

**A peer-reviewed version of this preprint was published in PeerJ on 7 December 2015.**

[View the peer-reviewed version](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.1453) (peerj.com/articles/1453), which is the preferred citable publication unless you specifically need to cite this preprint.

Sánchez-Oliver JS, Rey Benayas JM, Carrascal LM. 2015. Low effect of young afforestations on bird communities inhabiting heterogeneous Mediterranean cropland. PeerJ 3:e1453  
<https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.1453>

# Low effect on open-farmland birds of young afforestations in heterogeneous Mediterranean croplands

Afforestation programs such as the one promoted by the EU Common Agricultural Policy have spread tree plantations on former cropland. These afforestations attract generalist forest and ubiquitous species but may cause severe damage to open habitat species, especially birds of high conservation value. We investigated the effects of young (< 20 yr) tree plantations dominated by pine *P. halepensis* on bird communities inhabiting the adjacent open farmland habitat in central Spain. We hypothesize that pine plantations with larger surface, and areas at shorter distances from plantations, would result in lower bird species richness and conservation value of open farmland birds. Regression models controlling for the influence of land use types around plantations revealed significant positive effects of distance to pine plantation edge on community species richness in winter, and negative effects on an index of conservation concern (SPEC) during the breeding season. However, plantation area did not have any effect on species richness or community conservation value. Our results indicate that pine afforestation of Mediterranean cropland in heterogeneous agricultural landscapes has an overall low detrimental effect on bird species that are characteristic of open farmland habitat.

1 **Low effect on open-farmland birds of young afforestations in heterogeneous**  
2 **Mediterranean croplands**

3 Juan S. Sánchez-Oliver<sup>1,3,\*</sup>, José M. Rey Benayas<sup>1</sup> and Luis M. Carrascal<sup>2</sup>

4 <sup>1</sup>: Departamento de Ciencias de la Vida, Edificio de Ciencias, Universidad de Alcalá, Alcalá de  
5 Henares, Spain.

6 <sup>2</sup>: Departamento de Biodiversidad y Biología Evolutiva, Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales-  
7 CSIC, Madrid, Spain.

8 <sup>3</sup>: Current affiliation: Applied Population and Community Ecology Laboratory, CIBIO/InBIO-  
9 Universidade do Porto, Lisboa, Portugal.

10 \*Corresponding author: Juan S. Sánchez-Oliver

11 Address: Jardim Botânico Tropical (IICT, Instituto de Investigação Científica Tropical), Travessa  
12 Conde da Ribeira 9, 1300-142 Lisboa, Portugal

13 E-mail: juansanchezoliver@cibio.up.pt

14 **Abstract** Afforestation programs such as the one promoted by the EU Common Agricultural  
15 Policy have spread tree plantations on former cropland. These afforestations attract generalist  
16 forest and ubiquitous species but may cause severe damage to open habitat species, especially  
17 birds of high conservation value. We investigated the effects of young (< 20 yr) tree plantations  
18 dominated by pine *P. halepensis* on bird communities inhabiting the adjacent open farmland  
19 habitat in central Spain. We hypothesize that pine plantations with larger surface, and areas at  
20 shorter distances from plantations, would result in lower bird species richness and conservation  
21 value of open farmland birds. Regression models controlling for the influence of land use types  
22 around plantations revealed significant positive effects of distance to pine plantation edge on  
23 community species richness in winter, and negative effects on an index of conservation concern  
24 (SPEC) during the breeding season. However, plantation area did not have any effect on species  
25 richness or community conservation value. Our results indicate that pine afforestation of  
26 Mediterranean cropland in heterogeneous agricultural landscapes has an overall low detrimental  
27 effect on bird species that are characteristic of open farmland habitat.

28 **Keywords:** conservation status, distance effects, land use types, pine plantations, species  
29 richness.

30 INTRODUCTION

31 A significant amount of abandoned cropland, low productive cropland and pastureland has been  
32 converted into tree plantations in the last few decades, and ca. 7% of forest land in the world are  
33 tree plantations at present (FAO, 2011). Different afforestation programs have contributed to the  
34 spread of such tree plantations at the regional level. For instance, the Common Agricultural  
35 Policy (CAP) has favoured the conversion of farmland into tree plantations in the European  
36 Union since 1992 by means of a scheme of aid for forestry measures in agriculture (EEC Council  
37 Regulation No. 2080/92), which has resulted in the afforestation of ca. 8 millions ha to date  
38 (European Commission, 2013a,b). Further, afforested cropland is expected to increase in the near  
39 future in countries such as Spain due to subsidies to afforestation of extirpated vineyards  
40 (Spanish Agrarian Guarantee Fund, 2012).

41 Tree plantations pursue a number of environmental and societal services such as soil retention  
42 and carbon sequestration (Rey Benayas et al., 2007). However, they may have noticeable effects  
43 on biological communities. Thus, Bremer & Farley (2010) found that tree plantations are most  
44 likely to contribute to biodiversity when established on degraded lands rather than replacing  
45 natural ecosystems, and when indigenous tree species are used rather than exotic species.

46 Similarly, a meta-analysis of faunal and floral species richness and abundance in timber  
47 plantations and pasture lands on 36 sites across the world concluded that plantations support  
48 higher species richness or abundance than pasture land only for particular taxonomic groups (i.e.  
49 herpetofauna), or specific landscape features (i.e. absence of remnant vegetation within pasture)  
50 (Felton et al., 2010).

51 Agro-ecosystems are important for maintenance of bird diversity in Europe, especially for species  
52 of conservation concern (BirdLife International, 2004a). The Directorate-General for Agriculture

53 and Rural Development (2012), using the European farmland bird index as a barometer of change  
54 for the biodiversity of agricultural land in Europe, shows a decline in these bird populations of ca.  
55 20% between 1990 and 2008 (see also Donald et al., 2002; Gregory et al., 2005; Butler et al.,  
56 2010; Scholefield et al., 2011; Guerrero et al., 2012). Cropland afforestations in southern Europe,  
57 which are mostly based on coniferous species, may cause severe damage to open habitat species,  
58 especially ground-nesting birds, many of which are of conservation concern in Europe (European  
59 Bird Census Council, 2010). These negative effect is mostly due to the replacement of high  
60 quality habitat and increasing risk of predation (Shochat et al. 2001, Santos et al. 2006, Caplat  
61 and Fonderflick 2009, Reino et al. 2009, Voříšek et al. 2010, Butler et al. 2010, Fonderflick et al.  
62 2010, Reino et al. 2010). For instance, an assessment of nest predation rates on open farmland  
63 habitat adjacent to tree plantations in central Spain resulted in 94.2% of artificial nests that were  
64 predated three weeks after the start of the experiment (Sánchez-Oliver, Rey Benayas & Carrascal,  
65 2014a). Conversely, tree plantations are a suitable habitat for forest generalist and ubiquitous  
66 species, which may lead to an increase in local species richness around them in agricultural  
67 landscapes (Rey Benayas, Galván & Carrascal, 2010; Sánchez-Oliver, Rey Benayas & Carrascal,  
68 2014b).

69 In this study we aim at investigating the effects of young (<20 yr) tree plantations on bird  
70 communities inhabiting the adjacent open farmland habitat in a Mediterranean landscape mosaic  
71 located in central Spain. Specifically, we ask if distance to and area of tree plantations affect  
72 species richness and conservation value of the birds communities under the hypotheses that they  
73 (1) define a surrounding (buffer) area that will have a detrimental effect on bird species that are  
74 characteristic of open farmland habitat, particularly for ground-nesting species that are of high  
75 conservation value, and (2) will attract forest generalist and ubiquitous species of low  
76 conservation value. We predict that the effects of tree plantations may depend on land use type

77 around them (Sánchez-Oliver et al., 2014b) and that they will be most noticeable in the breeding  
78 season than in winter due to territorial behaviour of birds.

## 79 METHODS

### 80 **Study area**

81 Field work was carried out on open farmland adjacent to afforested cropland located in Campo de  
82 Montiel (La Mancha natural region, southern Spanish plateau, UTM 30 S 469411 4289409;  
83 Figure 1). The study area spreads on ca. 440 km<sup>2</sup> with altitude ranging between 690 and 793 m  
84 a.s.l. The climate is continental Mediterranean with dry and hot summers and cold winters. Mean  
85 annual temperature and total annual precipitation in the area during the last 30 years were 13.7 °C  
86 and 390 mm, respectively (Agencia Española de Meteorología, 2012). These figures were 15.8°C  
87 and 362.9 mm in 2012, when our bird surveys took place (Junta de Castilla-La Mancha, 2013).

88 The area is a representative mosaic of different crops, pastures and semi-natural or introduced  
89 woody vegetation that are characteristic of large areas in Mediterranean landscapes. Croplands  
90 were mostly occupied by herbaceous crops (wheat and barley) and permanent woody crops (olive  
91 groves and vineyards). Natural vegetation consisted of holm oak (*Quercus rotundifolia* L.)  
92 woodland and riparian forests that have been mostly extirpated from this region. Until 1992,  
93 woodland cover was restricted to open holm oak patches, usually grazed by sheep and goats.  
94 Major land use changes in the last 20 years are the abandonment of herbaceous cropland and  
95 vineyard extirpation and their subsequent afforestation with the native Aleppo pine (*Pinus*  
96 *halepensis* Mill.) alone or mixed with holm oak. These tree plantations are of small area due to

97 property size and noticeably dominated by pines as they establish better and grow faster than  
98 other planted species such as holm oak.

### 99 **Selection of tree plantations for bird survey at adjacent farmland habitat**

100 First, all tree plantations in the study area were located using both orto-photos (Geographic  
101 Information System of Farming Land 2010; hereafter SigPac) and Google Earth®, and were later  
102 verified in the field. We found 99 tree plantations on former cropland that took place in 1992 or  
103 later. Tree plantations < 1 ha were directly discarded. In addition, a target tree plantation had to  
104 be placed at least 2-km away from another plantation in the transect direction to avoid that  
105 surveyed birds associated to open farmland adjacent to a given tree plantation were affected by  
106 another tree plantation. Following these criteria, we finally selected 40 tree plantations to assess  
107 bird community on farmland adjacent to tree plantations. We measured the area of every tree  
108 plantation (Table 1) using ArcGIS 10.0 (ESRI Inc.). As they are young, the tree canopy is little  
109 developed (mean tree cover =  $38.8\% \pm 25.7\%$ , mean tree height =  $3.6\text{ m} \pm 1.5\text{ m}$ , and mean dbh =  
110  $13.3\text{ cm} \pm 6.5\text{ cm}$ ).

### 111 **Bird survey**

112 Bird census were carried out in winter (January and February) and breeding season (April and  
113 May) of 2012 to assess the wintering and breeding bird communities, respectively. Census  
114 method consisted of outward line transects of 1000-m length with belts of 100-m at each side of  
115 the observer and initiated at the tree plantation edge (Bibby et al. 2000, Gregory et al. 2004). Two  
116 census-transects for each plantation and season were carried out in different days, one in the



117 morning between sunrise and three hours later and one in the evening two hours before sunset-  
118 (80 transects in total). The two transects from each tree plantation spanned on different directions  
119 that were established *a priori* to meet the criterion used for selection of tree plantations (see  
120 above). They were walked at an average speed of 2.5 km h<sup>-1</sup>. We noted and geo-localized the  
121 presence of every bird except those that were over-flying the census area (i.e., distance to the tree  
122 plantation edge and situation with respect to the transect progression line; Table S1 in  
123 supplementary material). All censuses were conducted by the same well trained field  
124 ornithologist (JS S-O) on windless and rainless days.

125 The European endangered status of each species was obtained from BirdLife International  
126 (2004b) using the Species of European Conservation Concern (SPEC index) scores. This index  
127 uses four categories: SPEC 1 (global conservation concern), SPEC 2 (concentrated in Europe and  
128 with an unfavourable globally threatened or near threatened conservation status or data deficient),  
129 SPEC 3 (not concentrated in Europe but with an unfavourable conservation status), and Non-  
130 SPEC (favourable conservation status). We assigned a value of 4 to species that were included in  
131 the Non-SPEC category. Finally, we used a transformed SPEC index by subtracting the SPEC  
132 value of each surveyed species to 5 in order that species of highest conservation concern attained  
133 the greatest value (4), whereas the species of lowest conservation concern attained a value of 1  
134 (de la Montaña, Rey Benayas & Carrascal, 2006). The average values of transformed SPEC index  
135 were calculated considering the recorded species in each transect (Table S1 in supplementary  
136 material).

137 To have a reference of the avifauna that colonizes farmland habitat in the studied region, for  
138 comparison with our bird survey, we used (1) the species list (47 species) of the common  
139 farmland bird indicator for Southern Europe (European Bird Census Council, 2010) and the list  
140 (36 species) of common farmland bird index (Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural

141 Development 2012), and (2) the mean density of breeding species found at the habitat categories  
142 labelled as (a) dry arable lands, (b) vineyards, (c) olive groves, (d) agricultural mosaics with  
143 woody cultivations, and (e) pastures within the Mesomediterranean region of Central Spain  
144 obtained from Carrascal & Palomino (2008) (Table S1 in supplementary material).

### 145 **Land use types**

146 We measured percentage of land use types in all 80 transects on farmland habitat where bird  
147 survey took place using ArcGIS 10.0 (ESRI Inc.). The length and width of transects make them  
148 representative samples of land use types in the studied landscape. Land use types were identified  
149 by means of land use layers taken from SigPac (Geographic Information System of Farming  
150 Land, 2010) and verified in the field. We initially distinguished 21 land use types that were  
151 aggregated into the following eleven categories for statistical analyses according to their larger  
152 covers in the study region (i.e., avoiding those habitat categories of very low representativeness):  
153 streams and rivers, roads and rural tracks, olive groves, scattered buildings, afforestations, semi-  
154 natural woodland, fruit and dried fruit groves, waste lands, pastures, dry herbaceous cropland,  
155 and vineyard. The percentage of area occupied by each land use type across transects is shown in  
156 Table 1.

### 157 **Statistical analyses**

158 For statistical analyses we did not consider water birds (e.g., Common Sandpiper *Actitis*  
159 *hypoleucus*, Mallard *Anas platyrhynchos*, and Grey Heron *Ardea cinerea*), aerial feeders  
160 (European Bee-eater *Merops apiaster* and the Hirundinidae family species), and raptors. Species

161 richness and bird community SPEC score were analyzed by means of Generalized Linear Models  
162 (GLM), with distance to tree plantation and plantation area as target predictors. Distance to tree  
163 plantation edge was treated as a dummy variable, i.e. 0 for close or <400 m vs. 1 for away or 600-  
164 1000 m. Area of tree plantation was included as a continuous covariate (in logarithm). As land  
165 use type may affect abundance of bird species around plantations, we included in the models the  
166 cover of six land use categories with a percentage higher than 1% as control covariates (namely,  
167 roads and rural tracks, olive groves, waste lands, pastures, dry herbaceous croplands and  
168 vineyards). GLMs were carried out with Gretl (release 1.9.5, <http://gretl.sourceforge.net/>).  
169 Statistical significance of the predictor variables was calculated using quasi-ML standard errors.  
170 We also tested for homogeneity of slopes of plantation area in the close and away transect sectors  
171 in *a posteriori* regression analyses. No interaction term distance\*area was significant, so the  
172 effects of plantation area are generalizable across distance from the edge of the plantations.

## 173 RESULTS

174 We detected a total of 3643 individuals belonging to 47 species in winter and 1149 individuals  
175 belonging to 37 species in the breeding season at our 80 1-km transects (Table S1 in  
176 supplementary material). Thirty two species were included in the Non-SPEC category – least  
177 conservation concern –, 12 in the SPEC 3, nine in the SPEC 2, and two in the SPEC 1 – highest  
178 conservation concern (Table S1 in supplementary material).

179 Models revealed significant effects of distance to tree plantation edge on community species  
180 richness in winter (i.e., communities away from the plantations were ca. 30% richer in species  
181 that those close) but not in the breeding season (Table 2). The plantation area term did not have  
182 any effect on species richness in both seasons.

183 Distance to tree plantation edge showed a significant effect on the SPEC index during the  
184 breeding season (i.e., 19% higher index close to tree plantations), but not in winter. Plantation  
185 area did not have any effect on the SPEC index in either season (Table 2).

## 186 DISCUSSION

187 Overall, we found that young tree plantations established on former cropland in a Mediterranean  
188 mosaic located in central Spain had (1) a detrimental effect on bird species richness in winter and  
189 (2) a marginal positive effect on conservation value of bird communities at adjacent open  
190 farmland habitat in the breeding season.

191 Previous studies on the effects of tree plantations in open habitat bird species have mostly found  
192 negative effects, particularly for the most specialized and of more conservation concern (Shochat  
193 et al. 2001, Santos et al. 2006, Devictor et al. 2008, Caplat & Fonderflick 2009, Reino et al. 2009,  
194 2010, 2013, Butler et al. 2010, Voříšek et al. 2010, Fonderflick et al. 2010, Morgado et al. 2010,  
195 Méndez et al. 2011). For instance, Fonderflick et al. (2013) found that the abundance of open-  
196 habitat birds decreased significantly in the vicinity of edges, this negative response extended  
197 within 150 m from the edge, and the effect was disproportionately higher in open-habitat species  
198 with high conservation concern. Accordingly, we found this detrimental effect for species  
199 richness in winter (Table 2A).

200 Nevertheless, conservation status concern of the bird assemblage in the breeding season was  
201 higher at close distance to the tree plantation edge and was not affected by the area of tree  
202 plantations (Table 2). The Little Bustard, a large and high conservation concern species, was  
203 associated to larger plantations in the breeding season in this study area (Table S1). The small

204 size of the plantations (5.8 ha in average) together with the little development of some of them  
205 (e.g. tree cover of 1.7%, Table 1) may produce detrimental effects only at very short distances  
206 from them (e.g. <150 m, Fonderflick et al., 2013; Sánchez-Oliver et al., 2014a). Further, these  
207 plantations may mirror remnants of natural or semi-natural woody vegetation such as woodland  
208 patches and hedgerows that may be even beneficial for some farmland bird species (e.g.  
209 buntings), as they offer opportunities for forage, refuge and breeding (Concepción & Díaz, 2010,  
210 2011; Morgado et al., 2010; Batáry et al., 2012). Importantly, the hypothesized detrimental effect  
211 of the tree plantations seems to be diluted by the high heterogeneity of the landscape and the  
212 important proportion of woody crop, such as olive groves (Table 1) (Tryjanowski et al., 2011;  
213 Myczko et al., 2013). In agreement, other studies have shown that landscape heterogeneity is a  
214 relevant factor affecting the occurrence and abundance of farmland birds (Morales, García &  
215 Arroyo, 2005; Batáry, Matthiesen & Tschardtke, 2010; Batáry et al., 2011; Flohre et al., 2011;  
216 Concepción & Díaz, 2011; Sánchez-Oliver et al., 2014a).

217 We conclude that distance to, but not area of, young pine plantations established on former  
218 Mediterranean cropland exert an overall detrimental effect on bird species richness at open  
219 farmland that seems to be diluted by the high heterogeneity of the landscape. Thus, these tree  
220 plantations should not be favoured, and even be extirpated, in homogenous agricultural  
221 landscapes that are highly valuable for ground-nesting bird species and open farmland  
222 communities (Traba et al., 2006; Butler et al., 2010; Sanderson et al., 2013). We recommend  
223 long-term assessments of afforestation in agricultural landscapes to fully understand and,  
224 consequently, reduce its impacts on biodiversity, particularly on ground-nesting birds.

## 225 **References**

- 226 Agencia Española de Meteorología. 2012. Agencia Española de Meteorología.
- 227 Batáry P, Báldi A, Kleijn D, Tschardtke T. 2011. Landscape-moderated biodiversity effects of agri-  
228 environmental management: a meta-analysis. *Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society*  
229 278:1894–902.
- 230 Batáry P, Kovács-Hostyánszki A, Fischer C, Tschardtke T, Holzschuh A. 2012. Contrasting effect of  
231 isolation of hedges from forests on farmland vs. woodland birds. *Community Ecology* 13:155–161.
- 232 Batáry P, Matthiesen T, Tschardtke T. 2010. Landscape-moderated importance of hedges in conserving  
233 farmland bird diversity of organic vs. conventional croplands and grasslands. *Biological*  
234 *Conservation* 143:2020–2027.
- 235 Bibby C, Burgess ND, Hill DA, Mustoe SH. 2000. *Bird Census Techniques*. London: Academic Press.
- 236 BirdLife International. 2004a. *Birds in Europe: population estimates, trends and conservation status*.  
237 Cambridge, U.K.: BirdLife International.
- 238 BirdLife International. 2004b. *Birds in the European Union: a status assessment*. Wageningen, The  
239 Netherlands.
- 240 Bremer LL, Farley KA. 2010. Does plantation forestry restore biodiversity or create green deserts? A  
241 synthesis of the effects of land-use transitions on plant species richness. *Biodiversity and*  
242 *Conservation* 19:3893–3915.
- 243 Butler SJ, Boccaccio L, Gregory RD, Vorisek P, Norris K. 2010. Quantifying the impact of land-use  
244 change to European farmland bird populations. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 137:348–  
245 357.
- 246 Caplat P, Fonderflick J. 2009. Area mediated shifts in bird community composition : a study on a  
247 fragmented Mediterranean grassland. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 18:2979–2995.
- 248 Carrascal LM, Palomino D. 2008. *Las aves comunes reproductoras en España. Población en 2004-2006*.  
249 Madrid: SEO/Birdlife.
- 250 Concepción ED, Díaz M. 2010. Relative effects of field-and landscape-scale intensification on farmland  
251 bird diversity in Mediterranean dry cereal croplands. *Aspects of Applied Biology* 100:245–252.
- 252 Concepción ED, Díaz M. 2011. Field, landscape and regional effects of farmland management on  
253 specialist open-land birds: Does body size matter? *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*  
254 142:303–310.
- 255 Devictor V, Julliard R, Jiguet F. 2008. Distribution of specialist and generalist species along spatial  
256 gradients of habitat disturbance and fragmentation. *Oikos* 117:507–514.
- 257 Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development. 2012. *Rural Development in the European*  
258 *Union. Statistical and Economic Information. Report 2012*.

- 259 Donald PF, Pisano G, Rayment M, Pain D. 2002. The Common Agricultural Policy, EU enlargement and  
260 the conservation of Europe's farmland birds. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 89:167–182.
- 261 European Bird Census Council. 2010. *European wild bird indicators, 2009*.
- 262 European Commission. 2013a. Forestry measures under the common agricultural policy.
- 263 European Commission. 2013b. EU agriculture - Statistical and economic information.
- 264 FAO. 2011. *State of the World's Forests 2011*. Rome: FAO.
- 265 Felton A, Knight E, Wood J, Zammit C, Lindenmayer DB. 2010. A meta-analysis of fauna and flora  
266 species richness and abundance in plantations and pasture lands. *Biological Conservation* 143:545–  
267 554.
- 268 Flohre A, Fischer C, Aavik T, Bengtsson J, Berendse F, Bommarco R, Ceryngier P, Clement LW, Dennis  
269 C, Eggers S et al. 2011. Agricultural intensification and biodiversity partitioning in European  
270 landscapes comparing plants, carabids, and birds. *Ecological Applications* 21:1772–81.
- 271 Fonderflick J, Besnard A, Martin J-L. 2013. Species traits and the response of open-habitat species to  
272 forest edge in landscape mosaics. *Oikos* 122:42–51.
- 273 Fonderflick J, Caplat P, Lovaty F, Thévenot M, Prodon R. 2010. Avifauna trends following changes in a  
274 Mediterranean upland pastoral system. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 137:337–347.
- 275 Geographic Information System of Farming Land. 2010. Geographic Information System of Farming  
276 Land.
- 277 Gregory RD, Gibbons DW, Donald PF. 2004. Bird census and survey techniques. In: Sutherland WJ,  
278 Newton I, Green RE eds. *Bird Ecology and Conservation: a Handbook of Techniques*. Oxford  
279 University Press,.
- 280 Gregory RD, van Strien A, Vorisek P, Gmelig Meyling AW, Noble DG, Foppen RPB, Gibbons DW. 2005.  
281 Developing indicators for European birds. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of*  
282 *London. Series B, Biological sciences* 360:269–88.
- 283 Guerrero I, Morales MB, Oñate JJ, Geiger F, Berendse F, Snoo G De, Eggers S, Pärt T, Bengtsson J,  
284 Clement LW et al. 2012. Response of ground-nesting farmland birds to agricultural intensification  
285 across Europe: Landscape and field level management factors. *Biological Conservation* 152:74–80.
- 286 Junta de Castilla-La Mancha. 2013. Datos meteorológicos de Red de la Calidad del Aire de Castilla-La  
287 Mancha.
- 288 De la Montaña E, Rey Benayas JM, Carrascal LM. 2006. Response of bird communities to silvicultural  
289 thinning of Mediterranean maquis. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 43:651–659.

- 290 Méndez M, Tella JL, Godoy J a. 2011. Restricted gene flow and genetic drift in recently fragmented  
291 populations of an endangered steppe bird. *Biological Conservation* 144:2615–2622.
- 292 Morales MB, García JT, Arroyo B. 2005. Can landscape composition changes predict spatial and annual  
293 variation of little bustard male abundance? *Animal Conservation* 8:167–174.
- 294 Morgado R, Beja P, Reino L, Gordinho L, Delgado A, Borralho R, Moreira F. 2010. Calandra lark habitat  
295 selection: Strong fragmentation effects in a grassland specialist. *Acta Oecologica* 36:63–73.
- 296 Myczko Ł, Rosin ZM, Skórka P, Wylegała P, Tobolka M, Fliszkiewicz M, Mizera T, Tryjanowski P. 2013.  
297 Effects of management intensity and orchard features on bird communities in winter. *Ecological*  
298 *Research*:503–512.
- 299 Reino L, Beja P, Araújo MB, Dray S, Segurado P. 2013. Does local habitat fragmentation affect large-scale  
300 distributions? The case of a specialist grassland bird. *Diversity and Distributions* 19:423–432.
- 301 Reino L, Beja P, Osborne PE, Morgado R, Fabião A, Rotenberry JT. 2009. Distance to edges, edge  
302 contrast and landscape fragmentation: Interactions affecting farmland birds around forest plantations.  
303 *Biological Conservation* 142:824–838.
- 304 Reino L, Porto M, Morgado R, Carvalho F, Mira A, Beja P. 2010. Does afforestation increase bird nest  
305 predation risk in surrounding farmland? *Forest Ecology and Management* 260:1359–1366.
- 306 Rey Benayas JM, Galván I, Carrascal LM. 2010. Differential effects of vegetation restoration in  
307 Mediterranean abandoned cropland by secondary succession and pine plantations on bird  
308 assemblages. *Forest Ecology and Management* 260:87–95.
- 309 Rey Benayas JM, Martins A, Nicolau JM, Schulz JJ. 2007. Abandonment of agricultural land: an overview  
310 of drivers and consequences. *CAB Reviews: Perspectives in Agriculture, Veterinary Science,*  
311 *Nutrition and Natural Resources* 2:1–14.
- 312 Sánchez-Oliver JS, Rey Benayas JM, Carrascal LM. 2014a. Local habitat and landscape influence  
313 predation of bird nests on afforested Mediterranean cropland. *Acta Oecologica* 58:35–43.
- 314 Sánchez-Oliver JS, Rey Benayas JM, Carrascal LM. 2014b. Differential effects of local habitat and  
315 landscape characteristics on bird communities in Mediterranean afforestations motivated by the EU  
316 Common Agrarian Policy. *European Journal of Wildlife Research* 60:135–143.
- 317 Sanderson FJ, Kucharz M, Jobda M, Donald PF. 2013. Impacts of agricultural intensification and  
318 abandonment on farmland birds in Poland following EU accession. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and*  
319 *Environment* 168:16–24.
- 320 Santos T, Tellería JL, Díaz M, Carbonell R. 2006. Evaluating the benefits of CAP reforms: Can  
321 afforestations restore bird diversity in Mediterranean Spain? *Basic and Applied Ecology* 7:483–495.
- 322 Scholefield P, Firbank L, Butler SJ, Norris K, Jones LM, Petit S. 2011. Modelling the European Farmland  
323 Bird Indicator in response to forecast land-use change in Europe. *Ecological Indicators* 11:46–51.



- 324 Shochat E, Abramsky Z, Pinshow B. 2001. Breeding bird species diversity in the Negev: Effects of scrub  
325 fragmentation by planted forests. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 38:1135–1147.
- 326 Spanish Agrarian Guarantee Fund. 2012. Spanish Agrarian Guarantee Fund.
- 327 Traba J, García de la Morena EL, Morales MB, Suárez F. 2006. Determining high value areas for steppe  
328 birds in Spain: hot spots, complementarity and the efficiency of protected areas. *Biodiversity and*  
329 *Conservation* 16:3255–3275.
- 330 Tryjanowski P, Hartel T, Báldi A, Szymański P, Tobolka M, Herzon I, Goławski A, Konvička M, Hromada  
331 M, Jerzak L et al. 2011. Conservation of Farmland Birds Faces Different Challenges in Western and  
332 Central-Eastern Europe. *Acta Ornithologica* 46:1–12.
- 333 Voříšek P, Jiguet F, van Strien A, Škorpilová J, Klvaňová A, Gregory RD. 2010. Trends in abundance and  
334 biomass of widespread European farmland birds: how much have we lost? In: *BOU Proceedings -*  
335 *Lowland Farmland Birds III*.

336 **Table 1.** Mean, standard deviation (sd) and range (min / max) of area of tree plantations and land-  
 337 use categories in 1-km x 200-m 80 transects on farmland habitat adjacent to the 40 tree  
 338 plantations (two transects per plantation) that were surveyed in Central Spain.

	Mean	sd	min	max
Area of tree plantation (ha)	5.8	6.6	1.3	36.5
Cover of the tree layer (%)	38.8	25.7	1.7	100.0
Average pine height (m)	3.6	1.5	1.0	7.2
Average trunk diameter of pines (dbh cm)	13.3	6.5	4.0	33.2
Streams and rivers (% cover)	0.3	0.9	0.0	6.4
Roads and rural tracks (% cover)	1.7	1.6	0.0	7.7
Olive groves (% cover)	14.2	21.5	0.0	94.5
Scattered buildings (% cover)	0.3	1.0	0.0	7.3
Afforestation (% cover)	0.8	2.5	0.0	22.7
Semi-natural woodland (% cover)	0.1	0.8	0.0	9.5
Fruit and dried fruit groves (% cover)	0.2	2.1	0.0	26.6
Waste lands (% cover)	1.7	4.6	0.0	31.8
Pastures (% cover)	6.5	15.8	0.0	99.2
Dry herbaceous cropland (% cover)	40.4	32.8	0.0	100.0
Vineyards (% cover)	33.9	32.2	0.0	100.0

339 **Table 2.** Species richness and the average SPEC index related to conservation concern (in an<sup>17</sup>  
 340 inverse scale from 1-safe to 4-highly threatened) of the bird fauna inhabiting areas close to (0-400  
 341 m) and away (600-1000 m) from forest plantation edges, in winter (A) and in the breeding season  
 342 (B). Figures are mean  $\pm$  sd. The regression coefficient and p-value of the effects of distance to  
 343 plantation edge and plantation area (log-transformed) were obtained using generalized regression  
 344 models that compare close vs. away (as a dummy variable: 0-close, 1-away) controlling for the  
 345 effects of land use type (see Methods for more details).

	Close		Away		Distance		Area of plantation	
	Mean $\pm$ sd	Mean $\pm$ sd	Coeffic.	p-value	Coeffic.	p-value	Coeffic.	p-value
<b>A. Winter</b>								
Species richness	2.76 $\pm$ 2.06	3.56 $\pm$ 2.25	0.127	0.015	-0.045	0.570		
Transformed SPEC index	1.39 $\pm$ 0.68	1.48 $\pm$ 0.64	0.054	0.337	-0.028	0.694		
<b>B. Breeding season</b>								
Species richness	3.20 $\pm$ 1.88	3.01 $\pm$ 1.87	0.000	0.996	-0.041	0.490		
SPEC index (inverse of)	1.86 $\pm$ 0.67	1.60 $\pm$ 0.72	-0.116	0.037	0.011	0.879		

346

347 **Figure 1.** Location of the study area in central Spain within the Ciudad Real province and  
348 distribution of the young forest plantations (in black) and transects (grey) on adjacent cropland  
349 that were investigated in this study.

