1 *ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER*

2 EFFECTS OF CROP TYPE AND HARVEST ON NEST SURVIVAL AND PRODUCTIVITY
3 OF DICKCISSELS IN SEMI-NATURAL GRASSLANDS

4 **Tara J. Conkling^{a,1,*}, Jerrold L. Belant^b, Travis L. DeVault^c, and James A. Martin^d**

5
6
7
8 ^aAgricultural Ecology Laboratory, Forest and Wildlife Research Center, Mississippi State
9 University, Box 9690, Mississippi State, MS 39762, USA.

10 ^bCarnivore Ecology Laboratory, Forest and Wildlife Research Center, Mississippi State
11 University, Box 9690, Mississippi State, MS 39762, USA

12 ^cUnited States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Wildlife
13 Services, National Wildlife Research Center, Sandusky, OH 44870, USA

14 ^dWarnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602,
15 USA.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 ¹Present address: U.S. Geological Survey, Forest and Rangeland Ecosystem Science Center,
24 Snake River Field Station, Boise, ID 83706, USA.

25 * Corresponding author.

26
27 E-mail addresses: tjconkling@gmail.com (T. Conkling), j.belant@msstate.edu (J. Belant), Travis
28 L.DeVault@aphis.usda.gov, (T. DeVault), martinj@warnell.uga.edu (J. Martin)

ABSTRACT

Recent focus on climate change and global energy production has increased interest in developing biofuels including perennial native grasses (e.g. switchgrass [*Panicum virgatum*]) as viable energy commodities while simultaneously maintaining ecosystem function and biodiversity. However, there is limited research examining the effects of biofuel-focused grasslands on grassland bird reproductive success and conservation. In 2011–2013 we studied the effects of vegetation composition and harvest regimens of switchgrass monocultures and native warm-season grass (NWSG) mixtures on nest success, nest density, and productivity for Dickcissels (*Spiza americana*) in Clay Co. MS, USA. There was no effect of vegetation metrics, harvest frequency, or biofuel treatment on nest survival. However, both vegetation composition and harvest frequencies influenced nest density and productivity. Native warm season grasses contained 54–64 times more nests relative to switchgrass treatments, and nest density and productivity was 10% greater in single harvest plots. Our results suggest semi-natural grasslands can balance biofuel production, ecosystem functionality, and conservation so that biofuels offer an opportunity for wildlife conservation rather than a continued threat to grassland birds.

KEYWORDS biofuels, Dickcissels, grassland birds, nest survival, *Panicum virgatum*, productivity

1. Introduction

Biofuels are a recent focus of global energy policies aimed at reducing greenhouse-gas emissions and alleviating climate change concerns while bolstering local economies (Farrell *et al.*, 2006; Campbell *et al.*, 2008; Tilman *et al.*, 2009; U.S. EPA, 2011). As such, there is increased interest in the use of perennial native grasses (e.g., switchgrass [*Panicum virgatum*])

for bioenergy production as they may also maintain ecosystem services including water and soil quality and wildlife habitat (McLaughlin and Kszos, 2005; Parrish and Fike, 2005; Fargione *et al.*, 2009; Hartman *et al.*, 2011; Uden *et al.*, 2014). However, there is limited research addressing the effects of semi-natural grasslands (Allen *et al.*, 2011) for biofuel production on the distribution, habitat selection, and demography of wildlife (Murray and Best, 2003; Allen *et al.*, 2011; Mitchell *et al.*, 2012; Dunlap, 2014).

Semi-natural grasslands managed for biofuels may mimic natural grasslands based on overall ecosystem functionality and vegetation structure (Fletcher Jr. and Koford, 2002), but there is ongoing debate regarding the most appropriate grass species or harvest strategies to use for energy production while maintaining biodiversity. Switchgrass monocultures often produce more cellulosic ethanol than low-input high-diversity plant mixtures because greater plant species richness decreases biofuel yield (Adler *et al.*, 2009). However, greater structural and species heterogeneity in mixed species plantings supports greater biodiversity and ecosystem functions (Tilman *et al.*, 2006; Adler *et al.*, 2009; Meehan *et al.*, 2010; Werling *et al.*, 2014). Additionally, these mixed species plantings provide resources important for breeding birds including potential nest sites and arthropods for nestling sustenance (Simpson, 1949; MacArthur and MacArthur, 1961; Wiens, 1974; Rotenberry, 1985; McCoy *et al.*, 2001). Biofuel production also requires annual or semi-annual harvests, with a main cutting traditionally during fall or winter months to maximize total biomass, and a potential secondary cutting for forage or biomass during the summer (Vogel *et al.*, 2002; Fike *et al.*, 2006; Liu *et al.*, 2015). As such, the timing of these additional harvest events can be detrimental to avian species if they occur during the breeding season (Roth *et al.*, 2005) because they destroy active nests, remove vegetative cover, and reduce food availability (Bollinger *et al.*, 1990; Kershner and Bollinger, 1996; Warren

and Anderson, 2005; Perlut *et al.*, 2006). Biomass harvests can also reduce plant height and density in subsequent years (Roth *et al.*, 2005) which may leave nests more vulnerable to detection by predators (Martin, 1993). Additionally, most avian species abandon harvested plots for the remainder of the breeding season (Frawley and Best, 1991), limiting future nest attempts and seasonal productivity.

Habitat manipulations can afford unique opportunities to understand management concurrently with ecological concepts. Animals select breeding habitats by distributing themselves across landscapes to maximize fitness within the constraint of resource availability and predation risk to themselves and offspring (Grinnell, 1917; Hildén, 1965; Jones, 2001; Fontaine and Martin, 2006). Considering animal settlement patterns, the ideal free distribution [IFD] model (Fretwell and Lucas Jr., 1969) predicts that local habitat quality determine species' density, resulting in equal fitness across all individuals regardless of habitat quality. In contrast, the ideal despotic distribution [IDD] model (Fretwell, 1972) suggests breeding birds occupy territories based on competition in addition to resource availability, thereby relegating subordinates into lower quality, less productive habitat, which leads to variation in per capita productivity. Regardless of distribution models used to examine individual fitness, resource rich environments and mixed species plantings support greater densities of breeding birds and greater total production of offspring per unit area (Fretwell and Lucas Jr., 1969; Bakker and Higgins, 2009), thereby contributing more individuals to the overall population. Thus, areas receiving multiple annual harvests or containing switchgrass monocultures would be expected to provide lower quality habitat and concomitant avian productivity than areas receiving single annual harvests or containing native warm-season grass mixtures. This effect would be exacerbated if competitive behaviors resulted in unequal per capita productivity across treatments.

We examined the effects of biofuel treatments on nest success, nest density, and productivity of Dickcissels (*Spiza americana*), a polygynous, ground and shrub-nesting grassland bird of conservation concern (Blankspoor, 1970; Temple, 2002). We predicted daily survival rate (DSR) and nest density would be greater in native warm-season grasslands (hereafter “NWSG”) than in switchgrass monocultures after accounting for other nest survival covariates including microhabitat and plot-level characteristics, ordinal date, and nest age (Jensen and Finck, 2004; Shaffer, 2004; Grant *et al.*, 2005). We also expected nest survival and nest density in multiple-harvested plots to be lower than single-harvested plots due to increased predation risk or direct failures from mowing and plot abandonment following harvest (Frawley and Best, 1991). As productivity per unit area is a product of reproductive success and nest density, even if nest survival was similar across treatment types, we expected plots with greater nest density to produce more offspring per hectare. However, in accordance with ideal free distribution, individual productivity would be similar across all territories, regardless of treatment. Conversely, if males display an ideal despotic distribution (Zimmerman, 1982), males in higher quality territories will also have greater individual productivity. This could have population-level implications for grassland birds if the potential loss of high quality breeding habitat due to biofuel cultivation reduces overall offspring production while also limiting the reproductive efforts of dominant individuals that would normally breed there (Haché *et al.*, 2013).

2. Methods

2.1 Study Area

This study was conducted from late April to late July 2011–2013 at B. Bryan Farm in Clay Co., Mississippi, on 16 plots (range: 4.73–8.51 ha) configured in a randomized complete block design. B. Bryan Farm is comprised mostly of row crop agriculture, pastureland, and

conservation easements situated within the historical range of the Blackland Prairie (Barone, 2005). Eight plots were planted in spring 2010 with a mixture of warm season grasses (e.g. big bluestem [*Andropogon gerardii*], little bluestem [*Schizachyrium scoparium*], indian grass [*Sorghastrum nutans*]) and forb species including Illinois bundleflower (*Desmanthus illinoensis*), wild blue lupine (*Lupinus perennis*), and tickseed sunflower (*Bidens aristosa*) and eight were planted with switchgrass; other species in the seedbank included giant ragweed (*Ambrosia trifida*), broadleaf signalgrass (*Urochloa platyphylla*) and *Sesbania* spp. All plots were mowed in April 2012 prior to green-up to simulate harvest. Additionally, 4 “multiple harvest” plots of each vegetation type were also harvested annually in late-June 2012 and 2013, resulting in 4 unique treatments: native warm-season grass single harvest (“NWSG single harvest”), switchgrass single harvest (“switchgrass single harvest”), native warm-season grass multiple annual harvest (“NWSG multiple harvest”), and switchgrass multiple annual harvest (“switchgrass multiple harvest”). One switchgrass single harvest plot and 1 switchgrass multiple harvest plot failed to establish sufficient vegetation so we limited subsequent analyses to the remaining 14 plots.

2.2 Territory Mapping and Banding

We conducted weekly visits to all plots and noted arrival dates of male Dickcissels to determine the pattern of habitat settlement from 1 May in 2011 and 24 April in 2012 and 2013 to 15 July each year. Once male Dickcissels established territories, we used target mist-netting for territorial males by attracting birds with conspecific playback of songs and call notes. After capture, we aged and banded all adult birds with a USFWS aluminum band and unique 3-color band combination for individual identification under approved permits (Mississippi State University IACUC approval #11-020, Mississippi Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit Federal Bird Banding Permit #22456).

We delineated territory areas for all males in the study plots by conducting surveys every 3–10 days from 0530–1200 CDT by walking each plot along 100-m gridlines established to ensure systematic sampling effort and to minimize disturbance to Dickcissels (Baker, 2011). If birds were present, we monitored birds from ≥ 15 m for at least 20 minutes and recorded 3–7 unique bird locations/survey with a handheld Global Positioning System (GPS), excluding locations where birds were influenced by observer presence, (e.g. birds engaged in scolding behaviors directed towards the observer). Following biomass harvest on treatment plots in late-June 2012 and 2013, we continued territory mapping and re-sighting efforts across all plots until 15 July. We used fixed kernel density estimators (KDE) and 95% volume contours to estimate territory size (Silverman, 1986; Worton, 1989) for all territorial males present ≥ 3 weeks for use in subsequent analyses using package *adehabitatHR* (Calenge, 2006) in program R 3.1.3 (R Core Team, 2015). We excluded territories from subsequent density analyses if the calculated 95% KDE contained $\leq 25\%$ of the study plots.

2.3 Nest searching and monitoring

From 1 May–9 August 2011 to 2013 we found and monitored nests using structured (systematic rope-dragging or walking), opportunistic, and behavioral searches (Conkling *et al.*, 2015). We searched all 14 plots in 2011–2012, and only NWSG plots in 2013 based on the limited number of nests for all avian species found in switchgrass during previous 2 seasons ($n = 11$, T. Conkling, unpublished results). For bi-weekly structured searches, 3 technicians used a 25-m rope with attached noisemakers to disturb vegetation, walking the entire study area to flush nesting birds. Existing vegetation limited rope-dragging efforts in 2011 (mostly *Sesbania* spp. > 2 m tall), necessitating the use of systematic walking by 3–5 technicians spaced at 4 m intervals disturbing the vegetation with hand-held 2-m PVC pipes (2.5 cm diameter). As part of

the experimental treatment, all plots were mowed to ~16 cm prior to the arrival of Dickcissels in April 2012; this also allowed observers to use rope-dragging for structured searches in 2012 and 2013. Additionally, we found nests opportunistically based on adult behaviors, incidental flushes, or by locating a nest in the absence of adult cues during visits to active Dickcissel territories every 3–10 days while conducting other activities (e.g. vegetation sampling, nest checks, and behavioral monitoring). We allocated equal time monitoring birds in all territories (≥ 30 minutes each week) to balance search efforts regardless of treatment. During all searches, observers spent ≤ 10 minutes scanning the vegetation to locate nests after a bird was flushed (Barg *et al.*, 2005).

We recorded the location of each nest with a handheld GPS and marked the nests with flagging >5m north of the nest. We then monitored all nests at 2–6 day intervals until the nest failed or young fledged (day 9–10 post-hatching) to determine nest fate and calculate daily survival rate. For nests found after hatch date, we aged nest contents based on physical development of nestlings (Temple, 2002) and then back-dated to determine incubation initiation date (12 days incubation, 9 days nestling). When we found nests after incubation began that failed prior to hatch date, we estimated incubation initiation date by assuming the midpoint of incubation (6 days) coincided with halfway between available check dates (Sousa and Westneat, 2012). In 2012 and 2013 we banded nestlings at approximately 6 days old with a USFWS aluminum band and 2-color band combination unique to each nest. We estimated territory productivity as the maximum of the number of fledglings per territory based on the total nestlings present at the last nest check before fledging for successful nests and the maximum number of fledglings observed interacting with an adult bird (e.g. active begging or feeding behaviors) in that territory irrespective of nest. If we observed banded fledglings, we only

counted those individuals towards the maximum number of fledglings for their original nesting territory, regardless of their observed location.

We collected nest vegetation measurements about 2 weeks after the estimated hatch date to avoid nest disturbance or prematurely force-fledging nestlings and to reduce variability on the timing of vegetation collection. We measured nest height, maximum vegetation height, litter depth, and vegetation visual obstruction with a Robel pole observed at a distance of 4m and height of 1m in each of the cardinal directions (Robel *et al.*, 1970). We calculated distance to nearest edge of grassland habitat using ArcMap 10.1 (ESRI, 2011). We also calculated nest visible height as the difference between nest height and mean visual obstruction. A nest with a positive visible height would be potentially visible from 4m, whereas a negative visible height indicated that a nest would be obscured by vegetation.

We collected plot-level vegetation data along 5 randomly located 50-m transects to determine structure and species composition among treatments. We first used a geographic information system (ESRI, 2011), to overlay a 50 x 50 m grid on each study plot and randomly selected 5 grid squares per plot for transect locations established as part of a concurrent study. Each 50-m transect was centered on the grid square midpoint with a randomly assigned transect orientation. We sampled each transect in March 2011 and then monthly from June 2011–December 2013, but we restricted analyses to samples collected in June each year (prior to midseason harvest) to limit effects of harvest on resulting vegetation measurements. We used the point-intercept method (FIREMON, 2007) to quantify vegetation species composition by recording litter depth along with species name and height (cm) for the 3 most common vegetation species at 5-m intervals along the transect (10 measurements/transect). We also classified vegetation structure at 10-m intervals (5 measurements/transect) by recording

maximum height of visual obstruction from each of the 4 cardinal directions with a Robel pole (Robel *et al.*, 1970).

2.4 Statistical analyses

We used R 3.1.3 (R Core Team, 2015) to test covariates for multicollinearity based on variance inflation factors (VIFs; Zuur *et al.* 2009). Nest height VIF was >3, so we removed it from subsequent analyses; after removal, all other VIFs were <1.12, indicating no multicollinearity between the remaining variables. We calculated mean values ($\pm$ SE) for nest age at initial discovery (hereafter “age found”), nest visible height, and distance to edge of habitat and plot-level characteristics including first week of territory establishment by males (hereafter “first week”), vegetation visual obstruction, and estimated vegetation species diversity by plot using Shannon’s Diversity Index (H' ; Hill 1973) based on the maximum number of species detected from all transects at each plot annually in June. We used analysis of variance (ANOVA; $\alpha = 0.05$), linear mixed models with R package *lme4* (Bates *et al.*, 2015), and Tukey’s test ($\alpha = 0.05$) with plot as a random effect to compare mean differences of vegetation metrics among treatments.

2.4.1 Nest survival modeling

We used a Bayesian framework (Royle and Dorazio, 2008) using JAGS 3.4.0 (Plummer, 2013) and R package R2jags (Su and Yajima, 2014) to estimate daily nest survival for monitored nests based on vegetation characteristics (visible height, distance to habitat edge), linear and quadratic effects of date, linear and quadratic effects of nest age, year, mean Robel measurement for the plot, and treatment, with plot and search method as random effects to account for potential variation in survival estimates (Conkling *et al.*, 2015). We calculated period nest survival for nests starting on median incubation initiation date (25 May) and multiplied daily

survival rate estimates generated for each of 21 days in the nesting period (i.e. incubation to fledging (Temple, 2002)). We standardized all data and used uninformative priors for all parameters and sampled using MCMC procedures with 3 independent Markov chains, 25000 burn in, and 75000 iterations. We examined traceplots and posterior distributions for the effects of interest using Brooks-Gelman-Rubin statistics ($\hat{R}$) <1.05 and evaluated goodness of fit for all models and the proportion of posterior distribution values >0 or <0 when 95% credible intervals overlapped zero using Bayesian *P*-values (Brooks and Gelman, 1998; Schmidt *et al.*, 2010; Gelman *et al.*, 2014).

2.4.2 Plot Nest Density and Productivity

We estimated nest density per ha by treatment per year given the total number of nests observed with contents (eggs or nestlings) using a generalized linear mixed model with a Poisson distribution within the same Bayesian framework outlined above. We used treatment and year as fixed effects, a random effect of plot, and plot area (ha) as an offset to account for differences in nest density based on survey area. Many analyses estimating densities of animal populations include detection probabilities (MacKenzie, 2006; Royle and Dorazio, 2008; Fiske and Chandler, 2011), although this is often difficult to account for in nest searching (but see Monroe 2014). Given the complexity of nest detection models (Monroe, 2014), we instead used unadjusted counts of nests found per plot as an index of nest density. As a result, we accounted for potential discrepancies in nest density by equally allotting nest searching efforts using systematic searches among treatments and spent a minimum of 30 minutes weekly in every identified territory. We estimated mean brood size for each treatment from the number of nestlings present in nests during the last nest visit before fledging (With *et al.*, 2008). We calculated the odds ratio for categorical covariates in the model by exponentiating the resulting parameter coefficients.

Finally, we estimated productivity (fledglings/ha) by vegetation treatment and year during each iteration within the Bayesian framework by multiplying the estimates for 21-day period survival and nest density by an estimate of brood size sampled from a normal distribution with treatment-specific means and variance. We used Cohen's D to calculate effect sizes between treatments to assess biological importance (Cohen, 1988; Nakagawa and Cuthill, 2007) by calculating the mean difference between groups, with Cohen (1988) defining effect sizes as small ($d = 0.20$), medium ($d = 0.50$), and large ($d = 0.80$). We also used Cohen's U_3 index derived from calculated effect sizes and corresponding z scores to determine the percentile gain of mean values between treatments (Durlak, 2009). For example, a large effect size of 0.8 corresponds to the 79th percentile under the normal curve, indicating that the mean value for a given treatment is 29 percentiles greater than mean value in the reference treatment (i.e. 50% percentile), whereas a small (0.2) effect size only equals an 8% difference between mean treatment values.

2.4.3 Territory Nest Density and Productivity

To determine if productivity varied at the territory level across treatments in accordance with IDD, we used a Bayesian framework to estimate nest density for each documented territory. We used a generalized linear mixed model with a zero-inflated Poisson distribution with vegetation treatment and year as fixed effects, random effect of plot, and total territorial males per plot as an offset to control for male density as outlined above. We then calculated productivity (fledglings/ha) per territory by multiplying territory nest density by brood size and period survival estimates for each treatment and year. We restricted our territory-level analyses to territories that included $\geq 25\%$ of the study plots.

3. Results

We monitored 238 nests (99 in 2011, 79 in 2012, 60 in 2013) in 176 Dickcissel territories and located 0 to 6 nests per territory ($\bar{x} = 1.65 \pm 0.04$); we only found 7 nests (3%) in switchgrass (5 in 2011, 1 in 2012, 1 in 2013). Settlement dates for males establishing territories were similar among treatments ($F_{1,6} = 1.34$, $P = 0.29$; Table A.1). Predation accounted for 63.8% of apparent nest failures, 11 nests (4.8%) failed due to mowing, 3 (1.3%) nests failed to hatch and were subsequently abandoned by adults, and 8 others (3.4%) were abandoned in the incubation stage for unknown reasons. Only 2 nests (0.8%) were parasitized by a single brown-headed cowbird (*Molothrus ater*) egg, with 1 nest later depredated during incubation, and 1 fledging a cowbird offspring. Nine nests were associated with territorial males but located outside of the plots and were excluded from analyses. The ages of nests found ($F_{3,7} = 0.68$, $P = 0.59$), nest visible height ($F_{3,7} = 2.64$, $P = 0.13$), and distance to edge ($F_{3,7} = 1.88$, $P = 0.22$) were similar among treatment types (Table A.1). Plot-level vegetation visual obstruction was greater in mature switchgrass treatments compared with NWSG (2013: $F_{3,10} = 28.72$, $P < 0.01$), although this metric varied during plot establishment years (2011: $F_{3,10} = 8.43$, $P < 0.01$; 2012: $F_{3,10} = 0.46$, $P = 0.72$); (Table A.2 & Fig. A.1). Additionally, plant diversity was greater in NWSG relative to switchgrass across all years ($F_{3,10} = 26.15$, $P < 0.01$), but was similar between harvest frequencies for each vegetation type (Fig. A.1).

There was no effect of vegetation metrics, harvest frequency, or biofuel treatment on nest survival. Daily survival rate for breeding Dickcissels was best explained by quadratic nest age, quadratic date, year (2012) and age of the nest when found (Table 1). Additionally, the period survival for the 21-day nesting cycle based on median initiation date indicated that overall survival of multiple-harvest treatments was not lower than single harvest treatments even with

mid-season harvests destroying active nests. (Table 2). Daily survival rate decreased as nests contents aged, resulting in lower survival for nestlings relative to the egg stage. Similarly, DSR declined as the season progressed, although there was a positive effect of quadratic date on survival. Additionally, DSR increased for nests found later in the nesting cycle independent of the effect of nest age ($\beta = 0.287$, 95% CrI: 0.093, 0.486). We also noted a marginal effect of distance to habitat edge (Bayesian P -value = 0.92).

The estimated nest density across plots ranged from 0.02 to 2.56 nests per hectare (Table 2). Nest density and productivity were lower in 2013 than in previous years and NWSG plots contained 54.0–64.6 times more nests than switchgrass monocultures of the same harvest frequency (Tables 2 & 3, Fig. 1), providing support that birds chose breeding locations in NWSG based on vegetation heterogeneity and diversity (Fig. A.1). Additionally, nest density and resulting productivity estimates were 2.4 times greater for NWSG single harvest plots relative to NWSG multiple harvest. The Bayesian P -value (0.78) for nest density indicated that the posterior distribution overlapped zero, but Cohen's effect sizes (2011: $d = 0.27$ [95% CI: 0.19, 0.34]; 2012: $d = 0.28$ [95% CI: 0.21, 0.35]; 2013: $d = 0.27$ [95% CI: 0.20, 0.35]) indicated a small practical significance, with a >10.5% gain in nest density estimates for single harvest plots (2011: $U_3 = 60.5\%$; 2012: $U_3 = 61.1\%$; 2013: $U_3 = 60.8\%$).

Most Dickcissel territories were located primarily in NWSG treatments; there was no significant difference between harvest frequencies in either 95% KDE territory area or the proportion of NWSG contained within the 95% KDE (Table A.2). We only had 2 Dickcissel territories with a greater proportion of their 95% KDE territory area within switchgrass treatment plots rather than in NWSG, so we restricted our territory-scale analyses to birds in NWSG

treatments. We also excluded 5 territories from subsequent analyses whose 95% KDE contained $\leq 25\%$ of treatment plots.

For the 7 nests located in switchgrass, we identified 4 territories associated with nests in switchgrass plots, but most of the 95% KDE territory areas for associated males were located in NWSG treatments (mean proportion = 0.62 ± 0.08). The remaining 3 nests were $>50\text{m}$ from the nearest known location of any territorial male so we were unable to determine the male associated with them. There was no difference in territory nest density between harvest frequencies (Table 4), but there were fewer nests in 2012 and 2013 relative to 2011, in accordance with increasing vegetation structure as all grasses matured (Fig. A.1). Additionally, per capita productivity did not differ between NWSG single harvest and multiple harvest treatments (Table 4), contrary to predictions based on IDD that individual reproductive success would be greatest in the higher quality habitat.

4. Discussion

Species composition of vegetation did not affect nest survival but there was a negative effect of switchgrass on nest density and productivity. Dickcissels appeared to perceive NWSG as higher quality habitat in accordance to IFD and IDD density-dependence predictions (Svårdson, 1949; Fretwell and Lucas Jr., 1969; Morisita, 1969; Petit and Petit, 1996), establishing territories and building nests in greater densities relative to switchgrass plots. Birds respond positively to increased vegetation structural complexity in high diversity plant mixtures (Simpson, 1949; MacArthur and MacArthur, 1961; Wiens, 1974; Robertson *et al.*, 2011), including those used for biofuels (Robertson *et al.*, 2011; Blank *et al.*, 2014). Although switchgrass and other cellulosic biofuels produce less ethanol than corn, they can offer a suitable alternative to rowcrop production on marginal lands (DeVault *et al.*, 2012) while providing

ecosystem benefits including carbon sequestration and grassland bird conservation (Fargione *et al.*, 2009; Werling *et al.*, 2014). However, monocultures of native grass species may not provide quality breeding habitat, especially as grasses mature (Keyser *et al.*, 2012). Switchgrass monocultures produce more ethanol than NWSG (Adler *et al.*, 2009), but the vegetation heterogeneity in NWSG that limits biofuel production also provides higher quality habitat for breeding grassland birds.

Our small sample size of only 7 nests in switchgrass plots may have limited the ability of our nest survival model to identify vegetation treatment effects. For example, period survival for switchgrass single harvest nests in 2011 ($\bar{x} = 0.316 \pm 0.230$) was greater than all other treatment types (Table 2), but this estimate was based on data from 4 total nests, compared with 32 nests in NWSG multiple harvest and 60 in NWSG single harvest plots, respectively. Regardless of model limitations, >97% of nests in our study were located in NWSG and only 2 of 176 males established territories primarily in switchgrass treatment plots, providing support that vegetation species composition had a strong effect on the overall nest density. Additionally, 5 of the 7 total switchgrass nests were found in the initial year of the study, further suggesting that mature grass monocultures might not be used by breeding grassland birds.

Contrary to our initial predictions regarding harvest frequency, multiple harvests did not reduce nest daily survival rates. We observed 11 nest failures attributed to mowing during June harvests, but these failures had minimal influence on the effects of harvest frequency on DSR, likely due to the low number of active nests ($n = 40$; 17% of total nests) in late June 2012 and 2013, and lower nest density in multiple-harvest plots. Perlut *et al.* (2006) also noted that while mowing was responsible for nest failures at 55% of nests on fields hayed in the middle of the breeding season (21 June–10 July), there was no difference in nest survival compared to

unmowed plots until after the nesting season. In contrast, our nest density and plot productivity estimates were greater in single harvest treatments relative to multiple harvest plots. While Bayesian *P*-values for the posterior distribution overlapped zero, this lack of statistical support may be due to the small number of NWSG plots sampled each year. Regardless, we observed a 10.8% annual mean gain in nest densities for single harvest plots; a change in vital rates $\geq 10\%$ may be biologically important for avian populations (Powell *et al.*, 1999; Donovan and Thompson III, 2001; Nakagawa and Cuthill, 2007). Also, our estimates of plot productivity were calculated based only on nest contents at the last nest visit before fledging and did not account for fledgling survival rates (Streby *et al.*, 2014). Fledglings of many grassland birds species including Dickcissels have limited mobility and remain near the nest for at least 1–2 weeks post-fledging (Berkeley *et al.*, 2007), making them vulnerable to predation, mowing, or other negative harvest effects that could exacerbate treatment effects on seasonal productivity.

Although we observed no difference in territorial male density between harvest frequencies (T. Conkling, unpublished results), the lower nest densities in multiple harvest plots suggest that Dickcissel females perceived a reduction in potential nest sites or food in these locations. It is unclear which habitat cues females use to select breeding habitat (Zimmerman, 1971, 1982; Finck, 1984; Temple, 2002). However, site fidelity for females is rare (Walk *et al.*, 2004; Small *et al.*, 2012; Sousa, 2012), suggesting they may be sensitive to annual changes in vegetation cover, food, availability of potential nest sites, and individual male quality (Orians and Wittenberger 1991; Germain and Arcese 2014; Zabala and Zuberogitia 2014; Conkling 2016). In contrast, up to 45% of Dickcissel males returned to their same breeding plots regardless of varying habitat conditions or previous productivity (Zimmerman and Finck 1989; Sousa and Westneat 2012; T. Conkling, unpublished results). This “always stay” strategy may be

394 advantageous for territorial birds attempting to maximize fitness in non-stable, intermediate
395 grasslands (Switzer, 1993) where existing vegetation structure and arthropods available at
396 territory establishment do not reflect conditions present later in the season (Sergio *et al.*, 2011) or
397 the likelihood of mid-season harvests.

398 At the individual scale, Dickcissels engaged in despotic behaviors to defend territories,
399 but dominant individuals appeared to be distributed equally across single harvest and multiple
400 harvest plots, resulting in similar estimates of per capita productivity among harvest treatments,
401 contrary to predictions based on ideal despotic distribution. Zimmerman (1982) suggested that
402 Dickcissel males breeding in preferred habitats experienced increased productivity due to higher
403 orders of polygyny resulting from more females attracted to potential nest sites. Dickcissel
404 populations may demonstrate an ideal despotic distribution as a consequence of increased female
405 density (Zimmerman, 1982), but this effect may be restricted to the core of their breeding range
406 where either quality breeding habitat can support additional females or the overall number of
407 females may be greater, thereby allowing higher orders of polygyny. We only observed low
408 orders of polygyny (≤ 3 females/territory) and no difference in the number of females per
409 territory between single and multiple harvest treatments (T. Conkling, unpublished results),
410 which may limit variation in per capita productivity between single and multiple harvest plots.

411 In addition to harvest frequency and year, factors such as individual quality can also
412 increase territory productivity, thereby obscuring site-specific habitat effects of avian fitness
413 (Germain and Arcese, 2014; Zabala and Zuberogoitia, 2014). For example, males establishing
414 territories earlier in the breeding season may have greater productivity than later-arriving males
415 (Lanyon and Thompson 1986; Grzybowski et al. 2005; Joos et al. 2014; Conkling 2016). In turn,
416 arrival date may be influenced by site fidelity or familiarity, age, and conspecific cues, all of

which may increase breeding success and seasonal productivity (Greenwood, 1980; Cody, 1985; Zimmerman and Finck, 1989; Switzer, 1993; Pärt, 2001). Accounting for individual metrics such as settlement patterns and site fidelity may help identify additional relationships between habitat covariates and individual productivity (Conkling, 2016).

5. Conclusions

Increasing our knowledge of factors important to nest success or productivity is necessary to understand the impacts that biofuel production in semi-natural grasslands may have on avian populations (Allen *et al.*, 2011). We did not find a treatment effect on nest survival, similar to Conover *et al.* (2011). However, vegetation species composition and, to a lesser extent, harvest frequency can be important factors driving avian habitat choices and resulting productivity (Perlut *et al.*, 2006; Murray and Best, 2014). Thus, promoting the use of second generation perennial biofuels such as switchgrass improves biodiversity and ecosystem function over monoculture annual plants such as corn, but the actual benefit to avian populations may be limited if monocultures function as poor breeding habitat for grassland birds, one of the most imperiled group of birds in North America (Peterjohn and Sauer, 1999; Askins *et al.*, 2007). Incorporating a diverse forb mixture into biofuel planning or interspersing switchgrass and NWSG plots to maximize biodiversity while still allowing for biofuel production may provide adequate biomass and improved habitat for breeding grassland birds (Tilman *et al.*, 2006). Additionally, altering timing of harvest to early fall or the following spring would have limited effects on nutritional value or combustibility of biomass while minimizing disturbances during the breeding season and potentially providing important migration and overwintering habitat (Adler *et al.* 2006; Robertson *et al.* 2011; Gamble *et al.* 2014; Conkling 2016) . Our results also highlight the importance of estimating avian density and nest survival to improve habitat

440 management. Density alone may not accurately reflect productivity or habitat quality of a given
441 patch (Van Horne, 1983; Vickery *et al.*, 1992; Berry *et al.*, 1998; Hughes *et al.*, 1999). By
442 estimating nest density in conjunction with fitness metrics such as nest survival (Van Horne,
443 1983; Bock and Jones, 2004; Johnson, 2007), researchers can more effectively estimate effects of
444 proposed biofuel vegetation treatments on avian populations of grassland birds. Biofuel
445 production is likely to become a greater focus of land use in the near future. As such, this
446 research provides guidance for management and conservation efforts aimed at balancing biofuel
447 production, ecosystem functionality, and grassland bird conservation so that biofuels become an
448 opportunity for wildlife conservation rather than a continued threat (Robertson *et al.*, 2012).

Acknowledgements

We thank W. Batton, K. Biondi, T. Campbell, C. Bogan, J. Burger, A. Clark, K. Drey, S. Easley, K. Fleming, T. Guthrie, G. Holmes, L. Latino, B. McKinley, Z. Loman, A. Monroe, K. Newcomb, E. O'Donnell, F. Owen, T. Pickering, T. Pope, A. Tisdale, M. Waldron, and others for field assistance. F. Bled, M-B. Lee, and A. Monroe provided help with statistical analyses. We also thank Bryan Farms and L. W. Burger for plot access. Multiple anonymous reviewers provided beneficial reviews. Funding was provided by the Federal Aviation Administration and the USDA-APHIS National Wildlife Research Center [1374390735CA]. USDA NRCS, USFWS Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program, the Mississippi Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station (MAFES), the Forest and Wildlife Research Center, and the College of Forest Resources at Mississippi State University provided additional support. The study sponsors had no additional role in study design, data collection, analysis, and interpretation, and in the decision to submit the paper for publication. Opinions expressed in this study do not necessarily reflect current FAA policy decisions regarding the control of wildlife on or near airports.

References

- Adler, P.R., Sanderson, M.A., Boateng, A.A., Weimer, P.I., Jung, H.J.G., 2006. Biomass yield and biofuel quality of switchgrass harvested in fall or spring. *Agronomy Journal* 98, 1518–1525.
- Adler, P.R., Sanderson, M.A., Weimer, P.J., Vogel, K.P., 2009. Plant species composition and biofuel yields of conservation grasslands. *Ecological Applications* 19, 2202–2209.

469 Allen, V., Batello, C., Berretta, E., Hodgson, J., Kothmann, M., Li, X., McIvor, J., Milne, J.,
 470 Morris, C., Peeters, A., 2011. An international terminology for grazing lands and grazing
 471 animals. *Grass and Forage Science* 66, 2–28.

472 Askins, R.A., Chavez-Ramirez, F., Dale, B.C., Haas, C.A., Herkert, J.R., Knopf, F.L., Vickery,
 473 P.D., 2007. Conservation of grassland birds in North America: Understanding ecological
 474 processes in different regions. Report of the AOU Committee on Conservation. *Ornithol.*
 475 *Monogr.* 64, 1–98.

476 Baker, K.L., 2011. Nestling provisioning by Dickcissels in native warm-season grass field
 477 buffers. Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS.

478 Bakker, K.K., Higgins, K.F., 2009. Planted grasslands and native sod prairie: equivalent habitat
 479 for grassland birds? *West. North Am. Naturalist* 69, 235–242.

480 Barg, J.J., Jones, J., Robertson, R.J., 2005. Describing breeding territories of migratory
 481 passerines: suggestions for sampling, choice of estimator, and delineation of core areas. *J.*
 482 *Anim. Ecol.* 74, 139–149.

483 Barone, J.A., 2005. Historical presence and distribution of prairies in the Black Belt of
 484 Mississippi and Alabama. *Castanea* 70, 170–183.

485 Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., Walker, S., 2015. lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using
 486 Eigen and S4. R package version 1.1-9. <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lme4>.

487 Berkeley, L.I., McCarty, J.P., Wolfenbarger, L.L., 2007. Postfledging survival and movement in
 488 Dickcissels (*Spiza americana*): Implications for habitat management and conservation.
 489 *Auk* 124, 396–409.

490 Berry, M.E., Bock, C.E., Haire, S.L., 1998. Abundance of diurnal raptors on open space
 491 grasslands in an urbanized landscape. *Condor* 100, 601–608.

492 Blank, P.J., Sample, D.W., Williams, C.L., Turner, M.G., 2014. Bird communities and biomass
 493 yields in potential bioenergy grasslands. PLoS One 9, e109989.

494 Blankspoor, G.W., 1970. The significance of nest site and nest site microclimate for the
 495 Dickcissel, *Spiza americana*. Kansas State University.

496 Bock, C.E., Jones, Z.F., 2004. Avian habitat evaluation: should counting birds count? Frontiers
 497 in Ecology and the Environment 2, 403–410.

498 Bollinger, E.K., Bollinger, P.B., Gavin, T.A., 1990. Effects of hay-cropping on eastern
 499 populations of the bobolink. Wildlife Soc. B. 18, 142–150.

500 Brooks, S.P., Gelman, A., 1998. General methods for monitoring convergence of iterative
 501 simulations. Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics 7, 434–455.

502 Calenge, C., 2006. The package “adehabitat” for the R software: a tool for the analysis of space
 503 and habitat use by animals. Ecol. Model. 197, 516–519.

504 Campbell, J.E., Lobell, D.B., Genova, R.C., Field, C.B., 2008. The global potential of bioenergy
 505 on abandoned agriculture lands. Environmental Science & Technology 42, 5791–5794.

506 Cody, M.L. (Ed), 1985. Habitat selection in birds. Academic Press, Orlando, Florida.

507 Cohen, J., 1988. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. 2nd Edition. Lawrence
 508 Earlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ.

509 Conkling, T.J., 2016. Ecological determinants of avian productivity and avian risk in semi-
 510 natural grasslands. Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Aquaculture. Mississippi State
 511 University, Mississippi State, MS.

512 Conkling, T.J., Belant, J.L., DeVault, T.L., Wang, G., Martin, J.A., 2015. Assessment of
 513 variation of nest survival for grassland birds due to method of nest discovery. Bird Study
 514 62, 223–231.

515 Conover, R.R., Dinsmore, S.J., Burger Jr, L., 2011. Effects of conservation practices on bird nest
516 density and survival in intensive agriculture. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*
517 141, 126–132.

518 DeVault, T.L., Belant, J.L., Blackwell, B.F., Martin, J.A., Schmidt, J.A., Burger Jr, L.W.,
519 Patterson Jr, J.W., 2012. Airports offer unrealized potential for alternative energy
520 production. *Environmental Management* 49, 517–522.

521 Donovan, T.M., Thompson III, F.R., 2001. Modeling the ecological trap hypothesis: a habitat
522 and demographic analysis for migrant songbirds. *Ecological Applications* 11, 871–882.

523 Dunlap, R.M., 2014. Responses of songbirds and small mammals to harvests of native grasslands
524 for biofuels in western Minnesota. University of Minnesota.

525 Durlak, J.A., 2009. How to select, calculate, and interpret effect sizes. *Journal of pediatric*
526 *psychology* 34, 917–928.

527 ESRI, 2011. ArcGIS Desktop: Release 10. Environmental Systems Research Institute, Redlands,
528 California, USA.

529 Fargione, J.E., Cooper, T.R., Flaspohler, D.J., Hill, J., Lehman, C., McCoy, T., McLeod, S.,
530 Nelson, E.J., Oberhauser, K.S., Tilman, D., 2009. Bioenergy and wildlife: Threats and
531 opportunities for grassland conservation. *Bioscience* 59, 767–777.

532 Farrell, A.E., Plevin, R.J., Turner, B.T., Jones, A.D., O'hare, M., Kammen, D.M., 2006. Ethanol
533 can contribute to energy and environmental goals. *Science* 311, 506–508.

534 Fike, J.H., Parrish, D.J., Wolf, D.D., Balasko, J.A., Green, J.T., Rasnake, M., Reynolds, J.H.,
535 2006. Switchgrass production for the upper southeastern USA: influence of cultivar and
536 cutting frequency on biomass yields. *Biomass and bioenergy* 30, 207–213.

537 Finck, E.J., 1984. Dickcissel behavior in primary and secondary habitats. *Wilson Bull.* 96, 672–
538 680.

539 FIREMON, 2007. Point intercept sampling methods. Fire Effects Monitoring and Inventory
540 System [FIREMON]:
541 <http://www.frames.gov/documents/projects/firemon/POv3_Methods.pdf> (accessed 13
542 September 2015).

543 Fiske, I., Chandler, R., 2011. unmarked: An R Package for fitting hierarchical models of wildlife
544 occurrence and abundance. *Journal of Statistical Software* 43, 1–23.

545 Fletcher Jr., R.J., Koford, R.R., 2002. Habitat and landscape associations of breeding birds in
546 native and restored grasslands. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 66, 1011–1022.

547 Fontaine, J.J., Martin, T.E., 2006. Habitat selection responses of parents to offspring predation
548 risk: An experimental test. *Am. Nat.* 168, 811–818.

549 Frawley, B.J., Best, L.B., 1991. Effects of mowing on breeding bird abundance and species
550 composition in alfalfa fields. *Wildlife Soc. B.* 19, 135–142.

551 Fretwell, S.D., 1972. *Populations in a seasonal environment*. Princeton University Press,
552 Princeton, NJ.

553 Fretwell, S.D., Lucas Jr., H.L., 1969. On territorial behavior and other factors influencing habitat
554 distribution in birds. *Acta Biother.* 19, 16–36.

555 Gamble, J.D., Jungers, J.M., Wyse, D.L., Johnson, G.A., Lamb, J.A., Sheaffer, C.C., 2014.
556 Harvest Date Effects on Biomass Yield, Moisture Content, Mineral Concentration, and
557 Mineral Export in Switchgrass and Native Polycultures Managed for Bioenergy.
558 *BioEnergy Research* 8, 740–749.

559 Gelman, A., Carlin, J.B., Stern, H.S., Dunson, D.B., Vehtari, A., Rubin, D.B., 2014. Bayesian
 560 Data Analysis. Third edition. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

561 Germain, R.R., Arcese, P., 2014. Distinguishing individual quality from habitat preference and
 562 quality in a territorial passerine. *Ecology* 95, 436–445.

563 Grant, T.A., Shaffer, T.L., Madden, E.M., Pietz, P.J., 2005. Time-specific variation in passerine
 564 nest survival: new insights into old questions. *Auk* 122, 661–672.

565 Greenwood, P.J., 1980. Mating systems, philopatry and dispersal in birds and mammals. *Anim.*
 566 *Behav.* 28, 1140–1162.

567 Grinnell, J., 1917. Field tests of the theories concerning distributional control. *Am. Nat.* 51, 115–
 568 128.

569 Grzybowski, J.A., Pease, C.M., Brittingham, M., 2005. Renesting determines seasonal fecundity
 570 in songbirds: What do we know? What should we assume? *Auk* 122, 280–291.

571 Haché, S., Villard, M.-A., Bayne, E.M., 2013. Experimental evidence for an ideal free
 572 distribution in a breeding population of a territorial songbird. *Ecology* 94, 861–869.

573 Hartman, J.C., Nippert, J.B., Orozco, R.A., Springer, C.J., 2011. Potential ecological impacts of
 574 switchgrass (*Panicum virgatum* L.) biofuel cultivation in the Central Great Plains, USA.
 575 *Biomass Bioenerg.* 35, 3415–3421.

576 Hildén, O., 1965. Habitat selection in birds: a review. *Ann. Zool. Fenn.* 2, 53–75.

577 Hill, M.O., 1973. Diversity and evenness: a unifying notation and its consequences. *Ecology* 54,
 578 427–432.

579 Hughes, J.P., Robel, R.J., Kemp, K.E., Zimmerman, J.L., 1999. Effects of habitat on Dickcissel
 580 abundance and nest success in Conservation Reserve Program fields in Kansas. *Journal*
 581 *of Wildlife Management* 63, 523–529.

582 Jensen, W.E., Finck, E.J., 2004. Edge effects on nesting dickcissels (*Spiza americana*) in relation
583 to edge type of remnant tallgrass prairie in Kansas. *Am. Midl. Nat.* 151, 192–199.

584 Johnson, M.D., 2007. Measuring habitat quality: a review. *Condor* 109, 489–504.

585 Jones, J., 2001. Habitat selection studies in avian ecology: A critical review. *Auk* 118, 557–562.

586 Joos, C.J., Thompson, F.R., Faaborg, J., 2014. The role of territory settlement, individual quality,
587 and nesting initiation on productivity of Bell's vireos *Vireo bellii bellii*. *J. Avian Biol.* 45,
588 584–590.

589 Kershner, E.L., Bollinger, E.K., 1996. Reproductive success of grassland birds at east-central
590 Illinois airports. *Am. Midl. Nat.* 136, 358–366.

591 Keyser, P., Harper, C., Bates, G., Waller, J., Doxon, E., 2012. Establishing native warm-season
592 grasses for livestock forage in the Mid-South. University of Tennessee Extension SP731-
593 B, Knoxville.

594 Lanyon, S.M., Thompson, C.F., 1986. Site fidelity and habitat quality as determinants of
595 settlement pattern in male painted buntings. *Condor*, 206–210.

596 Liu, X.J.A., Fike, J.H., Galbraith, J.M., Fike, W.B., Parrish, D.J., Evanylo, G.K., Strahm, B.D.,
597 2015. Effects of harvest frequency and biosolids application on switchgrass yield,
598 feedstock quality, and theoretical ethanol yield. *GCB Bioenergy* 7, 112–121.

599 MacArthur, R.H., MacArthur, J.W., 1961. On bird species diversity. *Ecology* 42, 594–598.

600 MacKenzie, D.I., 2006. Modeling the probability of resource use: The effect of, and dealing
601 with, detecting a species imperfectly. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 70, 367–374.

602 Martin, T.E., 1993. Nest predation and nest sites: new perspectives on old patterns. *Bioscience*
603 43, 523–532.

604 McCoy, T.D., Ryan, M.R., Burger, L.W., Kurzejeski, E.W., 2001. Grassland bird conservation:
605 CP1 vs. CP2 plantings in Conservation Reserve Program fields in Missouri. *Am. Midl.*
606 *Nat.* 145, 1–17.

607 McLaughlin, S.B., Kszos, L.A., 2005. Development of switchgrass (*Panicum virgatum*) as a
608 bioenergy feedstock in the United States. *Biomass Bioenerg.* 28, 515–535.

609 Meehan, T.D., Hurlbert, A.H., Gratton, C., 2010. Bird communities in future bioenergy
610 landscapes of the Upper Midwest. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107,
611 18533–18538.

612 Mitchell, R., Vogel, K.P., Uden, D.R., 2012. The feasibility of switchgrass for biofuel
613 production. *Biofuels* 3, 47–59.

614 Monroe, A.P., 2014. Ecological and economic implicaitons of plant diversity and grazing in
615 pasture systems. *Wildlife, Fisheries, and Aquaculture*. Mississippi State University

616 Morisita, M., 1969. Measuring of habitat value by the "environmental density" method. In: Patil,
617 G.P., Pielour, E.C., Waters, W.E. (Eds.), *Statistical ecology*, Vol. 1: Spatial patterns and
618 statistical distributions. Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park,
619 Pennsylvania, pp. 379–401.

620 Murray, L.D., Best, L.B., 2003. Short-term bird response to harvesting switchgrass for biomass
621 in Iowa. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 67, 611–621.

622 Murray, L.D., Best, L.B., 2014. Nest-site selection and reproductive success of Common
623 Yellowthroats in managed Iowa grasslands. *Condor* 116, 74–83.

624 Nakagawa, S., Cuthill, I.C., 2007. Effect size, confidence interval and statistical significance: a
625 practical guide for biologists. *Biol. Rev.* 82, 591–605.

626 Orians, G.H., Wittenberger, J.F., 1991. Spatial and temporal scales in habitat selection. *Am. Nat.*
627 137, S29–S49.

628 Parrish, D.J., Fike, J.H., 2005. The biology and agronomy of switchgrass for biofuels. *Crit. Rev.*
629 *Plant Sci.* 24, 423–459.

630 Pärt, T., 2001. Experimental evidence of environmental effects on age-specific reproductive
631 success: the importance of resource quality. *P. Roy. Soc. B-Biol. Sci.* 268, 2267–2271.

632 Perlut, N.G., Strong, A.M., Donovan, T.M., Buckley, N.J., 2006. Grassland songbirds in a
633 dynamic management landscape: Behavioral responses and management strategies.
634 *Ecological Applications* 16, 2235–2247.

635 Peterjohn, B.G., Sauer, J.R., 1999. Population status of North American grassland birds from the
636 North American Breeding Bird Survey, 1966-1996. *Stud. Avian Biol.* 19, 27–44.

637 Petit, L.J., Petit, D.R., 1996. Factors governing habitat selection by Prothonotary Warblers: field
638 tests of the Fretwell-Lucas models. *Ecological Monographs* 66, 367–387.

639 Plummer, M., 2013. JAGS: just another Gibbs sampler. Version 3.4.0.
640 [<http://sourceforge.net/projects/mcmc-jags/files/>](http://sourceforge.net/projects/mcmc-jags/files/).

641 Powell, L.A., Conroy, M.J., Krementz, D.G., Lang, J.D., 1999. A model to predict breeding-
642 season productivity for multibrooded songbirds. *Auk* 116, 1001–1008.

643 R Core Team, 2015. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
644 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

645 Robel, R.J., Briggs, J.N., Dayton, A.D., Hulbert, L.C., 1970. Relationships between visual
646 obstruction measurements and weight of grassland vegetation. *J. Range Manage.* 23,
647 295–297.

648 Robertson, B.A., Doran, P.J., Loomis, L.R., Robertson, J., Schemske, D.W., 2011. Perennial
 649 biomass feedstocks enhance avian diversity. *GCB Bioenergy* 3, 235–246.

650 Robertson, B.A., Rice, R.A., Sillett, T.S., Ribic, C.A., Babcock, B.A., Landis, D.A., Herkert,
 651 J.R., Fletcher Jr, R.J., Fontaine, J.J., Doran, P.J., 2012. Are agrofuels a conservation
 652 threat or opportunity for grassland birds in the United States? *Condor* 114, 679–688.

653 Rotenberry, J.T., 1985. The role of habitat in avian community composition: physiognomy or
 654 floristics? *Oecologia* 67, 213–217.

655 Roth, A.M., Sample, D.W., Ribic, C.A., Paine, L., Undersander, D.J., Bartelt, G.A., 2005.
 656 Grassland bird response to harvesting switchgrass as a biomass energy crop. *Biomass*
 657 *Bioenerg.* 28, 490–498.

658 Royle, J.A., Dorazio, R.M., 2008. Hierarchical modeling and inference in ecology: the analysis
 659 of data from populations, metapopulations and communities. Academic Press, London,
 660 UK.

661 Schmidt, J.H., Walker, J.A., Lindberg, M.S., Johnson, D.S., Stephens, S.E., 2010. A general
 662 Bayesian hierarchical model for estimating survival of nests and young. *Auk* 127, 379–
 663 386.

664 Sergio, F., Blas, J., López, L., Tanferna, A., Díaz-Delgado, R., Donázar, J.A., Hiraldo, F., 2011.
 665 Coping with uncertainty: breeding adjustments to an unpredictable environment in an
 666 opportunistic raptor. *Oecologia* 166, 79–90.

667 Shaffer, T.L., 2004. A unified approach to analyzing nest success. *Auk* 121, 526–540.

668 Silverman, B.W., 1986. Density estimation for statistics and data analysis. Chapman and Hall,
 669 London, UK.

670 Simpson, E.H., 1949. Measurement of diversity. *Nature* 163, 688.

671 Small, D.M., Gimpel, M.E., Gill, D.E., 2012. Site fidelity and natal philopatry in dickcissels.
672 Northeast. Nat 19, 123–129.

673 Sousa, B.F., 2012. Ecology of mating patterns and sexual selection in Dickcissels breeding in
674 managed prairie. Biological Sciences. University of Kentucky.

675 Sousa, B.F., Westneat, D.F., 2012. Positive association between social and extra-pair mating in a
676 polygynous songbird, the dickcissel (*Spiza americana*). Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol. 67, 243–
677 255.

678 Streby, H.M., Refsnider, J.M., Andersen, D.E., 2014. Redefining reproductive success in
679 songbirds: Moving beyond the nest success paradigm. Auk 131, 718–726.

680 Su, Y.-S., Yajima, M., 2014. R2jags: A Package for Running jags from R. R package version
681 0.04-02. <<http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=R2jags>>.

682 Svärdson, G., 1949. Competition and habitat selection in birds. Oikos 1, 157–174.

683 Switzer, P.V., 1993. Site fidelity in predictable and unpredictable habitats. Evol. Ecol. 7, 533–
684 555.

685 Temple, S.A., 2002. Dickcissel (*Spiza americana*). In The Birds of North America 703, (F. B.
686 Gill and A. Poole, Editors). Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, PA, USA, and
687 American Ornithologists' Union, Washington DC, USA. doi:10.2173/bna.703.

688 Tilman, D., Hill, J., Lehman, C., 2006. Carbon-negative biofuels from low-input high-diversity
689 grassland biomass. Science 314, 1598–1600.

690 Tilman, D., Socolow, R., Foley, J.A., Hill, J., Larson, E., Lynd, L., Pacala, S., Reilly, J.,
691 Searchinger, T., Somerville, C., Williams, R., 2009. Beneficial biofuels - the food,
692 energy, and environmental trilemma. Science 325, 270–271.

693 U.S. EPA, 2011. Biofuels and the environment: the first triennial report to congress. U.S.
 694 Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, National Center
 695 for Environmental Assessment, Washington DC. EPA/600/R-10/183F.
 696 Uden, D.R., Allen, C.R., Mitchell, R.B., McCoy, T.D., Guan, Q., 2014. Predicted avian
 697 responses to bioenergy development scenarios in an intensive agricultural landscape.
 698 GCB Bioenergy 7, 717–726.
 699 Van Horne, B., 1983. Density as a misleading indicator of habitat quality. Journal of Wildlife
 700 Management 47, 893–901.
 701 Vickery, P.D., Hunter Jr, M.L., Wells, J.V., 1992. Is density an indicator of breeding success?
 702 Auk, 706–710.
 703 Vogel, K.P., Brejda, J.J., Walters, D.T., Buxton, D.R., 2002. Switchgrass biomass production in
 704 the Midwest USA. Agronomy Journal 94, 413–420.
 705 Walk, J.W., Wentworth, K., Kershner, E.L., Bollinger, E.K., Warner, R.E., 2004. Renesting
 706 decisions and annual fecundity of female dickcissels (*Spiza americana*) in Illinois. Auk
 707 121, 1250–1261.
 708 Warren, K.A., Anderson, J.T., 2005. Grassland songbird nest-site selection and response to
 709 mowing in West Virginia. Wildlife Soc. B. 33, 285–292.
 710 Werling, B.P., Dickson, T.L., Isaacs, R., Gaines, H., Gratton, C., Gross, K.L., Liere, H.,
 711 Malmstrom, C.M., Meehan, T.D., Ruan, L., 2014. Perennial grasslands enhance
 712 biodiversity and multiple ecosystem services in bioenergy landscapes. Proceedings of the
 713 National Academy of Sciences 111, 1652–1657.
 714 Wiens, J.A., 1974. Habitat heterogeneity and avian community structure in North American
 715 grasslands. Am. Midl. Nat., 195–213.

716 With, K.A., King, A.W., Jensen, W.E., 2008. Remaining large grasslands may not be sufficient
 717 to prevent grassland bird declines. *Biol. Conserv.* 141, 3152–3167.

718 Worton, B.J., 1989. Kernel methods for estimating the utilization distribution in home-range
 719 studies. *Ecology* 70, 164–168.

720 Zabala, J., Zuberogoitia, I., 2014. Individual quality explains variation in reproductive success
 721 better than territory quality in a long-lived territorial raptor. *PLoS One* 9, e90254.

722 Zimmerman, J.L., 1971. The territory and its density dependent effect in *Spiza americana*. *Auk*
 723 88, 591–612.

724 Zimmerman, J.L., 1982. Nesting success of dickcissels (*Spiza americana*) in preferred and less
 725 preferred habitats. *Auk* 99, 292–298.

726 Zimmerman, J.L., Finck, E.J., 1989. Philopatry and correlates of territorial fidelity in male
 727 dickcissels. *N. Am. Bird Bander* 14, 83–85.

728 Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N., Walker, N.J., Saveliev, A.A., Smith, G.M., 2009. Mixed effects models
 729 and extensions in ecology with R. Springer, New York, NY.

730

731 Table 1. Model coefficients ($\pm$ SD), 95% credible intervals, Brooks-Gelman-Rubin statistics ($\hat{R}$),
 732 and Bayesian P -values for parameters in MCMC model to estimate nest survival for Dickcissel
 733 nests in Clay Co., Mississippi, 2011–2013.

Parameter	Estimate	SD	95% Credible Intervals		Bayesian	
			Lower	Upper	$\hat{R}$	P -value
Intercept	2.778	0.606	1.674	4.005	1.050	0.997
Age	-1.064	0.115	-1.301	-0.851	1.002	1.000
Quadratic Age	-0.507	0.093	-0.683	-0.320	1.000	1.000
Date	-0.639	0.157	-0.939	-0.331	1.001	1.000
Quadratic Date	0.960	0.199	0.588	1.368	1.002	1.000
Nest Age When Found	0.288	0.098	0.091	0.472	1.000	0.998
Year-2012 ^a	-0.823	0.253	-1.333	-0.341	1.001	1.000
Year-2013 ^a	-0.085	0.399	-0.860	0.689	1.000	0.590
Nest Distance to Edge	0.121	0.087	-0.050	0.289	1.002	0.922
Visual Obstruction	-0.070	0.164	-0.390	0.256	1.001	0.347
Territory Area (95% KDE)	-0.078	0.085	-0.237	0.093	1.001	0.819
Nest-Visible Height	-0.062	0.108	-0.263	0.162	1.001	0.725
Native Warm-Season Grass (single harvest) ^b	0.059	0.454	-0.938	0.966	1.002	0.419
Switchgrass (multiple harvest) ^b	-0.001	1.037	-1.980	2.198	1.002	0.519
Switchgrass (single harvest) ^b	0.880	0.845	-0.633	2.826	1.001	0.862

734 ^a 2011 is the reference year. Coefficient refers to change in daily survival rate (DSR) for given
 735 year relative to 2011

736 ^b Native Warm-Season Grass (multiple harvest) is the reference condition. Coefficient refers to
 737 change in relative density for given treatment relative to NWSG-M

Table 2. Period survival (21-day nesting period) for Dickcissel (*Spiza Americana*) nests located on median incubation initiation date (25 May) midway through nesting cycle (day 11), period survival, plot productivity (number of fledglings/ha), and territory productivity (# fledglings/ha) in Clay Co., Mississippi, 2011–2013.

Treatment	Year					
	2011		2012		2013	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Period Survival						
Native Warm-Season Grass (multiple harvest)	0.096	0.106	0.019	0.057	0.086	0.102
Native Warm-Season Grass (single harvest)	0.105	0.109	0.022	0.059	0.097	0.109
Switchgrass (multiple harvest)	0.147	0.194	0.056	0.126	-	-
Switchgrass (single harvest)	0.316	0.230	-	-	-	-
Plot						
Nest Density						
Native Warm-Season Grass (multiple harvest)	1.182	5.714	0.928	4.115	0.667	3.216
Native Warm-Season Grass (single harvest)	2.562	4.590	2.045	3.836	1.445	2.389
Switchgrass (multiple harvest)	0.027	0.039	0.022	0.030	-	-
Switchgrass (single harvest)	0.047	0.068	-	-	-	-
Productivity						
Native Warm-Season Grass (multiple harvest)	0.497	7.855	0.088	1.545	0.260	3.869
Native Warm-Season Grass (single harvest)	0.907	2.306	0.128	0.425	0.462	1.357
Switchgrass (multiple harvest)	0.008	0.023	0.003	0.026	-	-
Switchgrass (single harvest)	0.044	0.126	-	-	-	-
Territory						
Nest Density						
Native Warm-Season Grass (multiple harvest)	0.173	0.049	0.112	0.033	0.114	0.035
Native Warm-Season Grass (single harvest)	0.192	0.047	0.125	0.032	0.128	0.035
Switchgrass (multiple harvest)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Switchgrass (single harvest)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Productivity						
Native Warm-Season Grass (multiple harvest)	0.084	0.102	0.014	0.034	0.042	0.057
Native Warm-Season Grass (single harvest)	0.094	0.113	0.016	0.040	0.050	0.068
Switchgrass (multiple harvest)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Switchgrass (single harvest)	-	-	-	-	-	-

743 Table 3. Model coefficients ($\pm$ SD), 95% credible intervals, Brooks-Gelman-Rubin statistics ($\hat{R}$),
 744 and Bayesian P -values for parameters in MCMC model to estimate plot nest density (number of
 745 nests/ha) for Dickcissel nests in Clay Co., Mississippi, 2011–2013.

Parameter	Estimate	SD	95% Credible Intervals		Bayesian	
			Lower	Upper	$\hat{R}$	P -value
Intercept	-0.369	0.891	-2.230	1.322	1.012	0.697
2012 ^a	-0.231	0.153	-0.534	0.073	1.001	0.931
2013 ^a	-0.570	0.173	-0.917	-0.239	1.004	1.000
Native Warm-Season Grass (single harvest) ^b	0.881	1.198	-1.421	3.370	1.009	0.780
Switchgrass (multiple harvest) ^b	-3.989	1.719	-7.981	-1.491	1.020	0.997
Switchgrass (single harvest) ^b	-3.288	1.489	-6.652	-0.859	1.019	0.993

746 ^a 2011 is the reference year. Coefficient refers to change in daily survival rate for given year
 747 relative to 2011. ^b Native warm-season grass (multiple harvest) is the reference treatment.
 748 Coefficient refers to change in daily survival rate for given treatment relative to native warm-
 749 season grass (multiple harvest).

750 Table 4. Model coefficients ($\pm$ SD) and 95% credible intervals for parameters in MCMC model
 751 to estimate nest density (number of nests/ha) for Dickcissel territories in Clay Co., Mississippi,
 752 2011–2013.

Parameter	Estimate	SD	95% Credible Intervals		Bayesian	
			Lower	Upper	$\hat{R}$	P-value
Intercept	-1.787	0.286	-2.399	-1.286	1.014	1.000
2012 ^a	-0.445	0.174	-0.775	-0.115	1.001	0.992
2013 ^a	-0.385	0.187	-0.7721	-0.034	1.000	0.983
Native Warm-Season Grass (single harvest) ^b	0.123	0.370	-0.532	0.954	1.001	0.647

753 ^a 2011 is the reference year. Coefficient refers to change in daily survival rate for given year

754 relative to 2011

755 ^b Native warm-season grass (multiple harvest) is the reference treatment. Coefficient refers to
 756 change in daily survival rate for given treatment relative to native warm-season grass (multiple
 757 harvest).

758 Figure 1. Mean (symbol) and 50% (thick bar) and 95% CrI (thin bar) for a) plot productivity and
759 b) territory productivity in native warm-season grass (NWSG) multiple harvest ($\square$), NWSG
760 single harvest ($\diamond$), switchgrass multiple harvest (Δ), and switchgrass single harvest (∇)
761 treatments in Clay Co., Mississippi, 2011–2013.