SECTION 1

BASELINE AND MONITORING STUDIES FOR WIND PROJECTS

PRE-PROJECT ASSESSMENT
The primary purposes of pre-project assessment studies are to 1) collect information suitable for predicting the potential impacts of the project on wildlife and plants and 2) design the project layout (e.g., turbine locations) so that impacts on biological resources are avoided and minimized. To the extent possible, this pre-project assessment may utilize existing information from projects in comparable habitat types in locations close to the proposed project. The site-specific components and the duration of the assessment should depend on the size of the project, the availability and extent of existing and applicable information in the vicinity of the project, the habitats potentially affected, the likelihood and timing of occurrence of Threatened and Endangered and other Sensitive-Status species at the site, and other factors such as issues and concerns identified during public scoping. Each component is discussed below. The results of the information review and baseline studies should be reported to the affected stakeholders (e.g., state and federal wildlife agencies) in a timely fashion.

Information Review
Existing information on species and potential habitats in the vicinity of the project area should be reviewed and if appropriate, mapped. Sources of existing information should include resource agencies, local experts, recognized databases (e.g., Priority Habitats and Species [PHS] database), and data gathered at other nearby wind plants or other types of projects. This information should be used to develop a current state-of-the-art field and analysis protocol that is reviewed and approved by the state wildlife agency.

Habitat Mapping
Key information about general vegetation and land cover types, wildlife habitat, habitat quality, extent of noxious weeds, and physical characteristics within the project area should be collected and compiled using current state-of-the-art protocols.

Raptor Nest Surveys
At a minimum, one raptor nest survey during breeding season within 1-mile of the project site\(^1\) should be conducted to determine the location and species of active nests potentially disturbed by construction activities, and to identify active and potentially active nest sites with the highest likelihood of impacts from the operation of the wind plant. A larger survey area (e.g., a 2-mile buffer) is recommended if there is some likelihood of the

\(^1\) Site – a project “site” for the purposes of addressing potential raptor nest disturbances is defined as the furthest extent of a ground disturbing activity and includes gravel sites used for construction, overhead and underground electrical routes, new and upgraded substations.
occurrence of nesting state and/or federally threatened and endangered raptor species (e.g., ferruginous hawk, bald eagle, golden eagle), or if empirical data on displacement impacts may be monitored after construction (see Research-Orientated Studies Below).

**General Avian Use Surveys**
A minimum of one full season of avian use surveys is recommended following current state-of-the-art protocols to estimate the use of the project area by avian species/groups of interest during the season of most concern (usually spring/early summer). Additional seasonal data (e.g. fall or winter) is recommended in the following cases: 1) use of the site for the avian groups of concern is estimated to be high relative to other projects, 2) there is very little existing data regarding seasonal use of the project site, and/or 3) the project is especially large. This additional avian use data should be collected to refine impact predictions and make decisions on project layout.

**Surveys for Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Species**
If existing information suggests the probable occurrence of state and/or federal threatened or endangered or sensitive-status species on the project site at a level of concern, focused surveys are recommended during the appropriate season to determine the presence or likelihood of presence of the species. For example, if bald eagles are expected to winter in concentrations in the project vicinity, targeted surveys to estimate bald eagle use of the site would be appropriate.

**MINIMIZATION OF WILDLIFE IMPACTS**
One goal of the pre-project assessment is to help design the project to avoid, reduce and minimize impacts to habitat and wildlife. Below are some considerations for avoiding and minimizing impacts to wildlife.

**Avoid Impacts**

- Encourage development in agricultural and already disturbed lands, including using existing transmission corridors and roads where possible.

- Use of tubular towers is recommended to reduce the ability of birds to perch on towers and to possibly reduce the risk of collision. Discourage the use of lattice towers, particularly those with horizontal cross-members.

- Discourage tower types that employ guy wires. If guy wired towers are approved, encourage the requirement of bird flight diverters on the guy wires.

- Avoid high bird concentration areas, especially concentration areas of sensitive status species, and breeding sites.

- Discourage the use of rodenticides to control rodent burrowing around towers.

- Encourage the protection of PHS priority habitats.
Minimize Impacts

- Minimize use of overhead power lines.²

- When overhead lines are used, use designs that avoid and minimize impacts to raptors and other birds (e.g., adequate conductor spacing, use of perch guards).

- Minimize the use of lights on towers, in accordance with federal, state, and local requirements, wherever possible because they may attract flying wildlife to the vicinity of the turbines in certain conditions.

- Encourage the control of noxious weeds in accordance with federal, state, and local laws. Encourage the control of detrimental weedy species that invade existing habitat as a result of disturbance from construction and operation.

- Encourage the requirement of a complete road siting and management plan, including vehicle-driving speeds that minimize wildlife mortality.

- Encourage the requirement of a fire protection plan.

Reduce or Eliminate Impacts Over Time

- Encourage a decommissioning condition that would require removal of the turbines and infrastructure when it ceases operation, and restoration of the site to approximate pre-project conditions.

OPERATIONAL MONITORING
As is the case with most development, some mortality of bats and birds is expected to result from wind power projects. However, it is anticipated that significant impacts to wildlife can be avoided or lessened at most wind projects if proper pre-project assessment is implemented and good project design and management practices are established. Monitoring studies, such as carcass surveys, using current state-of-the-art protocols are required to determine the actual direct impacts of the wind farm on birds. The duration and scope of the monitoring should depend on the size of the project, and the availability of existing monitoring data at projects in comparable habitat types.

A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is recommended to be responsible for reviewing results of monitoring data and making suggestions to the permitting agency regarding the need to adjust mitigation and monitoring requirements based on results of initial monitoring data and available data from other projects. The range of possible adjustments to the monitoring and mitigation requirements should be clearly stated in the project permit (e.g., Conditional Use Permit). Adjustments should be made if unanticipated impacts become apparent from monitoring data. Examples of such changes

² However, use of overhead power lines might be warranted if habitat type is of concern.
may include additional monitoring or research focused to understand the identified impacts (e.g., bats) and creation of raptor nesting structures (artificial or natural, on or off-site) if significant impacts to raptor species are identified. Adjustments that are not feasible because they would make the wind project un-financeable include removing turbines or shutting down turbines during certain periods of the year. Adjustments can also reduce monitoring requirements based on monitoring data and site-specific conditions.

Potential members to the TAC include stakeholders such as state and federal wildlife agencies, the developers, environmental groups, landowners, and county representatives. Protocols for conducting the monitoring study and procedures for reporting and handling, and rehabilitating injured wildlife should be reviewed by the TAC. Progress reports summarizing the monitoring results should be reported to the TAC on a quarterly basis. Reporting schedules and scope of reports will be developed in the event of unusual unanticipated avian mortality.

RESEARCH-ORIENTED STUDIES
Standard pre-project assessment studies and standard fatality operational monitoring have been distinguished from more research-orientated studies. At some projects, additional studies that utilize pre-construction data may be conducted to test specific research hypotheses about impacts to a particular species or group of species. Rather than being necessary for pre-permit assessment, such studies are often more research-oriented and often are focused on indirect impacts, such as displacement, that provide information for future projects. Examples include the use of gradient analysis in understanding the level of displacement of grassland nesting birds as a function of distance from turbines or raptor nest monitoring comparing density and nest success before and after operation of the wind plant. If such studies are determined to be important to the overall understanding of wind energy/wildlife interactions, they should be designed to follow appropriate experimental designs and state of the art protocols (Anderson et al. 1999, Morrison et al. 2002). Funding for these more research-oriented studies should be solicited from multiple sources, including the wind industry, environmental groups, state and federal agencies, advocacy groups and other sources.
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SECTION 2
WIND PROJECT HABITAT MITIGATION

General Principles for Wind Project Siting and Mitigation
These principles are intended for projects proposed for sites east of the Cascades, where almost all wind projects have been proposed to date. These principles would require review and revision for sites west of the Cascades.

- Implementation of the mitigation measures contained in this proposal are presumed to fully mitigate for habitat losses for all species, including species classified as “protected,” in the Washington Administrative Code, but excluding species classified as state “endangered” or federally “threatened” or “endangered,” for which additional species- and site-specific mitigation may be necessary.

- Wind project developers should be encouraged to site wind power projects on disturbed lands (i.e., developed, cultivated, or otherwise disturbed by road or other corridors).

- Wind project developers should be encouraged to place linear facilities (such as collector cable routes, transmission line routes, or access roads) in or adjacent to existing disturbed corridors in order to minimize habitat fragmentation and degradation.

- Wind project developers should be discouraged from using or degrading high value habitat areas, especially shrub-steppe habitat in “excellent” condition.

- Wind project developers are responsible for acquiring replacement habitat under this proposal and for management of such lands for the life of the project, unless otherwise indicated.

- WDFW mitigation guidance seeks to recognize the full range of environmental benefits and impacts of development in determining appropriate mitigation, including the fact that wind is a renewable energy resource that can replace fossil fuels and other energy sources that have serious environmental consequences to plant and animal species and habitats.

MITIGATION FOR PERMANENT HABITAT IMPACTS

A. No mitigation required for cropland, developed, or disturbed areas

No mitigation will be required for impacts to lands that have little or no habitat value. Examples include lands that are:

- Currently being cultivated;
- Developed (long term); or
- Disturbed by an active road or other corridor that eliminates natural habitat values.
B. Criteria for Mitigation by Acquisition of Replacement Habitat

In each of the mitigation categories listed below, the criteria indicate that the replacement habitat should be:

- Like-kind (e.g., shrub-steppe for shrub-steppe; grassland for grassland) and/or of equal or higher habitat value than the impacted area, noting that an alternative ratio may be negotiated by a wind developer and WDFW for replacement habitat that differs from impacted habitat;
- Given legal protection (through acquisition in fee, a conservation easement, or other means);
- Protected from degradation for the life of the project to improve habitat function and value over time;
- In the same geographical region as the impacted habitat; and
- Jointly agreed upon by the wind developer and WDFW.

If a wind power applicant meets these criteria, then the following ratios apply:

1. Acquisition of Replacement Habitat Subject to Imminent Development – 1:1
   One acre of suitable replacement habitat will be accepted as mitigation for one acre of permanently impacted habitat where the replacement habitat is subject to imminent development – that is, there is a credible plan to develop the replacement habitat within five years and WDFW concurs with this assessment.

   **Rationale:** There is no net loss of habitat function or value where the replacement habitat would be lost but for its acquisition as mitigation. In fact, there should be a net gain in habitat value over time since protection of the replacement habitat (of equal or better value than the impacted area) will usually result in improved habitat value.

2. Acquisition of Grassland, CRP Replacement Habitat – 1:1
   One acre of suitable replacement grassland or CRP habitat will be accepted as mitigation for one acre of such habitat that is permanently impacted.

   **Rationale:** Habitat values are protected under this approach because:

   - Development of degraded grasslands or CRP habitat is preferable to development of shrub-steppe or other high value habitats.
   - The replacement habitat was at some risk of development and is now given permanent protection.
   - The replacement habitat is likely to improve in habitat function and value over time as degrading forces are removed.
   - The value of the replacement habitat is equal to or better than the habitat value of the impacted area.
   - The 1:1 ratio combines a number of factors -- which could require much time, effort, and expense to analyze and process -- in a simple and equitable approach.
3. **Acquisition of Shrub-Steppe, Other High-Value Habitat** -- 2:1

Two acres of suitable shrub-steppe or other high-value replacement habitat will be accepted as mitigation for one acre of permanently impacted shrub-steppe or other high-value habitat. In this context, “other high-value habitat” includes lithosol/shrub matrix (plant communities on lithosol soils intermixed with other plant communities on deeper soils).

**Rationale:** A net gain in habitat value is likely under this approach because the replacement habitat:

- Was at some risk of development and is now given permanent protection.
- Is likely to improve in habitat function and value over time as degrading forces are reduced on the protected area.
- Value is equal to or better than the habitat value of the impacted area.
- The 2:1 ratio combines a number of factors -- which could require much time, effort, and expense to analyze and process -- in a simple and equitable approach.

**Exception for habitat in “excellent” condition:** Where a wind project will affect habitat in “excellent” condition (based on federal methodologies for assessing range land, or other method acceptable to WDFW), wind project developers will engage in additional consultation with WDFW regarding suitable mitigation requirements for such habitat.

**MITIGATION FOR TEMPORARY IMPACTS TO HABITAT**

Temporary impacts to habitat are those that are anticipated to end when construction is complete and land has been restored. Temporary impacts include trenching for placement of underground cables, construction staging areas, lay-down areas, and temporary construction access. Temporary impacts also include the portions of road corridors that are used during construction but that are re-vegetated at the end of construction, but do not include the portions of roads that continue to be used for project operations (which are considered permanently affected). The goal of restoration of temporary impacts should be to restore the disturbed habitat to a condition that is at least as good as its pre-project condition.

A. **No Mitigation Required for Temporary Impacts to Cropland, Developed or Disturbed Areas (same as for permanent impacts)**

B. **Restoration, Mitigation for Temporary Impacts to Grass, CRP Lands -- 0.1:1**

Temporary impacts to grassland or CRP habitat can be mitigated by:

- Implementing a WDFW approved restoration plan for the impacted area. A restoration plan should include site preparation, reseeding with appropriate vegetation, noxious weed control, and protection from degradation (irrigation...
or planting with live plants will not be required).

- Acquiring 0.1 acres of suitable replacement habitat for every acre temporarily impacted by the project.

- A good faith effort should be made to restore the impacted area, however long-term performance targets should not be imposed since temporal losses and the possibility of restoration failure are incorporated into the acquisition and improvement of replacement habitat.

- WDFW and a wind developer may agree on other ratios and terms where doing so is mutually beneficial.

C. Restoration, Mitigation for Temporary Impacts to Shrub-steppe Habitat—0.5:1

Temporary impacts to shrub-steppe habitat can be mitigated by:

- Implementing a WDFW approved restoration plan for the impacted area. A restoration plan should include site preparation, reseeding with appropriate vegetation, noxious weed control, and protection from degradation (irrigation or planting with live plants will not be required).

- Acquiring 0.5 acres of suitable replacement habitat for every acre temporarily impacted by the project.

- A good faith effort should be made to restore the impacted area, however long-term performance targets should not be imposed since temporal losses and the possibility of restoration failure are incorporated into the acquisition and improvement of replacement habitat.

- WDFW and a wind developer may agree on other ratios and terms where doing so is mutually beneficial.

**Customized Acquisition and Restoration Packages** – This Habitat Mitigation proposal should not be viewed as preventing or discouraging WDFW and wind developers from negotiating “customized” or “alternative” mitigation packages where circumstances make it desirable for both parties to use accepted methodologies (such as NRDA or an alternative mitigation option) to do so.
SECTION 3
WIND POWER ALTERNATIVE MITIGATION PILOT PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION: This pilot program offers an alternative to conventional mitigation for wind projects that can greatly improve the habitat value per mitigation dollar as well as provide a more streamlined and efficient mitigation process for applicants. A significant feature of the pilot program is that it links targeted acquisition by WDFW of the highest value habitat in central and eastern Washington with sustained “stewardship” funding from wind projects to restore, manage, and monitor these critical habitat areas. Fortunately, many of the areas that have the highest habitat values are also low cost, providing an outstanding opportunity to maximize the value of mitigation funds.

Because the Alternative Mitigation Pilot Program is experimental in nature, the fee will be reviewed annually, and adjusted as necessary, by WDFW to ensure that it is equitable, compared to the conventional mitigation option in Section 2, and provides incentives to encourage significant participation by wind developers. In addition, the Alternative Mitigation Pilot Program will be reviewed and evaluated at the end of five years, along with the other sections of the Wind Power Guidelines.

GOAL: The goal of the Wind Power Alternative Mitigation Pilot Program is to provide an optional and streamlined approach to mitigation that results in better habitat value and is more attractive to wind developers than conventional “on-site” mitigation.

PRE-PROJECT ASSESSMENT, OPERATIONAL MONITORING
A wind project applicant may either:

1. Follow the guidance set forth in Section 1 of the Wind Power Guidelines document (Baseline and Monitoring Studies for Wind Projects), or

2. Follow a streamlined process (to be negotiated with WDFW) if the project is to be sited in an area that has been determined by WDFW to present a low probability of significant risk to wildlife (and efforts have been made to avoid and minimize wildlife impacts).

ALTERNATIVE HABITAT MITIGATION
After determination by the wind project applicant, in consultation with WDFW, of the project’s impact on habitat (in terms of acres permanently and temporarily impacted, and the type and general quality of habitat impacted), the applicant and WDFW will identify the appropriate annual fee for the life of the project\(^1\), based on an Alternative Mitigation Fee Rate of $55.00/acre/year for each acre of replacement habitat that would be owed

---

\(^1\) At the time of this writing, a request is being made to the State Legislature for an appropriation in the 2004 Supplemental Operating Budget.

\(^2\) “Life of the project” is defined as beginning at the end of the first year of commercial operation and ending with implementation of the project decommissioning plan.
using the ratios and analysis contained in Section 2.5

As noted above, the Alternative Mitigation Fee Rate will be reviewed annually, and adjusted as necessary, by WDFW. Changes to the fee will be applied to future wind development proposals (for which mitigation has not yet been determined); changes in the fee will not be applied retroactively.

General provisions:

- The fee listed above is based on habitat in “average” condition and can be increased or decreased by up to 25% to account for differences in habitat quality.
- The applicant will be required to implement an approved restoration plan for temporarily impacted areas (in accordance with Section 2).
- In cases where the project impacts a mixture of habitat types, the fee schedule will be applied accordingly (to the nearest acre).
- The annual fee will be used primarily to support “stewardship” of high-value habitat in the same ecological region as the project (for management, monitoring, restoration, protection from degradation). It is envisioned that these annual stewardship funds will be applied to strategically important habitat in central and eastern Washington that is newly acquired by WDFW. The annual fees will be deposited into a dedicated WDFW account and may also be used for acquisition.
- If the applicant and WDFW cannot agree on a mutually advantageous “package” under the alternative mitigation program, the conventional mitigation guidance in Section 2 will be applied to the project.

---

5 To determine Alternative Mitigation Fee, use the guidance provided in Section 2 to:

1) Determine acres permanently and temporarily impacted by project for the shrub-steppe and grass categories (i.e., permanently impacted shrub-steppe, permanently impacted grass/CRP, temporarily impacted shrub-steppe, and temporarily impacted grass/CRP);

2) Multiply the acres in each of the four categories by the applicable ratio (e.g., shrub-steppe acres permanently impacted x 2.0);

3) Sum the acreage of the four categories to arrive at the total acres of mitigation owed; and

4) Multiply this total by the Alternative Mitigation Fee Rate to arrive at total annual payment for the project.