

## **Exhibit B**

### **Literature Cited in the Trades Comments**

Applegate DH, Owens NL. 2014. Oil and gas impacts on Wyoming's sage-grouse: summarizing the past and predicting the foreseeable future. *Human-Wildlife Interactions* 8(2):284

Blomberg EJ, Gibson D, Atamian MT, Sedinger JS. 2014. Individual and environmental effects on egg allocations of female greater sage-grouse. *Auk* 131(4):507-523

Blomberg EJ, Gibson D, Atamian MT, Sedinger JS. 2017. Variable drivers of primary versus secondary nesting; density-dependence and drought effects on greater sage-grouse. *Journal of Avian Biology* 48(6):827-836

Blomberg EJ, Sedinger JS, Atamian MT, Nonne DV. 2012. Characteristics of climate and landscape disturbance influence the dynamics of greater sage-grouse populations. *Ecosphere* 3(6):art55

Christiansen TJ, Belton LR. 2017. Wyoming sage-grouse working groups: lessons learned. *Human-Wildlife Interactions* 11(3):274-286

Claridge-Chang A, Assam PN. 2016. Estimation statistics should replace significance testing. *Nature Methods* 13(2):108-109

Coates PS, Ricca MA, Prochazka BG, Brooks ML, Doherty KE, Kroger T, Blomberg EJ, Hagen CA, Casazza ML. 2016. Wildfire, climate, and invasive grass interactions negatively impact an indicator species by reshaping sagebrush ecosystems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 113(45):12745-12750

Coates PS, Prochazka BG, Ricca MA, Wann GT, Aldridge CL, Hanser SE, Doherty KE, O'Donnell MS, Edmunds DR, Espinosa SP, 2017. Hierarchical population monitoring of greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) in Nevada and California—Identifying populations for management at the appropriate spatial scale: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2017–1089, 49 p., <https://doi.org/10.3133/ofr20171089>.

Coates PS, Prochazka BG, Ricca MA, Halstead BJ, Casazza ML, Blomberg EJ, Brussee BE, Wiechman L, Tebbenkamp J, Gardner SC, Reese KP. 2018, The relative importance of intrinsic and extrinsic drivers to population growth vary among local populations of greater sage-grouse—An integrated population modeling approach: *The Auk, Ornithological Advances* 135(2)240–261 <https://doi.org/10.1642/AUK-17-137.1>.

Dinkins JB, Conover MR, Kirol CP, Beck JL, Frey SN. 2016. Effects of common raven and coyote removal and temporal variation in climate on greater sage-grouse nesting success. *Biological Conservation* 202: 50–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.08.011>.

Ferguson C, Marcus A, Oransky I. 2014. The peer-review scam. *Nature* 515:480-482. <https://www.nature.com/news/publishing-the-peer-review-scam-1.16400>

Fraser H, Parker T, Nakagawa S, Barnett A, Fidler F. 2018. Questionable research practices in ecology and evolution. *PLoS ONE* 13(7): e0200303. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0200303>

Gardner TA, et al. 2013. Biodiversity Offsets and the Challenge of Achieving No Net Loss. *Conservation Biology* 27: 1254–1264. doi: 10.1111/cobi.12118

Gibbons P, Macintosh A, Constable AL, Hayashi K. 2017. Outcomes from 10 years of biodiversity offsetting. *Global Change Biology* 00:1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13977>

Gibson D, Blomberg EJ, Atamian MT, Sedinger JS. 2017. Weather, habitat composition, and female behavior interact to modify offspring survival in greater sage-grouse. *Ecological Applications* 27(1):168-181

Hanser SE, Deibert PA, Tull JC, Carr NB, Aldridge CL, Bargsten TC, Christiansen TJ, Coates, PS, Crist MR, Doherty KE, Ellsworth EA, Foster LJ, Herren VA, Miller KH, Moser A, Naeve RM, Prentice, KL, Remington TE, Ricca MA, Shinneman, DJ, Truex RL, Wiechman LA, Wilson DC, Bowen ZH. 2018. Greater sage-grouse science (2015–17)—Synthesis and potential management implications: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2018–1017, 46 p., <https://doi.org/10.3133/ofr20181017>.

Jasanoff S. 2006. Transparency in public science: purposes, reasons, limits. *Law and Contemporary Problems* 69:21-45. <https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1385&context=lcp>

Knick ST, Connelly JW, eds. 2011. Greater sage-grouse ecology and conservation of a landscape species and its habitats: Berkeley, Calif., University of California Press, *Studies in Avian Biology*, no. 38, 564 p.

Manier DJ, Bowen ZH, Brooks ML, Casazza ML, Coates PS, Deibert PA, Hanser SE, Johnson DH. 2014. Conservation buffer distance estimates for Greater Sage-Grouse—A review: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2014–1239, 14 p. Available: <https://dx.doi.org/10.3133/ofr20141239>.

Maron M, et al. 2015. Locking in loss: Baselines of decline in Australian biodiversity offset policies. *Biol. Conserv.* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2015.05.017> also see [http://bbop.forest-trends.org/documents/files/setting\\_appropriate\\_baselines.pdf](http://bbop.forest-trends.org/documents/files/setting_appropriate_baselines.pdf)

Moilanen A, Laitila J. 2015. Indirect leakage leads to a failure of avoided loss biodiversity offsetting. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 53: 106–111

Moreno-Mateos D, et al. 2015. The true loss caused by biodiversity offsets, *Biological Conservation* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2015.08.016>

National Research Council. 2012. Assessing the Reliability of Complex Models: Mathematical and Statistical Foundations of Verification, Validation, and Uncertainty Quantification. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press. Available at: <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/13395/assessing-the-reliability-of-complex-models-mathematical-and-statistical-foundations>

OMB. 1999. Circular A-110. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wpcontent/uploads/2017/11/Circular-110.pdf>.

———. 2002. Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility, and Integrity of Information Disseminated by Federal Agencies. Office of Management and Budget. <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2002/02/22/R2-59/guidelines-for-ensuring-and-maximizing-the-quality-objectivity-utility-and-integrity-of-information>

O'Neil ST, Coates PS, Brussee BE, Jackson PJ, Howe KB, Moser AM, Foster LJ, Delehanty DJ. 2018. Broad-scale occurrence of a subsidized avian predator: Reducing impacts of ravens on sage-grouse and other sensitive prey. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 55(6): 2641-2652. DOI: 10.1111/1365-2664.13249

Peebles LW and Conover MR. 2016. Effectiveness of the toxicant DRC-1339 in reducing populations of common ravens in Wyoming. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 40(2):281–287. [<https://doi.org/10.1002/wsb.661>].

Peebles LW, Conover MR, and Dinkins JB. 2017. Adult sage-grouse numbers rise following raven removal or an increase in precipitation. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 41(3):471–478. [doi.org/10.1002/wsb.788](https://doi.org/10.1002/wsb.788).

Quetier F, Baptiste R, Harold L. 2014. No net loss of biodiversity or paper offsets? A critical review of the French no net loss policy. *Environmental Science & Policy* 38: 120-131. Publisher's official version : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2013.11.009> , Open Access version : <http://archimer.ifremer.fr/doc/00168/27924/>

Ramey R, Brown L, Blackgoat F. 2011. Oil and gas development and greater sage grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*): a review of threats and mitigation measures. *Journal of Energy and Development* 35(1):49-78 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24812714?seq=1> - [page scan tab contents](#)

Ramey RR, Thorley JL, Ivey AS. 2015. Recent greater sage grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) population dynamics in Wyoming are primarily driven by climate, not oil and gas development. Preprint available at: <http://biorxiv.org/content/early/2015/10/04/028274> Supplemental Materials S2 available at: <http://biorxiv.org/content/early/2015/10/04/028274>

Ramey RR II, Thorley JL, Ivey AS. 2018. Local and population-level responses of Greater sage-grouse to oil and gas development and climatic variation in Wyoming. *PeerJ* 6:e5417 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.5417>

Sage-grouse National Technical Team (NTT). 2011. A report on national greater sage-grouse conservation measures: Bureau of Land Management, 74 p., t [https://eplanning.blm.gov/epl-front-office/projects/lup/9153/39961/41912/WySG\\_Tech-Team-Report-Conservation-Measure\\_2011.pdf](https://eplanning.blm.gov/epl-front-office/projects/lup/9153/39961/41912/WySG_Tech-Team-Report-Conservation-Measure_2011.pdf).

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2013. Greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) conservation objectives (COT)—Final report: Denver, Colo., U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 91 p., <https://www.fws.gov/greatersagegrouse/documents/COT-Report-with-Dear-Interested-Reader-Letter.pdf>