future gas development can be seen in half a dozen counties in southwestern Pennsylvania and half a dozen counties in north central and northeastern parts of the state.

These geographic projections of future Marcellus gas development are spatial representations of possible scenarios. They are not predictions. We faced several constraints in developing the geographic scenarios:


- We do not have access to proprietary seismic and test well geologic data that natural gas companies have. Shale porosity, for example, is a key factor but there are no publicly available data for this.
- We do not have the detailed location of gas company leases. Each company is looking for the highest probability locations across their lease holds while our model looks for the highest probability sites across the entire Marcellus formation in the state. Because there have only been a few Marcellus test wells and permits in the Delaware watershed, we believe the projections for new well pads are probably significantly underestimated in Wayne County.

Still, we believe the overall geographic patterns in the projected gas development locations are relatively robust for several reasons. We used nearly 1,500 existing drilled or permitted well pads to build the model and nearly 500 additional drilled and permitted well pads to validate the model. These unique well pad locations represented 4,446 permitted wells. This is typically a sufficient sample size for building predictive models. Additionally, reviews from industry, academic, and government agency reviewers indicate our methods and results are generally sound. Some reviewers expect future well pad locations to be more geographically expansive than our current projections indicate, especially in the Delaware watershed where only a few Marcellus test wells and permits have been issued. Our projections for Wayne County, for example, are likely underestimating future development potential.




Map showing projected location of 10,000 new Marcellus Shale natural gas pads across Pennsylvania (medium development scenario).







Map showing projected location of new Marcellus well pads in southern Susquehanna County under the medium development scenario.



Map showing projected location of new Marcellus well pads in southwestern Pennsylvania under the medium development scenario.



Map showing projected location of 6,000 new Marcellus well pads across Pennsylvania (low development scenario).



Map showing projected location of 15,000 new Marcellus well pads across Pennsylvania (high development scenario).

---

## Conservation Impacts of Marcellus Shale Natural Gas Development

What is the overlap of the areas with the highest probability of future Marcellus gas development and those areas known to have high conservation values? To answer this question, we intersected the projected Marcellus well pads with areas previously identified and mapped as having high conservation values. We looked at several examples from four categories of conservation value, including:

- Forest habitats
- Freshwater habitats
- Species of conservation concern
- Outdoor recreation


Substantial areas of overlap are indicated between likely future Marcellus development areas and Pennsylvania's most important forest, freshwater, sensitive species habitats, and outdoor recreation sites.

### **FORESTS**


Forests are Pennsylvania's most extensive natural habitat type. Once covering at least 95 percent of the state's land area, forests were whittled away for agriculture, charcoal for iron smelting, and lumber until only a third of the state's forests remained. Forests have rebounded steadily to cover about 60 percent of the state, though a trend toward increasing net loss of forest has emerged during the past decade. Pennsylvania is famous worldwide for its outstanding cherry, oak, and maple hardwoods, and forests provide livelihoods for many thousands of Pennsylvanians in the forest products and tourism industries. They also contribute enormously to the quality of life for all Pennsylvanians by filtering contaminants from water and air, reducing the severity of floods, sequestering carbon dioxide emissions that would otherwise warm the planet, and providing a scenic backdrop to recreational pursuits.

A majority of projected well locations are found in a forest setting for all three scenarios (64% in each case). The low scenario would see 4,310 well pads in forest areas. With an average cleared forest average of 8.8 acres per pad (including roads and other infrastructure), the total forest clearing would be approximately 38,000 acres. Indirect impacts to adjacent forest interior habitats would total an additional 91,000 acres. Forest impacts from the medium scenario (6,950 projected wells in forest locations) would be 61,000 cleared forest acres and an additional 147,000 acres of adjacent forest interior habitat impacts. For the high scenario (10,250 forest well pads), approximately 90,000 acres would be cleared, and an additional 220,000 acres of forest interior habitats would be affected by new adjacent clearings. While the high Marcellus scenario would result in a loss of less than one percent of the state's total forest acreage, areas with intensive Marcellus gas development could see a loss of 2-3 percent of local forest habitats. Some part of the cleared forest area will become reforested after drilling is completed, but there has not been enough time to establish a trend since the Marcellus development started.

Large contiguous forest patches are especially valuable because they sustain wide-ranging forest species, such as northern goshawk, and provide more habitat for forest interior species. They are also more resistant to the spread of invasive species, suffer less tree damage from wind and ice storms, and provide more ecosystem services – from carbon storage to water filtration – than small patches. The Nature Conservancy and the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy’s Forest Conservation Analysis mapped nearly 25,000 forest patches in the state greater than 100 acres. Patches at least 1,000 acres in size are about a tenth of the total (2,700) and patches at least 5,000 acres are rare (only 316 patches). In contrast to overall forest loss, projected Marcellus gas development scenarios indicate a more pronounced impact on large forest patches. For example, 40 percent of patches greater than 5,000 acres are projected to have at least one well pad and associated infrastructure located in them in the medium scenario compared to just over 20 percent for patches > 1,000 acres. Most affected large patches have multiple projected well pads (as many as 29). The projections indicate larger patches are likely to be more vulnerable, with over a third projected to have at least one new well pad and road. Many affected large patches have multiple projected well pads (as many as 17 for patches). While one or two well pads and associated infrastructure may not fragment the large patch into smaller patches, each additional well pad increases the likelihood that the large patch will become several smaller patches with a substantially reduced forest interior habitat area.



Map showing number of probable Marcellus well pads in forest patches greater than 1,000 acres across Pennsylvania.




Map showing projected number of well pads in forest patches greater than 1,000 acres under the medium development scenario in Potter, Cameron, McKean and Forest Counties.

Bird species that nest in close canopy forest environments are often referred to as “forest interior” species. The Carnegie Museum of Natural History, Powdermill Nature Reserve and the Pennsylvania Game Commission recently completed Pennsylvania’s Second Breeding Bird Atlas project. As part of the project, trained ornithologists conducted point counts using standardized protocols at 39,000 sites from 2004 to 2009. The result is an incredibly




Scarlet tanager © U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

detailed data base that provides the most accurate information on the distribution and density of breeding birds available anywhere in the United States. Density data for several forest interior nesting species were mapped and intersected with the projected Marcellus gas well pad locations. The resulting maps show the estimated reduction in habitat for that species in each Marcellus gas probability pixel (including both cleared forest and adjacent edge effects). Scarlet Tanagers are one of the most widespread forest interior nesting bird in the state. Since they are so widespread, a majority of their range in the state is outside of the most likely Marcellus development areas. In some locations, scarlet tanager populations could decline by as much as 23 percent in the Medium Scenario. Black-throated blue warblers are more narrowly distributed in Pennsylvania favoring mature northern hardwood and coniferous forests with a dense understory, frequently in mountain terrain. Since most of their breeding range in Pennsylvania overlaps with likely Marcellus development areas, a higher proportion of their habitat could be affected.



Map showing estimated percent loss of habitat for Scarlet Tanagers under medium scenario.




Map showing estimated percent loss of habitat for Black-Throated Blue Warblers under medium scenario.

## FRESHWATER


Home to three great river systems and one of the Great Lakes, Pennsylvania's fresh water resources are vital not only to the Commonwealth but to much of the eastern United States. The **Ohio River** basin contains the richest fresh water ecosystems in North America. In Pennsylvania, French Creek and parts of the Upper Allegheny River contain some of the most intact aquatic ecosystems in the entire basin. The **Susquehanna River** is the source of more than half the fresh water that enters the Chesapeake Bay, and most of the water that flows down the Susquehanna River originates in tributary headwaters across a wide swath of central Pennsylvania. Forming Pennsylvania's eastern boundary, the **Delaware River** is the longest undammed river in the eastern United States, one of the last strongholds for Atlantic coast migratory fish, and provides the drinking water source for nearly 20 million Americans living in Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey. Because of their importance to human health and livelihoods, the potential of Marcellus gas development to affect water flows and quality have received growing attention from regulatory agencies, natural gas companies, and environmental groups.

The intersection of gas development with sensitive watersheds has received less attention. High Quality and Exceptional Value (EV) watersheds have been designated by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental



Map showing current number of Marcellus well pads in intact and predicted intact brook trout watersheds. Data source: Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture.

Protection across the state. Our projections indicate 28 percent of High Quality and 5 percent of Exceptional Values streams have or will have Marcellus gas development during the next two decades. Presence of well pads in these watersheds may not be a problem as long as spill containment measures and erosion and sedimentation regulations are strictly observed and enforced in these areas. More specifically, the projections indicate 3,581 well pads could be located within ½ mile of a High Quality or Exceptional Values streams. Pads within close proximity to High Quality and especially Exceptional Value streams pose more risk than those at greater distances, as there is increased risk for potential spills and uncontained sediments to find their way into streams.



Map showing projected number of Marcellus well pads by 2030 in intact and predicted intact brook trout watersheds under medium scenario. Data source: Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture.

Native brook trout are one of the most sensitive aquatic species in Pennsylvania watersheds. Brook trout favor cold, highly-oxygenated water and are unusually sensitive to warmer temperatures, sediments, and contaminants. Once widely distributed across Pennsylvania, healthy populations have retreated to a shrinking number of small watersheds. Many of these watersheds overlap with the Marcellus shale formation. A large majority (113) of the 138 intact or predicted intact native brook trout watersheds in Pennsylvania are projected to see at least some Marcellus gas development. Over half (74) are projected to host between 6 – 38 well pads, and the number reaches as high as 64 pads for some intact brook trout watersheds in the high scenario. Rigorous sediment controls and carefully designed stream crossings will be critical for brook trout survival in watersheds, especially upper watersheds, with intensive Marcellus development.



---

## RARE SPECIES


Of the approximately 100,000 species believed to occur in Pennsylvania, just over 1 percent (1052) is tracked by The Pennsylvania Natural Heritage Program (PNHP). Due to low population sizes and immediate threats, these species are rare, declining or otherwise considered to be of conservation concern. PNHP records indicate that 329 tracked species have populations within pixels that have a relatively high modeled probability for Marcellus development. Nearly 40 percent (132) are considered to be globally rare or critically endangered or imperiled in Pennsylvania. Many are found in riparian areas, streams, and wetlands, while others are clustered in unusually biologically diverse areas such as the Youghiogheny Gorge. Some of these species may have only one, two or three populations left in the state. Two examples include the green salamander (*Aneides aeneus*) with all known populations in relatively high probability Marcellus development pixels and snow trillium (*Trillium nivale*) with 73 percent of known populations in relatively high probability pixels. A well-managed screening system to identify the presence of these species and their preferred habitats will be critical to their survival as energy development expands across the state.



Green salamander © Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission

## RECREATION

Pennsylvania has built one of the largest networks of public recreation lands in the eastern United States, but much of it could see Marcellus and other natural gas development in coming decades. Of the 4.5 million acres of state and federal lands in the state, we estimate as little as 500,000 acres are permanently protected from surface mineral development, including gas drilling. State and federal agencies do not own mineral rights under at least 2.2 million acres. Most other areas where the state does own mineral rights can be leased, such as the estimated 700,000 acres previously leased for gas development on state forest lands. Severe budget pressures will likely to tempt the legislature to lease additional lands in the future. Our projections excluded state Wild and Natural Areas, National Park lands, and Congressionally-designated Wilderness Areas but otherwise assumed that high probability Marcellus gas pixels on public lands could be developed. The low scenario projects 897 pad locations on State Forest and State Game Lands which expands to 1,438 well pads in the medium scenario and 2,096 pads in the high scenario. The focal area below illustrates what the overlap of future gas development and conservation lands could look like in the medium scenario for the southern Laurel Highlands. It projects 7 well pads in the portion of Forbes State Forest visible in the focal area above, 13 pads on State Game Lands 51, and 3 on State Game Lands 111.



Map showing projected Marcellus well pads under the medium scenario on public and private conservation lands in the Laurel Highlands.

Pennsylvania’s state park system, recognized as one of the best in the nation, illustrates the challenge of protecting recreational values in areas of intensive Marcellus development. While the DCNR has a long standing policy of not extracting natural resources in state parks, it does not own the mineral rights under an estimated 80 percent of the system’s 283,000 acres. Our projections indicate Marcellus well pads could be located in between 9 and 22 state parks.

**AVOIDING FOREST IMPACTS IN THE LAUREL HIGHLANDS**

The projected potential impacts of Marcellus gas energy development assume recent patterns of development will continue.

Projected Well Pads on State Lands (Medium Scenario)	
DCNR State Forests	1,002
DCNR State Parks	41
State Game Lands	436
<b>Total State Lands</b>	<b>1,479</b>

Given the relatively large areas drained by Marcellus gas pads (depending on the lateral length and number of wells per pad), there is flexibility in how they are placed. This allows us potentially to optimize between energy production and conservation outcomes. To look at how

conservation impacts could be minimized, we examined how projected Marcellus gas pads could be relocated to

---

avoid forest patches in the Southern Laurel Highlands in Fayette and Somerset counties. This area is important because it represents a unique ecological region with a large amount of state land as well as private farmland and forest land. The area is also facing great pressure to develop the Marcellus Gas resource. The focus area included approximately 350 square miles and included Chestnut Ridge on its western border and Laurel Ridge on its east. Within the area, there are two state parks (Ohiopyle State Park and Laurel Hill State Park), two State Game Lands (SGL 51, SGL 111), and state forest land (Forbes State Forest).


The Medium Scenario projected 127 well pads in the focus area. Fourteen well pads were projected in agricultural fields, 33 were in edge habitat (within 100 m of the forest edge), 11 fell within existing cleared areas (e.g. strip mines), and 69 were in forest. There were five pads on Ohiopyle State Park, and 13 within a mile of its boundary. Laurel Ridge State Park contained two pads. Forbes State Forest had seven modeled pads. State Game Lands 111 had 3 pads, and SGL 51 had 13. It was not clear if DCNR State Parks Bureau or the Game Commission control the sub-surface mineral rights beneath the 23 modeled pads. Given that 80 percent of mineral rights are severed on State Park and State Game Lands (and close to 100 percent in western parts of the state), we have assumed that drilling could happen at those projected locations.


To assess additional impacts beyond the well pad itself, we placed a new and/or improved road from the projected pad to the nearest existing road (ESRI Roads Layer). We placed new roads along existing trails, paths and openings whenever detectable on aerial photo imagery (used Bing Maps and 2005-2006 PA Map imagery), avoiding wetlands, steep slopes, cliffs, rock outcrops, and buildings, and where possible, rivers, streams, and forest patches. The projected pads and roads required clearing 400 acres of forest.

Can a modest shift in the location of well pads reduce impacts to forest patches and conservation lands? To reduce the impacts to forest habitats, the wells were relocated to nearby existing anthropogenic openings, old fields, or agricultural fields. Attempts were made to maintain the 4,200 foot (1,260 m) distance between modeled wells. If nearby open areas did not exist, the locations of the well pads were moved toward the edges of forest patches to minimize impacts to forest interior habitats. A set of rules was developed and followed to minimize bias, including:


1. Modeled well pads were not relocated if they occurred in old fields or agricultural fields.
2. Modeled well pads that occurred in forest or edge habitat were moved but well pads were placed in the same general areas as the modeled well pad;
3. Attempts were made to avoid placing relocated well pads any closer than the minimum distance between pads, as specified by the medium scenario (1260 m )
4. Agriculture, cleared land (e.g., former strip mines), or otherwise opened land cover was favored over forest or edges for relocating well pads;
5. If the well pad could not be placed in an open area, forest edges were favored over deep interior forest;
6. Residential areas were avoided. Relocated well pads were placed at least 500 feet (150 m) from homes;
7. Wetlands, water, steep slopes, cliffs, rock outcrops, creeks and rivers, buildings and manicured lawns were avoided;
8. Relocated well pads were only placed in areas with similar to those that supported modeled pads.
9. Relocated well pads often were connected to roads using existing trails, paths and openings whenever detectable on aerial photo imagery (used Bing Maps and 2005-2006 PA Map imagery);
10. The same number of relocated well pads were placed on state lands and Western Pennsylvania Conservancy lands as they were in the modeled output;
11. When the modeled well pad occurred within a forest patch with no nearby alternative locations (due to proximity of other wells or environmental constraints), the projected well pad was not relocated.

The relocated wells and roads did not eliminate forest impacts in this heavily forested landscape, but there was a significant reduction. Total forest loss declined almost 40% while impacts to interior forest habitats adjacent to new clearings declined by a third.





Location of 127 projected Marcellus well pads and new roads in the study area in the southern Laurel Highlands.



Relocated well pads (on the right) reduced forest clearing and forest interior habitat impacts by 40 % and 33% respectively compared to the projected well pads (on the left).

---

## Key Findings

Key findings from the Pennsylvania Energy Impacts Assessment for Marcellus Shale natural gas include:

- About 60,000 new Marcellus wells are projected by 2030 in Pennsylvania with a range of 6,000 to 15,000 well pads, depending on the number of wells per pad;
- Wells are likely to be developed in at least 30 counties, with the greatest number concentrated in 15 southwestern, north central, and northeastern counties;
- Nearly two thirds of well pads are projected to be in forest areas, with forest clearing projected to range between 38,000 and 90,000 acres depending on the number of number of well pads that are developed. An additional range of 91,000 to 220,000 acres of forest interior habitat impacts are projected due to new forest edges created by well pads and associated infrastructure (roads, water impoundments);
- On a statewide basis, the projected forest clearing from well pad development would affect less than one percent of the state’s forests, but forest clearing and fragmentation could be much more pronounced in areas with intensive Marcellus development;
- Approximately one third of Pennsylvania’s largest forest patches (>5,000 acres) are projected to have a range of between 1 and 17 well pads in the medium scenario;
- Impacts on forest interior breeding bird habitats vary with the range and population densities of the species. The widely-distributed scarlet tanager would see relatively modest impacts to its statewide population while black-throated blue warblers, with a Pennsylvania range that largely overlaps with Marcellus development area, could see more significant population impacts;
- Watersheds with healthy eastern brook trout populations substantially overlap with projected Marcellus development sites. The state’s watersheds ranked as “intact” by the Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture are concentrated in north central Pennsylvania, where most of these small watersheds are projected to have between two and three dozen well pads;
- Nearly a third of the species tracked by the Pennsylvania Natural Heritage Program are found in areas projected to have a high probability of Marcellus well development, with 132 considered to be globally rare or critically endangered or imperiled in Pennsylvania. Several of these species have all or most of their known populations in Pennsylvania in high probability Marcellus gas development areas.
- Marcellus gas development is projected to be extensive across Pennsylvania’s 4.5 million acres of public lands, including State Parks, State Forests, and State Game Lands. Just over 10 percent of these lands are legally protected from surface development.
- Integration of conservation features into the planning and development of Marcellus gas well fields can significantly reduce impacts. For example, relocating projected wells to open areas or toward the edge of large forest patches in high probability gas development pixels in the southern Laurel Highlands reduces forest clearing by 40 percent and forest interior impacts by over a third.

---

## Additional Information

- Geologic information on the Marcellus shale formation in Pennsylvania:  
[http://www.dcnr.state.pa.us/topogeo/oilandgas/marcellus\\_shale.aspx](http://www.dcnr.state.pa.us/topogeo/oilandgas/marcellus_shale.aspx)
- Estimates of Marcellus shale formation gas reserves:  
<http://geology.com/articles/marcellus-shale.shtml>
- Baker-Hughes weekly oil and gas rig count  
<http://gis.bakerhughesdirect.com/Reports/StandardReport.aspx>
- Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, Permit and Rig Activity Report:  
<http://www.dep.state.pa.us/dep/deputate/minres/oilgas/RIG10.htm>
- Copeland, H. E., K.E. Doherty, D.E. Naugle, A. Pocewicz, and J. M. Kiesecker. 2009. Mapping Oil and Gas Development Potential in the US Intermountain West and Estimating Impacts to Species:  
<http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0007400>
- Overview of forest fragmentation impacts on forest interior nesting species:  
<http://www.state.nj.us/dep/fgw/neomigr.htm>
- Overview of Pennsylvania High Quality and Exceptional Value Streams:  
<http://www.dcnr.state.pa.us/wlhabitat/aquatic/streamdist.aspx>
- Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, Chapter 93 Water Quality Standards, Exceptional Value and High Quality Streams: data downloaded from Pennsylvania Spatial Data Access:  
<http://www.pasda.psu.edu>
- Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture intact brook trout watersheds:  
<http://128.118.47.58/EBTJV/ebtjv2.html>
- Overview of Carnegie Museum of Natural History, Powdermill Nature Reserve, and the Pennsylvania Game Commission's 2<sup>nd</sup> Pennsylvania Breeding Bird Atlas Project:  
<http://www.carnegiemnh.org/powdermill/atlas/2pbba.html>
- Pennsylvania Natural Heritage Program, including lists of globally rare and state endangered and imperiled species: <http://www.naturalheritage.state.pa.us/>
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, National Agriculture Imagery Program: <http://datagateway.nrcs.usda.gov/GDGOrder.aspx>
- DigitalGlobe, GlobeExplorer, ImageConnect Version 3.1: <http://www.digitalglobe.com>

---

## Wind

---

Wind has become one of the country's fastest growing sources of renewable energy. Pennsylvania is a leader in the industry as host to several wind company manufacturing plants and corporate headquarters. Wind energy development has been spurred by its potential to reduce carbon emissions, promote new manufacturing jobs, and increase energy independence. Technological advances have expanded the size and efficiency of wind turbines during the past decade. This, together with state and federal incentive programs, has facilitated wind development in Pennsylvania, which otherwise ranks relatively low among states for its potential wind generation capacity. The eight turbines installed next to the Pennsylvania Turnpike in Somerset County a decade ago have grown to nearly 500 turbines, with more permitted for construction (AWEA, 2010). Topography is a key factor in average wind speeds across Pennsylvania, so nearly all turbines have been built on mountain ridgelines or on top of high elevation plateaus.

Wind energy has become the most symbolic icon of the shift toward a low carbon economy. With no air emissions or water consumption, it is one of the cleanest renewable energy types. Communities across the state benefit economically as rural landowners lease their properties, skilled jobs are created to manufacture turbines, and workers are hired to install and maintain turbines. Wind development has faced controversy in some areas from neighboring landowners and those worried about impacts to migrating birds and bats. The wind industry, government agencies, and independent researchers have invested considerable effort in trying to better understand impacts on birds and bats. For example, 26 wind development companies have signed a cooperative agreement with the Pennsylvania Game Commission to conduct bird, bat and animal surveys using specified protocols in proposed development areas. Among other findings have been the discovery of the Pennsylvania's second largest Indiana bat maternal colony and a variety of previously undocumented foraging and roosting locations for the state's two rarest bats (Indiana and eastern small-footed). Less understood are the potential habitat impacts of wind development in the northeastern United States. This assessment, therefore, focuses on impacts to forest and stream habitats and selected species of conservation concern that may be vulnerable to development of ridgetop habitats.

### What is Wind Energy?

Wind mills have powered grain processing and water pumping in agriculture around the world – most famously in the Netherlands – for centuries. The first modern wind facilities to generate electricity were built in California in the early 1980s. Rated at less than 0.5 MW capacity per turbine, the towers were only 50 feet tall. These facilities were poorly designed and generated considerable controversy because they caused significant mortalities to migrating hawks and eagles. Wind energy development did not expand appreciably until the late 1990s when newer turbine designs and federal energy incentives stimulated the development of new facilities. These turbines were rated at 1.0 or 1.5 MW capacity and reached about 200 feet high at the tip of their rotor. Since the power produced by a wind turbine is proportional to the cube of the blade size and how high in the air it is; turbine size, height and power ratings have expanded steadily. The largest turbines installed in Pennsylvania are now rated at



2.5 MW (the average was 1.8 MW in 2009) and reach over 400 feet to the tip of the rotor at the apex of its rotation.


Location is everything for wind development in the northeastern United States. Unlike the vast windswept plains in the Midwest and the intermountain West, high wind speeds in the Northeast are primarily confined to mountain ridgetops, plateau escarpments, and the Atlantic and Great Lake shorelines. Areas that have a wind power class rating of 3 or more (300 watts per m<sup>2</sup>) are potentially feasible for wind power development. Wind companies will lease areas that seem to have the most favorable characteristics including wind class, flat pad sites, proximity to transmission lines, and proximity to existing highways. Before development, a wind development company will typically place an anemometer tower on potential development sites to improve knowledge about wind power at the site during a year or longer monitoring period. The turbines are mounted on pads at least 800 feet apart with an access road between towers. The average size of wind facilities has been growing steadily since the first eight were established in 2000. The two largest facilities are now between 75 and 100 turbines.

Several steps have been taken to address potential conflicts between wind development and wildlife in Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania Game Commission (PGC) has a voluntary agreement in place with most wind companies active in the state to screen proposed facilities for possible impacts to birds and bats and migratory pathways. Participating wind companies carry out pre-construction monitoring for birds and bats. If possible conflicts are identified, PGC works with wind companies to avoid or minimize impacts and to continue monitoring post construction in some cases. Second, the Pennsylvania Wind and Wildlife Collaborative (PWWC) was established in 2005 with a state goal to develop a set of “Pennsylvania-specific principles, policies and best management practices, guidelines and tools to assess risks to habitat and wildlife, and to mitigate for the impact of that development.” Several studies on wildlife and habitat issues have been commissioned, though guidelines and Best Management Practices (BMPs) have not been released.

## Current and Projected Wind Energy Development

We documented the spatial foot print of 319 wind turbines at 12 wind facilities across the state by comparing aerial photos taken before and after development. Turbine pads, roads, and other new clearings were digitized for all 12 facilities visible in 2008 images from the


Map showing 12 wind facilities included in the spatial footprint analysis.



Average Spatial Disturbance for Wind Energy Development in Forested Context (acres)		
Forest cleared for wind turbine	1.4	1.9
Forest cleared for associated infrastructure (roads, other cleared areas)	0.5	
Indirect forest impact from new edges	13.4	
<b>TOTAL DIRECT AND INDIRECT IMPACTS</b>	<b>15.3</b>	

National Agriculture Imagery Program. The ground excavated for turbines, roads, and associated infrastructure (e.g., clearings for constructions staging areas or electrical sub-stations) is the most obvious spatial impact. For each turbine site, turbine pads, new roads, staging areas, and sub-stations were digitized and measured. Turbine pads occupy 1.4 acres on average, while the associated infrastructure (roads, staging areas, and substations) takes up an additional half acre, for a total of 1.9 acres of spatial impact per wind turbine.

As with Marcellus gas development, adjacent lands can also be impacted even if they are not directly cleared (See p. 11 for a description of forest edge impacts on forest “interior” species). To assess the potential interior forest habitat impact, we created a 330 foot buffer into forest patches from new edges created by wind turbine and associated infrastructure development. For turbine sites developed in forest areas (about 80% of the 319 turbines), an average area of 13.4 acres of interior forest habitat was lost in addition to the 1.9 acres of directly cleared forest.



We project between 1,250 and 3,400 total wind turbines will be erected in Pennsylvania by 2030.

---

The number of wind turbines built in Pennsylvania will certainly expand during the next two decades. Various factors will drive exactly how many turbines are ultimately built including electricity prices, state and federal incentives, technological improvements, energy and climate policy, regulatory changes, and social preferences. Our projections assume economic, policy, and social conditions will remain favorable enough to promote steady expansion of wind development in the state since we cannot reasonably forecast energy prices, technological developments, and policy conditions. The key driver in our low scenario is that companies will use wind energy to meet 70 percent of the current Alternative Energy Portfolio Standard (AEPS) Tier 1 standard (8 percent of electric generation). This projection indicates an additional 750 turbines (2 MW average) will be added to the 500 turbines currently operating. The key driver in our medium scenario is that utilities will use wind energy to meet 70 percent of an expanded AEPS 15% Tier 1 standard, as proposed in recent draft legislation. That scenario would add 1,400 new turbines to those already built. The high scenario used in this assessment is based on the 20% wind power electric generation scenario used by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in the Eastern Wind Integration Study (EWITS). This scenario would require 2,900 additional turbines.

Where are those new turbines in each scenario more and less likely to go? To start, we created a probability surface by looking at a range of variables that might be relevant to a company's decision to develop a wind facility with wind turbines that have already been built. We used the maximum entropy modeling approach used to develop the Marcellus gas probability surface (see p. 13) and built the model using 580 existing and permitted wind turbines. Variables that potentially drive wind energy development were chosen based on data availability and included wind power ( $W/m^2$ ), distance to transmission lines, percent slope, distance to roads, and land cover. An additional 193 existing and permitted wind turbines were used to test the validity of the model's probability surface and the model was found to be 95.8% accurate in predicting existing and permitted turbines from randomly sampled undeveloped areas. The resulting probability map indicates many long, narrow high probability sites along ridge tops, and several wider areas on high plateaus and along the Lake Erie coastline.


To determine where wind development is more likely, we searched for the highest probability areas where wind turbines in each scenario might be located. The probability surface was re-sampled from 30-meter to 60-meter resolution (0.89 acres) to represent the approximate geographic footprint of wind turbines based on aerial photo assessment. We selected the highest probability pixel, buffered that pixel by a minimum separation distance of 800 feet (240 meters – the average minimum distance between existing turbines), and then selected the next highest probability pixel, and so on. Pixels were selected until the threshold for each scenario was reached (low – 700 turbines; medium – 1,200 turbines; high – 2,700 turbines). The selected pixels were then converted into points for map display purposes.

The resulting projected turbine locations occurred in strings, groups, or scattered single turbines, mostly in southwest, north central and northeastern parts of Pennsylvania. Wind turbines, however, are almost always located in clusters rather than widely separated locations for individual turbines. In order to represent viable wind farms, we selected clusters of pixels with high probability to represent viable wind facilities, based on the following:


- Excluded areas approximately 300 meters (1,000 ft) from existing homes (as visible in aerial imagery)
- Excluded buffers of regional airports by 6,096 m (20,000 ft) and local airports by 3,048 m (10,000 ft)
- Excluded buffers of existing turbines (buffer = 960 m or 4 times the minimum turbine separation distance of 240 m)
- Excluded Pennsylvania State Parks, Pennsylvania State Forests, and Pennsylvania State Game Lands
- Excluded setbacks of 152 m (500 ft) from the boundaries of state and federal lands

- Required a minimum of 6 projected turbines grouped together to be considered a potentially viable site
- Selected already proposed wind turbines (based on permit data from the Federal Aviation Administration)


Potential wind facilities were manually selected by identifying groupings of projected wind turbines. Scenarios are cumulative, so the medium scenario includes turbines in both the low and medium scenarios, whereas the high scenario includes all projected turbines.




Map showing existing wind turbines with the probability that a given area will be developed indicated by color (dark red is high probability; dark blue is low).




Map showing 1,400 new wind turbines projected by 2030 under the medium development scenario.



Map showing 750 new wind turbines projected by 2030 under the low development scenario.



Map showing 2,900 new wind turbines projected by 2030 under the high development scenario.



Map showing medium wind development scenario within Somerset and Bradford counties.

These geographic projections of future wind energy development are spatial representations of possible scenarios. They are not predictions. We faced several constraints in developing the geographic scenarios:

- We do not have the detailed wind power data that wind companies have developed through anemometer tower monitoring.
- We do not have the detailed location of wind energy leases.

Still, we believe the overall geographic patterns in the projected wind development locations are relatively robust for several reasons. We used over 500 existing or permitted wind turbines to build the model and nearly 200 additional existing and permitted wind turbine sites were used to validate the model. This is typically a sufficient sample size for building predictive models. They are also consistent with Black and Veatch (2010) projected locations for wind facilities under a 15% renewable energy portfolio standard.

## Conservation Impacts of Wind Energy Development

What is the overlap of the areas with the highest probability of future wind energy development and those areas known to have high conservation values? To answer this question, we intersected the projected wind energy facilities with high conservation value areas. We looked at several examples from four categories of conservation value, including:

- Forest habitats
- Freshwater habitats

- 
- Species of conservation concern
  - Outdoor recreation

Areas of overlap between likely future wind development areas and priority conservation areas in Pennsylvania are substantially less than the conservation area overlap with likely future Marcellus development areas, largely because the projected foot print will be much smaller.


## Forests

A large majority of projected wind turbines are found in forest patches, about 80 percent for each of the scenarios. The low scenario would see 600 new wind turbines in forest areas. With a cleared forest average of 1.9 acres per turbine (including roads and other infrastructure), the total forest loss would be a modest 1,900 acres. Indirect impacts to adjacent forest interior habitats would total an additional 13,400 acres. Forest impacts from the medium scenario (1,520 projected turbines in forest locations) would be 2,900 cleared forest acres and an additional 20,400 acres of adjacent forest interior habitat impacts. For the high scenario (2,720 turbines in forest areas) 5,200 acres would be cleared and an additional 36,500 acres of forest interior habitats would be affected by new adjacent clearings. On a statewide basis, the projected forest losses and accompanying interior forest habitat impacts will be minor given the Pennsylvania's 16 million acres of forest. Locally, these impacts could be significant for individual large forest patches where wind development takes place.


All forests have conservation value, but large contiguous forest patches are especially valuable because they sustain wide-ranging forest species, such as northern goshawk, than small patches. They are also more resistant to the spread of invasive species, can better withstand damage from wind and ice storms, and provide more ecosystem services – from carbon sequestration to water filtration – than small patches. The Nature Conservancy and the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy's Forest Conservation Analysis mapped nearly 25,000 forest patches in the state greater than 100 acres. Patches at least 1,000 acres in size are about a tenth of the total (2,700). The medium projected wind development scenarios indicate 73 patches (3%) greater than 1,000 acres in size are projected to have at least one wind turbine and associated infrastructure. Patches at least 5,000 acres in size are relatively rare (only 316 patches). The medium wind scenario indicates about 21 (7%) of these patches could be affected by future wind turbine development. Most affected large patches have multiple projected wind turbines (as many as 36). Typically, a large patch is split by wind development into two or three smaller patches due the linear pattern of development. Projected gas well pads, by contrast, are more likely to fragment a large patch into multiple smaller patches.

Forest interior bird species could be affected by the clearing of forest and adjacent edge effects that wind turbine facilities create in a forest context. We used data from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Breeding Bird Atlas Project (see p. 20) to assess the potential impact on forest interior species. The resulting maps show the estimated reduction in habitat for that species in each high wind development gas probability pixel (including both cleared forest and adjacent edge effects). Scarlet Tanagers are perhaps the most widespread forest interior nesting bird in the state. Since they are so widespread, the vast majority of their range in the state is outside of the most likely wind development areas. Scarlet Tanager populations could decline by an insignificant amount due to habitat losses projected in the medium scenario. Black-throated blue warblers are more narrowly distributed in Pennsylvania favoring mature northern hardwood and coniferous forests with a thick understory, frequently in mountain terrain. Likewise, population declines would also be extremely small for Black-throated blue warblers under the medium scenario.





Map showing estimated percent loss of habitat for Scarlet Tanagers under the medium wind scenario.




Map showing estimated percent loss of habitat for Black-Throated Blue Warblers under the medium wind scenario.


## Freshwater

Wind energy and freshwater habitats are not often thought of in the same context since most wind facilities are generally in high elevation areas away from rivers and streams. The exceptions are small headwater streams, some of which may be classified as Exceptional Value watersheds. Our medium scenario projection indicates that 9 percent of future turbine development could be located within ½ mile of an Exceptional Value stream.

Native brook trout are one of the most sensitive species in Pennsylvania watersheds. Brook trout favor cold, highly-oxygenated water and are unusually sensitive to warmer temperatures, sediments, and contaminants. Once widely distributed across Pennsylvania, healthy populations have retreated to a shrinking number of small watersheds. The potential impact on intact brook trout watersheds, however, does increase significantly between the low to high scenarios. Wind turbines have been built in just five of the intact brook trout watersheds identified by the Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture. That number would expand to 13 in the low scenario, 19 in the medium scenario, and 28 in the high scenario. The presence of wind turbines may pose a limited risk in many of these watersheds, principally from soil disturbance near headwater streams.



Map showing current number of wind turbines in intact and predicted intact brook trout watersheds.



Map showing projected number of wind turbines in intact brook trout watersheds (by 2030) under medium scenario.

Poorly designed or maintained sedimentation measures, especially on road cuts and stream crossings, is the principal risk to these sensitive populations.

### Rare Species

Of the approximately 100,000 species believed to occur in Pennsylvania, just over 1 percent is tracked by the Pennsylvania Natural Heritage Program (PNHP). These species are rare, declining or otherwise considered to be of conservation concern. PNHP records indicate that 77 tracked species have populations within pixels that have a relatively high modeled probability for wind development. Most of these species are commonly found in rocky outcrops and scrub oak/pitch pine barrens habitats on ridgetops across the state. Only a handful of species, however, have more than a few occurrences overlapping with the relatively high probability wind development pixels. For example, the eastern timber rattlesnake (*Crotalus horridus*) and Allegheny woodrat (*Neotoma magister*) are strongly associated with rocky outcrops and talus slopes along or near ridgetops. Six percent of the rattlesnake's known rattlesnake breeding/denning sites and three percent of Allegheny woodrat den sites are located in relatively high wind probability pixels. The den sites are very small sites and do not include foraging areas. The Pennsylvania Natural Heritage Program has developed core habitat polygons for each Allegheny woodrat occurrence. Much larger than the den locations, these polygons indicate a much broader overlap – 43 percent – with relatively high probability pixels for wind development. The Northern long-eared Myotis bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) has about eight percent of its known winter hibernation and summer roosting areas overlapping with relatively high probability wind development pixels. Ridgetop barrens communities in northeastern Pennsylvania have some of the state's largest concentrations of rare terrestrial species. The Nature Conservancy has mapped these communities, and some of these habitats overlap with high wind areas. In general, there appears to be relatively little overlap between tracked species occurrences in Pennsylvania and likely wind

---

development sites. For a handful of species, there is enough overlap to indicate the importance of surveys early in the project planning stage to identify the presence of rare species and their core habitats.

We have not addressed the potential impact of these scenarios on bird migration patterns and bat foraging populations. For more information on wind development impacts on bird and bat species, please see links to the Pennsylvania Game Commission, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, American Wind and Wildlife Institute, and Bat Conservation International.

### **Recreation**

Wind development has not occurred on any state or federal lands in Pennsylvania to date. Since our projections assume there will not be a significant change in state land leasing policies for wind development, we have not projected new wind turbines in State Parks, State Forests or State Game Lands. Our projections, however, do indicate that wind turbines will be located in close proximity (sometimes as close as 500 feet) to many state lands. They are likely to be highly visible in some heavily visited areas, such as Blue Knob State Park in Bedford County, where natural landscape vistas are a prime attraction.

---

## Key Findings

Key findings from the Pennsylvania Energy Impacts Assessment include:

- Projections of between 750 and 2,900 new wind turbines developed on ridgetops and high plateaus by 2030, depending on the size of the Pennsylvania Alternative Energy Portfolio standard. There are currently an estimated 500 wind turbines built in the state.
- Wind turbine facilities are likely to be developed in half of the state's counties, especially along the Allegheny front in western Pennsylvania and on high Central Appalachian ridges in central and northeastern parts of the state;
- Nearly eighty percent of turbine locations are projected to be in forest areas, with forest clearing projected to range between 1,900 and 5,200 acres depending on the number of turbines developed. An additional range of 13,400 to 36,500 acres of forest interior habitat impacts are projected due to new edges created by turbine pads and roads;
- On a statewide basis, the projected forest clearing from turbine development is relatively minor, though some of the state's largest forest patches (>5,000 acres) could be fragmented into smaller patches by projected wind turbine development;
- Impacts on forest interior breeding bird habitats appear to be limited, largely because the overall footprint for the projected wind turbine facilities is small in comparison to the typical breeding range of these species in Pennsylvania. The study did not assess impacts to migratory pathways for birds or foraging bats.
- Relatively few watersheds ranked as "intact" by the Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture are affected by projected wind turbine development. Several intact watersheds, however, could see several dozen wind turbines. In a number of cases, these small watersheds are projected to see significant Marcellus gas development as well. Given the cumulative impact of these activities, rigorously designed and monitored sediment control measures will be needed to protect sensitive brook trout populations.
- A relatively small handful of rare species occurrences tracked by the Pennsylvania Natural Heritage Program are found in areas with high probability for wind development. These species tend to be associated with rocky outcrops and barrens communities typically found on ridge tops, including the Allegheny wood rat, the eastern timber rattlesnake, and the northern long-eared Myotis bat.
- Wind development is not projected to occur on Pennsylvania's public lands. Existing and projected wind turbines, however, will be close to some of Pennsylvania's most heavily visited outdoor recreation areas where scenic natural vistas are a major attraction.

---

## Additional Information

- American Wind Energy Association (2010). U.S. Wind Projects Database.  
[http://www.awea.org/la\\_usprojects.cfm](http://www.awea.org/la_usprojects.cfm)
- Black and Veatch (2010). Assessment of a 15 Percent Pennsylvania Alternative Energy Portfolio Standard. Report prepared for the Community Foundation for the Alleghenies, Johnstown, PA.  
<http://www.cfalleghenies.org/pdf/aepss.pdf>
- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) permits for wind turbines:  
<https://oeaaa.faa.gov/oeaaa/external/public/publicAction.jsp?action=showCaseDownloadForm>
- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Obstruction Evaluation / Airport Airspace Analysis (OE/AAA):  
<https://oeaaa.faa.gov/oeaaa/external/public/publicAction.jsp?action=showCaseDownloadForm>
- Pennsylvania Wind Farms and Wildlife Collaborative: <http://www.dcnr.state.pa.us/wind/index.aspx>
- PA Game Commission (2007) Wind Energy Voluntary Cooperative Agreement and First Annual Report for the Wind Energy Voluntary Cooperative Agreement:  
<http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt?open=514&objID=613068&mode=2>
- Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, Chapter 93 Water Quality Standards, Exceptional Value and High Quality Streams: data downloaded from Pennsylvania Spatial Data Access:  
([www.pasda.psu.edu](http://www.pasda.psu.edu))
- U.S. Department of Energy TrueWind 80 Meter Wind Resource Maps:  
[http://www.windpoweringamerica.gov/wind\\_maps.asp](http://www.windpoweringamerica.gov/wind_maps.asp)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wind Turbine Advisory Committee:  
[http://www.fws.gov/habitatconservation/windpower/wind\\_turbine\\_advisory\\_committee.html](http://www.fws.gov/habitatconservation/windpower/wind_turbine_advisory_committee.html)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency summary of forest fragmentation effects:  
<http://cfpub.epa.gov/eroe/index.cfm?fuseaction=detail.viewInd&lv=list.listByAlpha&r=219658&subtop=210>
- Overview of forest fragmentation impacts on forest interior nesting species:  
<http://www.state.nj.us/dep/fgw/neomigr.htm>
- Overview of Pennsylvania High Quality and Exceptional Value Streams:  
<http://www.dcnr.state.pa.us/wlhabitat/aquatic/streamdist.aspx>
- Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture intact brook trout watersheds:  
<http://128.118.47.58/EBTJV/ebtjv2.html>

- 
- Overview of Carnegie Museum of Natural History, Powdermill Nature Reserve, and the Pennsylvania Game Commission's 2<sup>nd</sup> Pennsylvania Breeding Bird Atlas Project: <http://www.carnegiemnh.org/powdermill/atlas/2pbba.html>
  - Pennsylvania Natural Heritage Program, including lists of globally rare and state endangered and imperiled species: <http://www.naturalheritage.state.pa.us/>
  - U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, National Agriculture Imagery Program: <http://datagateway.nrcs.usda.gov/GDGOrder.aspx>