

APPENDIX E

Agency Letter Responses

This page intentionally left blank.



Jack Dalrymple, Governor
Mark A. Zimmerman, Director

1600 East Century Avenue, Suite 3
Bismarck, ND 58503-0649
Phone 701-328-5357
Fax 701-328-5363
E-mail parkrec@nd.gov
www.parkrec.nd.gov

March 18, 2011

Clayton Derby
West Inc.
4007 State Street, Suite 109
Bismarck, ND 58503

Re: Proposed New Frontier Wind Energy Project - McHenry County

Dear Mr. Miller:

The North Dakota Parks and Recreation Department has reviewed the above referenced project proposal for developing the New Frontier wind energy project in McHenry County.

Our agency scope of authority and expertise covers recreation and biological resources (in particular rare species and ecological communities). The project as defined does not affect state park lands that we manage or Land and Water Conservation Fund recreation projects that we coordinate.

The North Dakota Natural Heritage biological conservation database has been reviewed to determine if any current or historic plant or animal species of concern or other significant ecological communities are known to occur within an approximate one-mile radius of the project area. Based on this review, there are no known occurrences within or adjacent to the project area. Because this information is not based on a comprehensive inventory, there may be species of concern or otherwise significant ecological communities in the area that are not represented in the database. The lack of data for any project area cannot be construed to mean that no significant features are present. The absence of data may indicate that the project area has not been surveyed, rather than confirm that the area lacks natural heritage resources.

Given the project's potential for not only habitat disturbance and disruption but the threat to nesting, feeding and migratory bird and bats in the area we suggest that all efforts be made to avoid impacts to wildlife species and their habitats. In an effort to avoid or minimize impacts to wildlife and their habitats we encourage proper evaluation of all potential wind energy sites. To identify and assess adverse impacts to wildlife we suggest pre and post construction avian and bat monitoring studies be conducted.

Regarding any reclamation efforts, we recommend that any impacted areas be revegetated with species native to the project area.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. Please contact Kathy Duttonhefner (701-328-5370 or kgduttonhefner@nd.gov) of our staff if additional information is needed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jesse Hanson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being more prominent.

Jesse Hanson, Manager
Planning and Natural Resources Division

R.USNDNHI*2011-059 KD3/16/2011DL3.25.2011

.....
Play in our backyard!



"VARIETY IN HUNTING AND FISHING"

NORTH DAKOTA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT

100 NORTH BISMARCK EXPRESSWAY BISMARCK, NORTH DAKOTA 58501-5095 PHONE 701-328-6300 FAX 701-328-6352

March 28, 2011

Clayton Derby
Senior Manager
WEST, Inc.
4007 State Street, Suite 109
Bismarck, ND 58503

Dear Mr. Derby:

RE: Proposed New Frontier Wind Energy Project – McHenry County, North Dakota

The North Dakota Game and Fish Department has reviewed this project for wildlife concerns.

Our primary concern with wind power development is the disturbance of native prairie associated with construction of turbines, access roads, and other associated facilities. We ask that work within native prairie be avoided to the extent possible. This could include micro-siting turbines onto adjacent previously disturbed land, locating access roads on existing section line trails rather than across undisturbed native prairie, etc.

The National Wetland Inventory indicates numerous wetlands within the proposed project area. We recommend that any unavoidable wetland impacts be replaced in kind, above-ground appurtenances not be placed in wetland areas, and no alterations be made to existing drainage patterns.

We also recommend that routine monitoring for avian and bat mortality be included as part of the facility maintenance plan for the life of the project. We would appreciate being kept informed as this project progresses, and if possible, we would like the GPS coordinates for each turbine after the site has been established.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul Schadewald". The signature is fluid and cursive.

Paul Schadewald
Chief
Conservation & Communication Division

js



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Ecological Services
3425 Miriam Avenue
Bismarck, North Dakota 58501



JUN 30 2011

Mr. Clayton Derby
Senior Manager
WEST Inc.
4007 State Street, Suite 109
Bismarck, North Dakota 58503

Re: Potential New Frontier Wind Energy Project

Dear Mr. Derby:

This is in response to your letter dated February 28, 2011, which was a follow-up to a meeting on February 24, 2011, in our office with representatives of your firm, Element Power, and North Dakota Game and Fish Department. You stated Element Power is evaluating the feasibility of developing the New Frontier wind energy project in McHenry County, North Dakota, including all or parts of T. 15 N., R. 80 W., Sec. 7, 8, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. The project proposal also includes a potential transmission line route to an existing substation near Voltaire. There are currently no proposed construction dates.

We offer the following comments under the authority of and in accordance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.) (MBTA), Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) (16 U.S.C. 668-668d, 54 Stat. 250), the Endangered Species Act (ESA) (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), and the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-57).

General Comments

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) holds certain resources in trust and manages them for the benefit of the American people. These resources include migratory birds, inter-jurisdictional fish, federally-listed threatened and endangered species of plants and animals and their habitats, and units of the National Wildlife Refuge system. One goal of Service policy is that conservation of fish and wildlife resources receive equal consideration with other features of resource development, and that conservation actions are coordinated with those other forms of development. Another goal is to conserve, protect, and enhance fish and wildlife and their habitats to facilitate the balanced development of the Nation's natural resources.

Adequate consideration for avian and other wildlife resources early in the site evaluation process can help to minimize impacts and facilitate project review. Informed site selection is possibly the most important step in avoiding and minimizing impacts to wildlife. Although current wind turbine technology and proper siting can help to minimize the incidence of avian and bat deaths

due to blade, aerial line, and turbine strikes, the potential for direct mortality of some migratory birds and bats will remain. Wind power developers, in concert with the Service, can help to ensure that projects proceed with as little impact to migratory birds as possible. This can be accomplished by gathering information on avian resources as they relate to project siting and by implementing measures to minimize impacts to migratory birds from the construction and operation of the wind facility. The Service's Interim Wind Turbine Siting Guidelines are enclosed to assist in project planning (enclosure 1). We encourage the project proponents to conduct a Potential Impact Index (PII) analysis on several potential sites within wind resource areas to assist in the selection of a wind power site that minimizes the potential to impact migratory birds.

You indicated your company is assisting Element Power in a Tier 2 analysis consistent with the Federal Advisory Committee recommendations. The Wind Turbine Guidelines Advisory Committee completed its work and submitted its recommendations to the Service on March 4, 2010. The Service published its Draft Land-Based Wind Energy Guidelines in the Federal Register for public comment on February 18, 2011. The Service has not yet published new guidelines; therefore, we continue to recommend use of the Service's 2003 voluntary Guidelines referenced above. Please inform this office whether or not you plan to use the Service's 2003 Guidelines in selecting your site and if not, whether you intend to use a different method to assess potential impacts to avian and other wildlife resources, and if so, what that method consists of.

In the meeting held in our office on February 24, Element Power provided the Service with copies of Final Critical Issues Analyses for both the New Frontier and Garrison Butte Wind Projects, prepared by HDR Engineering Inc., both dated June 2010. The New Frontier document states that HDR made a site visit on November 20, 2009. The Service should have been contacted and involved in survey design for any prospective project sites. In both the New Frontier and Garrison Butte Analyses, the following recommendation is made by HDR: "USFWS has been taking a very cautious approach to energy projects within the whooping crane migratory corridor and should be consulted early on in the project development process to discuss potential impacts and probable avoidance or mitigation strategies." We could not agree more, and we urge Element Power to work with the Service on potential impacts to whooping cranes and other wildlife resources before making a final site selection.

Migratory Birds

The MBTA prohibits the taking, killing, possession, and transportation (among other actions), of migratory birds, their eggs, parts, and nests, except when specifically permitted. While the Act has no provision for allowing unintentional take, the Service realizes that some birds may be killed during wind project construction and operation even if all known reasonable and effective measures to protect birds are used. The Office of Law Enforcement (OLE) carries out its mission to protect migratory birds through investigations and enforcement, as well as by fostering relationships with individuals, companies, and agencies that have taken effective steps to avoid take of migratory birds and by encouraging others to implement measures to avoid take of migratory birds. It is not possible to absolve individuals, companies, or agencies from liability

even if they implement bird mortality avoidance or other similar protective measures. However, OLE focuses its resources on investigating and prosecuting individuals and agencies that take migratory birds without identifying and implementing all reasonable, prudent and effective measures to avoid that take. Companies are encouraged to work closely with Service biologists to identify available protective measures when developing project plans and/or avian protection plans, and to implement those measures prior to/during project construction and operation.

The Service has coordinated with the Avian Power Line Interaction Committee (APLIC) to develop guidelines to assist companies in formulating Avian Protection Plans (APP). The guidelines can be accessed from APLIC's website at <http://www.aplic.org/>. These plans are utility specific and designed to reduce operational risks that result from avian interactions with electric utility facilities, but we suggest they may be adapted to wind energy facilities. Wind energy projects have the potential to negatively affect bats, as well as avian species. Therefore, we encourage project developers to formulate an Avian and Bat Protection Plan (ABPP) if bats migrate through or may be present in the project area.

Some of the things that the Service looks for in an APP or ABPP are typically a statement of company policy confirming the company's commitment to work cooperatively towards the protection of migratory birds and bats; identification of the process under which the company will obtain and comply with all necessary permits, including, but not limited to, nest relocation, temporary possession, depredation, salvage/disposal, and scientific collection; discussion of the company's plan for monitoring and reporting all incidents of avian or bat injury or mortality; a commitment to make all reasonable efforts to construct and modify infrastructure to reduce the incidence of avian and bat mortality; a mechanism to review existing practices, ensuring quality control and allowing for adaptive management; and a plan for providing adequate training for all appropriate utility personnel. An APP or ABPP reporting system is important to help the company pinpoint areas of concern by tracking both the specific locations where mortalities may be occurring, as well as the extent of such mortalities and the remedial actions taken/planned to address identified problem areas. Following the 2003 voluntary Guidelines and involving the Service prior to selecting a project site are key components to obtaining prosecutorial discretion in the event of bird injuries and mortalities due to project construction and operation.

To minimize the electrocution hazard to birds, the Service, with support from the Rural Utilities Service, recommends that new or updated overhead power lines be constructed in accordance with the current guidelines for preventing raptor electrocutions. The recommended guidelines can be found in "[2006 Suggested Practices for Avian Protection on Power Lines](#)". To increase power line visibility and reduce bird fatalities resulting from collisions with power lines, the Service recommends all new power lines that cross or run adjacent to rivers or large wetlands be modified according to "[Mitigating Bird Collisions with Power Lines: The State of the Art in 1994](#)". Both publications can be obtained by writing or calling the Edison Electric Institute, P.O. Box 266, Waldorf, Maryland 20604-0266, (1-800-334-5453) or visiting their website at www.eei.org.

To the extent practicable, construction should be scheduled for late summer or fall/early winter so as not to disrupt waterfowl or other wildlife during the breeding season (February 1 to July 15). If work is proposed to take place during the breeding season or at any other time which may result in

the take of migratory birds, their eggs, or active nests, the Service recommends that the project proponent take all practicable measures to avoid and minimize take, such as maintaining adequate buffers to protect the birds until the young have fledged. The Service further recommends that if field surveys for nesting birds are contemplated, that survey plans be shared with and coordinated with this office, and that if surveys are conducted with the intent of avoiding take, that any documentation of the presence of migratory birds, eggs, and active nests, along with information regarding the qualifications of the biologist(s) performing the surveys, and any avoidance measures implemented at the project site be maintained. Should surveys or other available information indicate a significant impact to migratory birds, the Service requests that this office be contacted for further consultation on the extent of the impact and the long-term implications of the intended use of the project on migratory bird populations.

Bald and Golden Eagles

The BGEPA prohibits anyone without a permit issued by the Secretary of the Interior from taking bald or golden eagles, including their parts, nests, or eggs. The Act provides criminal and civil penalties for persons who take, possess, sell, purchase, barter, offer to sell, purchase or barter, transport, export or import, at any time or any manner, any bald eagle or any golden eagle, alive or dead, or any part, nest, or egg thereof. The Act defines take as pursue, shoot, shoot at, poison, wound, kill, capture, trap, collect, molest or disturb. "Disturb" means to agitate or bother a bald or golden eagle to a degree that causes, or is likely to cause, based on the best scientific information available, 1) injury to an eagle, 2) a decrease in its productivity, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior, or 3) nest abandonment, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior. In addition to immediate impacts, this definition also covers impacts that result from human-induced alterations initiated around a previously used nest site during a time when eagles are not present, if, upon the eagles return, such alterations agitate or bother an eagle to a degree that injures an eagle or substantially interferes with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering habits and causes, or is likely to cause, a loss of productivity or nest abandonment. A permit is required for any take of bald or golden eagles or their nests. Permits to take eagles or their nests are available only for legitimate emergencies or as part of a program to protect eagles.

Threatened, Endangered, and Candidate Species

A list of federally threatened and endangered species, and candidate species that may occur within the proposed project's potential area of influence is enclosed, i.e. a list of threatened, endangered, and candidate species for McHenry County (enclosure 3). This list fulfills requirements of the Service under the ESA.

Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the ESA allows non-Federal parties planning activities that have no Federal nexus, but which could result in the incidental taking of listed animals, to apply for an incidental take permit. (A Federal nexus exists whenever an activity is conducted, funded, or licensed or permitted by a Federal agency). The application must include a habitat conservation plan (HCP) laying out the proposed actions, determining the effects of those actions on federally-listed plant

and wildlife species and their habitats (and may include proposed or candidate species), and defining measures to minimize and mitigate adverse effects.

If a Federal agency authorizes, funds, or carries out a proposed action, the responsible Federal agency, or its delegated agent, is required to evaluate whether the action "may affect" listed species or critical habitat. If the Federal agency or its designated agent determines the action "may affect, is likely to adversely affect" listed species or result in destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat, the responsible Federal agency shall request formal section 7 consultation with this office. If the evaluation shows a "no effect" determination for listed species or critical habitat, further consultation is not necessary. If a private entity receives Federal funding for a construction project, or if any Federal permit or license is required, the Federal agency may designate the fund recipient or permittee as its agent for purposes of informal section 7 consultation. The funding, permitting, or licensing Federal agency is responsible to ensure that its actions comply with the ESA, including obtaining concurrence from the Service for any action that may affect a threatened or endangered species or designated critical habitat.

The Aransas Wood Buffalo Population (AWBP) of whooping cranes is the only self sustaining migratory population of whooping cranes remaining in the wild. These birds breed in the wetlands of Wood Buffalo National Park in Alberta and the Northwest Territories of northern Canada, and overwinter on the Texas coast. Whooping cranes in the AWBP annually migrate through North Dakota during their spring and fall migrations.

Endangered whooping cranes have been documented using stopover habitat throughout North Dakota. Wind energy projects in this wind resource area have the potential to affect whooping cranes during their annual spring and fall migrations. Potential effects may be direct (e.g. collision mortality) or indirect (e.g. avoidance of the site resulting in cranes seeking alternate habitat). The best available information indicates that whooping cranes avoid stopover habitat that is developed with wind energy appurtenances, particularly wind turbines. This avoidance may deny them the use of important habitat, and thus may result in an adverse effect in the form of harm by significant habitat modification. Whooping cranes use migration stopover habitat opportunistically and may not use the same stopovers annually. Whooping cranes often stop wherever they happen to be late in the day when they find conditions no longer suitable for migration. This tendency can make for a very unpredictable pattern of stopover use, depending on daily weather conditions.

The interactions of whooping cranes with wind turbines and wind farms are currently not fully known, although it is expected that these large birds with relatively low maneuverability are susceptible to mortality via collisions with turbines. The highest known source of mortality to fledged whooping cranes is from striking power lines. Currently, collisions with power lines have accounted for the death or serious injury of at least 46 whooping cranes since 1956.

Element Power has informed us that there is no Federal nexus to this project. Element Power is also participating in the Great Plains Wind Energy (GPWE) Programmatic HCP that includes the potential project site described. Given that project-specific HCPs are costly and time-consuming

both for the project proponent and the Service, and if Element Power believes that incidental take of any federally-listed species, including the whooping crane and the piping plover, is likely to occur, we suggest that if the New Frontier Project goes forward at the indicated site, be covered under the GPWE HCP.

Fish and Wildlife Service Property Interests

The Service administers Waterfowl Production Areas owned in fee title, as well as wetland and grassland easements throughout North Dakota. A review of Service realty records for the proposed project area indicates Service property interests are located in the proposed project area (enclosure 3). The Service has an ongoing easement acquisition program and we recommend that for any plans to develop in McHenry County, you contact Mr. Kelly Hogan for more specific information relative to Service easements and up-to-date realty records at telephone (701) 768-2548 or email kelly_hogan@fws.gov.

Wetland easements are legal agreements with private landowners that permanently protect wetland basins from being drained, burned, leveled, or filled. Grassland easements are legal agreements with landowners that permanently protect grassland vegetation, primarily native prairie, from being destroyed or developed. Grassland easements prevent these grasslands from being converted to cropland. Mowing, haying, and grass seed harvesting must be delayed on grassland easements until after July 15 each year to protect grassland nesting birds. The primary responsibility in protecting these interests is to review all proposed uses to ensure that the requests are compatible with Service easement regulations and various laws and policies. These comments and suggestions are made in an attempt to accomplish three goals: 1) avoid impacts to Service grassland and wetland easements in the project area as much as possible; 2) if unavoidable, ensure that any proposed turbine and associated infrastructure impacts (roads, buried collection lines, transmission lines, sub-stations, etc.) on any Service easement areas are kept to an absolute minimum; and 3) investigate all potential alternatives to eliminate or reduce impacts to easement areas to protect the integrity of the easement.

Cultural resource compliance requires coordination with the Zone Archeologist early in the NEPA process. Cultural Resource field investigations on USFWS easements and fee lands require a permit issued by the Zone Archeologist. Contact Barry G. Williams, USFWS Dakotas Zone Archeologist (barry_williams@fws.gov, 701-355-8577).

High Value Habitat Avoidance

High value wildlife habitat types in North Dakota include native prairie, wetlands, wooded draws and riparian forests. We recommend that construction of wind towers and appurtenant facilities in the these habitat types be avoided whenever possible.

Our review of NWI maps indicates that wetland areas are located within the project area. NWI data can be accessed directly by visiting their website at (wetlands.fws.gov). Section 404 of the Clean Water Act regulates placement of fill materials in certain wetlands. A Corps of Engineers'


404 permit may be required if fill material will be placed in aquatic sites, including wetlands. The project proponent should contact Mr. Dan Cimarosti, Regulatory Office, Corps of Engineers, 1513 South 12th Street, Bismarck, North Dakota 58504 (701-255-0015), to determine their permit requirements. If a 404 permit is required, the Service will also provide recommendations on this project to the Corps.

Research, Monitoring, and Assessment

We recommend project proponents conduct a minimum of 2 years of pre-construction wildlife surveys to quantify bird and bat use of the project area. Collision monitoring studies are recommended for a minimum of 3 years post-construction to determine the effect of several factors, such as site selection, turbine designs, the layout of wind plants, wind plant operations, habitat alteration, and changes in available perching and nesting sites, on bird and bat deaths. Annual reports outlining the results of these monitoring studies should be submitted to this office. The Avian Subcommittee of the National Wind Coordinating Committee (NWCC) has developed a guidance document to assist wind energy developers in designing studies that will produce credible and comparable results of avian interaction with wind power plants. The NWCC document, "Studying Wind Energy/Bird Interactions: A Guidance Document. Metrics and methods for determining or monitoring potential impacts on birds at existing and proposed wind energy sites," can be obtained by contacting the National Wind Coordination Committee, c/o RESOLVE, 1255 23rd Street, Suite 275, Washington, D.C. 20037, or by visiting their website at (www.nationalwind.org).

If you have any questions, please contact Kevin Shelley of my staff or myself at (701) 250-4481, or at the letterhead address.

Sincerely,



Jeffrey K. Towner
Field Supervisor
North Dakota Field Office

Enclosures (3)

cc: N. Dakota Public Service Commission
J. Clark Salyer Wetland Management District
(Attn: Kelly Hogan)
North Dakota Game and Fish Department
(Attn: John Schumacher)

FEDERAL THREATENED, ENDANGERED, AND CANDIDATE SPECIES
AND DESIGNATED CRITICAL HABITAT FOUND IN
MCHENRY COUNTY, NORTH DAKOTA

ENDANGERED SPECIES

Birds

Whooping crane (Grus Americana): Aransas-Wood Buffalo Population (264 birds) occurs in North Dakota counties during spring and fall migration between breeding and wintering areas. Whooping cranes prefer to roost overnight in shallow open water wetland habitat with good visibility during migration stopovers.

Mammals

Gray wolf (Canis lupus): Occasional visitor in North Dakota. Most frequently observed in the Turtle Mountains area.

THREATENED SPECIES

Birds

Piping plover (Charadrius melodus): Nests on midstream sandbars of the Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers and along shorelines of saline wetlands. More nest in North Dakota than any other state.

CANDIDATE SPECIES

Birds

Sprague's Pipit (Anthus spragueii): Nests in native and planted grassland. Prefers patches of grassland at least 72 acres (29 hectares).

Invertebrates

Dakota skipper (Hesperia dacotae): Found in native prairie containing a high diversity of wildflowers and grasses. Habitat includes two prairie types: 1) low (wet) prairie dominated by bluestem grasses, wood lily, harebell, and smooth camas; 2) upland (dry) prairie on ridges and hillsides dominated by bluestem grasses, needlegrass, pale purple and upright coneflowers and blanketflower.

DESIGNATED CRITICAL HABITAT

Birds

Piping Plover - Alkali Lakes and Wetlands - Critical habitat includes: (1) shallow, seasonally to permanently flooded, mixosaline to hypersaline wetlands with sandy to gravelly, sparsely vegetated beaches, salt-encrusted mud flats, and/or gravelly salt flats; (2) springs and fens along edges of alkali lakes and wetlands; and (3) adjacent uplands 200 feet (61 meters) above the high water mark of the alkali lake or wetland.

Piping Plover - Missouri River - Critical habitat includes sparsely vegetated channel sandbars, sand and gravel beaches on islands, temporary pools on sandbars and islands, and the interface with the river.

Piping Plover - Lake Sakakawea and Oahe - Critical habitat includes sparsely vegetated shoreline beaches, peninsulas, islands composed of sand, gravel, or shale, and their interface with the water bodies.

INTERIM GUIDELINES TO AVOID AND MINIMIZE WILDLIFE IMPACTS FROM WIND TURBINES

Introduction

Wind-generated electrical energy is renewable, produces no emissions, and is generally considered to be an environmentally friendly technology. Development of wind energy is strongly endorsed by the Secretary of the Interior, as expressed in the Secretary's Renewable Energy on Public Lands Initiative (May 2002). However, wind energy facilities can adversely impact wildlife, especially birds (e.g., Orloff and Flannery 1992, Leddy et al. 1999, Woodward et al. 2001, Braun et al. 2002, Hunt 2002) and bats (Keeley et al. 2001, Johnson et al. 2002, Johnson et al. 2003). As more facilities with larger turbines are built, the cumulative effects of this rapidly growing industry may initiate or contribute to the decline of some wildlife populations (Manes et al. 2002, Johnson et al. 2002, Manville 2003). The potential harm to these populations from an additional source of mortality or adverse habitat impacts makes careful evaluation of proposed facilities essential. Due to local differences in wildlife concentration and movement patterns, habitats, area topography, facility design, and weather, each proposed development site is unique and requires detailed, individual evaluation.

The following guidance was prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). Like the Service's voluntary guidance addressing the siting, construction, operation, and decommissioning of communication towers (<http://migratorybirds.fws.gov/issues/towers/comtow.html>) and the voluntary guidance developed in cooperation with the electric utility industry to minimize bird strikes and electrocutions (APLIC 1994, APLIC 1996), this guidance is intended to assist the wind energy industry in avoiding or minimizing impacts to wildlife and their habitats. This is accomplished through: (1) proper evaluation of potential Wind Resource Areas (WRAs), (2) proper location and design of turbines and associated structures within WRAs selected for development, and (3) pre- and post-construction research and monitoring to identify and/or assess impacts to wildlife. These guidelines are based on current science and will be updated as new information becomes available. They are voluntary, and interim in nature. They will be evaluated over a two-year period, and then modified as necessary based on their performance in the field, on comments from the public, and on the latest scientific and technical discoveries developed in coordination with industry, states, academic researchers, and other Federal agencies. After this period, the Service plans to develop a complete operations manual for evaluation, site selection, design, construction, operation, and monitoring of wind energy facilities in both terrestrial and aquatic environments.

Data on wildlife use and mortality collected at one wind energy facility are not necessarily applicable to others; each site poses its own set of possibilities for negative effects on wildlife. In addition, the wind industry is rapidly expanding into habitats and regions that have not been well studied. The Service therefore suggests a precautionary approach to site selection and development, and will employ this approach in making recommendations and assessing impacts of wind energy developments. We encourage the wind energy industry to follow these guidelines and, in cooperation with the Service, to conduct scientific research to provide additional information on the impacts of wind energy development on wildlife. We further encourage the industry to look for opportunities to promote bird and other wildlife conservation when planning wind energy facilities (e.g., voluntary habitat acquisition or conservation easements).

The Service is guided by the Fish and Wildlife Service Mitigation Policy (Federal Register 46 (15), January 1981) in evaluating modifications to or loss of habitat caused by development. This policy follows the sequence of steps recommended in the Council on Environmental Quality's Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in seeking to avoid, minimize, or compensate for negative impacts. Mitigation can involve (1) avoiding the impact of an activity by taking no action; (2) minimizing impacts by limiting the degree of activity; (3) rectifying an impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring an affected environment; (4) reducing or eliminating an impact by conducting activities that preserve and maintain the resources; or (5) compensating for an impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments. Any mitigation recommended by the Service

1. Identify and evaluate reference sites, preferably within the general geographic area of the proposed facility. Reference sites are high-quality wildlife areas where wind development would result in the maximum negative impact on wildlife (i.e., sites selected to have the highest possible rank using the protocol). Reference sites are used to determine the comparative risks of developing other potential sites.
2. Evaluate potential development sites to determine risk to wildlife and rank sites against each other using the highest-ranking reference site as a standard. Although high-ranking sites are generally less desirable for wind energy development, a high rank does not necessarily preclude development of a site, nor does a low rank automatically eliminate the need to conduct pre-development assessments of wildlife resources or post-development assessments of impacts.

Studies to Assess and Monitor Wildlife Impacts

While ranking potential development sites, the site evaluation team referenced above may identify pre-development studies that are needed to better assess potential negative impacts to wildlife. Ranking may also suggest the extent and duration of study required. Developers are encouraged to conduct any studies suggested by the team in coordination with Service and other agency wildlife biologists.

Post-development mortality studies should be a part of any site development plan in order to determine if or to what extent mortality occurs. As with pre-development studies, ranking may suggest the extent and duration of study needed. Studies should be designed in coordination with Federal and other agency biologists.

Site Development Recommendations

The following recommendations apply to locating turbines and associated structures within WRAs selected for development of wind energy facilities:

1. Avoid placing turbines in documented locations of any species of wildlife, fish, or plant protected under the Federal Endangered Species Act.
2. Avoid locating turbines in known local bird migration pathways or in areas where birds are highly concentrated, unless mortality risk is low (e.g., birds present rarely enter the rotor-swept area). Examples of high concentration areas for birds are wetlands, State or Federal refuges, private duck clubs, staging areas, rookeries, leks, roosts, riparian areas along streams, and landfills. Avoid known daily movement flyways (e.g., between roosting and feeding areas) and areas with a high incidence of fog, mist, low cloud ceilings, and low visibility.
3. Avoid placing turbines near known bat hibernation, breeding, and maternity/nursery colonies, in migration corridors, or in flight paths between colonies and feeding areas.
4. Configure turbine locations to avoid areas or features of the landscape known to attract raptors (hawks, falcons, eagles, owls). For example, Golden Eagles, hawks, and falcons use cliff/rim edges extensively; setbacks from these edges may reduce mortality. Other examples include not locating turbines in a dip or pass in a ridge, or in or near prairie dog colonies.
5. Configure turbine arrays to avoid potential avian mortality where feasible. For example, group turbines rather than spreading them widely, and orient rows of turbines parallel to known bird movements, thereby decreasing the potential for bird strikes. Implement appropriate storm water management practices that do not create attractions for birds, and maintain contiguous habitat for area-sensitive species (e.g., Sage Grouse).

Appendix 1

PROTOCOL TO RANK POTENTIAL TERRESTRIAL WIND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT SITES BY IMPACTS ON WILDLIFE

This protocol was developed by a team of Federal, State, university, and industry biologists to rank potential wind development sites in Montana by their potential for impacts on wildlife (USFWS 2002). It has been modified to apply nationwide. The protocol allows the user to evaluate potential development sites and rank them against a reference site. Objectives are to: (1) assist developers in deciding whether to proceed with development; (2) provide a procedure to determine pre-construction study needs to verify use of potential sites by wildlife; and (3) provide recommendations for monitoring potential sites post-construction to identify, quantify, or verify actual impacts (or lack thereof).

Although this protocol focuses on impacts to wildlife, potential impacts to fish, other aquatic life, and plants should be considered as well. Surveys for rare, threatened, or endangered plants known or suspected to occur in the geographic area should be conducted at all proposed terrestrial development sites having suitable habitat.

This protocol is intended to provide a conceptual framework for initial steps in investigating a site. It is not intended to be all-inclusive relative to objectives, methods, and analysis nor to serve as the definitive reference or directive for any step in wind power related investigations. The Physical Attributes, Species Occurrence and Status, and Ecological Attractiveness groupings in this protocol should serve as a model framework; the terrain features, species, and conditions used in these groupings will be dictated by local conditions and should be developed by wildlife biologists familiar with the region in which this protocol is being used.

Potential Impact Index (PII)

The Potential Impact Index represents a "first cut" analysis of the suitability of a site proposed for development. It does so by estimating use of the site by selected wildlife species as an indicator of potential impact. Emphasis of the PII is on initial site evaluation and is intended to provide more objectivity than simple reconnaissance surveys.

There are two steps to follow in ranking sites by their potential impact on wildlife:

1. Identify and evaluate reference sites within the general geographic area of Wind Resource Areas (WRA's) being considered for development of a facility. Reference sites are areas where wind development would result in the maximum negative impact on wildlife, resulting in a high PII score. Reference sites are used to determine the comparative risks of developing other potential sites.
2. Evaluate potential development sites to determine risk to wildlife, and rank sites against each other using the highest-ranking reference site as a standard. While high-ranking sites are generally less desirable for wind development, a high rank does not necessarily preclude development of a site, not does a low rank automatically eliminate the need to conduct pre-development assessments of wildlife use and impact potential.

The following assumptions are implicit in the PII process:

1. All WRA sites, regardless of turbine design, configuration, placement, or operation present some hazard and risk to wildlife from both an individual and population perspective.
2. Certain sites present less hazard and risk to wildlife than others.

2. After completing the three checklists for each site, add the total number of checks in a checklist for an ending sum (each box checked equals one).

Determining PII Score

The Potential Impact Index score is determined as follows:

1. Place the sums from each of the three checklists in the POTENTIAL IMPACT INDEX table sum boxes (Σ column) in the appropriate category.
2. Divide each checklist sum by the previously calculated divisor to adjust the sum for disproportionate numbers of conditions in each checklist, and place this adjusted sum in the Σ/p boxes for each checklist.
3. Add the adjusted checklist sums (Σ/p column) to produce the PII score.

Include any questions, statements, comments, or concerns regarding any checklist cell or category on the SITE SPECIFIC COMMENTS sheet. These comments are critical to determining pre-construction study needs. They will also help identify and refine questions and objectives to be addressed by follow-up study and monitoring. The nature of suspected Significant Ecological Events should be noted on the SITE SPECIFIC COMMENTS sheet.

Ranking PII Scores

PII of each site evaluated is assigned a ranking based on its proportional relationship to the reference site that has the maximum PII score, as shown in Figure 2 in the Montana example. Ranking categories (High, Low, etc.) in the example are arbitrarily set at intervals of 20 percent of maximum.

Rankings are intended as a guide to developers. They are designed to serve as indicators of relative risk to wildlife and thus provide an estimator of the level of impact that may be expected should a site be developed. A high rank does not preclude development, nor does a low rank automatically eliminate the need to conduct pre-development assessments of impacts on wildlife. More intensive pre-construction studies may be needed for both scenarios if development of the site is pursued. Rankings may also suggest the extent of additional study needed.

In the case of federally listed threatened, endangered, or candidate species of wildlife, fish, or plants, consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service under the Endangered Species Act is required, and may preclude development of a site regardless of its PII score. See Appendix 5 for procedures for obtaining lists of these species that may be present, and for consulting with the Fish and Wildlife Service if species or their habitats are found.

Determining Pre-construction Study Needs

The goals of pre-construction studies are to estimate impacts of proposed wind power development on wildlife by addressing areas of concern identified during the PII process. Objectives, intensity, duration, and methods of pre-construction studies are likely to be site specific, but may be independent of ranking. Regardless of ranking, studies should be designed to address (1) verification of use of WRAs by all species recorded in the "SPECIES OCCURRENCE AND STATUS" checklist, (2) verification of natural conditions (e.g., under "Significant Ecological Events", the magnitude, timing, and location of suspected bird/bat migration), or (3) questions noted in the SITE SPECIFIC COMMENTS sheet for that site. The SITE SPECIFIC COMMENTS sheet may also indicate conditions that need not be investigated. As a result, a site with a low rank may require radar surveillance (e.g., important songbird migration site) while a site with a high rank may require only a single season visual survey (e.g., site potentially contains autumn Whooping Crane habitat). The process should involve a feedback mechanism within an adaptive management strategy (Figure 1). Timely review of study results will determine if data are

Post-construction Studies

The Service recommends that all sites be monitored for impacts on wildlife after construction is completed. Some sites may be so obviously benign that little more than simple reconnaissance study may be needed and any impact will be revealed during post-construction monitoring. Otherwise, pre-construction studies should be designed to explicitly consider post-construction monitoring that permits statistically valid evaluation of actual impacts. Accordingly, studies should be conducted as much as possible within a Before-After-Control-Impact (BACI) study design (Green 1979). Such design requires investigation of at least two sites (Impact [proposed site] and Control) simultaneously, both pre-construction (Before) and post-construction (After). Because true "Control" sites are seldom available, other sites may be substituted, including reference sites used in developing the PII ranking. In the case of radar surveillance studies, sites within the proposed WRA boundaries may be acceptable (e.g., Harmata et al. 1998). Structuring pre-construction studies within a hypotheses-testing framework will help identify appropriate metrics, focus effort, and permit comparisons with post-construction conditions or other WRAs.

Where feasible, post-construction studies should also be utilized to test measures that may eliminate or reduce impacts on wildlife. See Appendix 4, Research Needs on the Impacts of Wind Power Development on Wildlife.

Metrics and Methods

Metrics and methods are specific tools used to assess wildlife populations and their status (e.g., point counts, line transects, nest success studies, radar surveys, mortality rates, and risk). They can provide important information about birds, bats, and other wildlife at proposed development sites. Metrics and methods may be selected to collect seasonal, group, guild, or habitat specific information, based on data and comments in the SPECIES OCCURRENCE AND STATUS checklist and SITE SPECIFIC COMMENTS sheet. For example, a proposed WRA may be in a narrow north-south oriented valley of relatively monotypic habitat. These conditions suggest a heavy seasonal avian migration corridor but little avian breeding habitat. Accordingly, study emphasis should be on defining use and mortality of migratory birds during autumn or spring or both, with little effort directed at defining use and mortality of breeding birds. Conversely, a potential WRA on a flat plain in diverse habitat would indicate the exact opposite in study emphasis.

While metrics represent specific measurements, concepts, and relationships, methods refer to observational or manipulative study techniques that may be used to verify the location of birds and other wildlife, estimate their numbers, and document their use and behavior (Anderson et al. 1999). Table 1 depicts some commonly used metrics and methods for wildlife studies.

Table 1. Examples of metrics and methods associated with evaluating use and mortality of wildlife at proposed Wind Resource Areas in Montana.

Data Need	Metric	Methods
Use Profile	Individuals/Count	Point Counts (birds) Winter Raptor Surveys Lek Counts (grouse) Migration Counts Ungulate Surveys Spotlight Surveys

control plots may be all that is needed at WRAs where recorded pre-construction use by wildlife is low. Documented high use of a proposed WRA may require monitoring methods identical to those employed in pre-construction studies. Anderson et al. (1999) provide specific, detailed direction in post-construction study design and monitoring. Manville (2002) developed a monitoring protocol for use by the U.S. Forest Service at three National Forests in Arizona to monitor the impact of cellular telecommunications towers on migratory birds that could be modified for use at land-based wind turbines.

PHYSICAL ATTRIBUTE CHECKLIST

Site

Physical Attribute							
Topography	Mountain Aspect, if mountainous*	Side	W				
			F				
			N				
			S				
		Top					
		Foothill	W				
			E				
			N				
			S				
Wind* Direction	S						
	N						
	E						
	W						
	Undrafts*						
Migratory* Corridor Potential	Latitudinal (N ↔ S)						
	Longitudinal (E ↔ W)						
	Wide Approaches (>30 km)*						
	Funnel Effect	Horizontal					
Vertical							
Site Size (acres) & Configuration*	<640						
	>640 <1000						
	>1000 <1500						
	Turbine Rows not Parallel to						
Infrastructure To Build	Transmission						
	Roads						
	Buildings*						
	Maintenance						
	Daily Activity						
	Substation						
Increased Activity*							
Totals							

* Criteria on following page

Bat Species Of Concern Checklist
 (Complete prior to SPECIES OCCURRENCE & STATUS Checklist)

Bats (n =)	Site											
Occurrence	B	M/W	Σ	B	M/W	Σ	B	M/W	Σ	B	M/W	Σ
Subtotals												
Total												

Bat Species Of Concern Checklist (species, max Σ =).

Column totals of this list are added to appropriate cells in the SPECIES OCCURRENCE & STATUS checklist. Appropriate bat field guides and references (Barbour and Davis 1969) should be consulted for confirmation of species distribution and habitat associations. State Natural Heritage Programs may also provide species accounts that include additional information useful in completing checklists.

In addition to species lists (rows), season of occurrence is also indicated (columns). "B" indicates breeding or summer occurrence and "M/W" indicates presence during migration or as wintering species. If occurrence within or in the vicinity of a proposed site is confirmed or suspected, an "X" is entered.

SPECIES OCCURRENCE & STATUS Checklist (categories, max $\Sigma =$, (p =).

Checklist totals for each column in “Avian Species of Concern List” and “Bat Species of Concern List” are inserted in this checklist.

Threatened & Endangered Species - Species on the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Species (<http://endangered.fws.gov>).

Candidate Species - Species being investigated for inclusion in the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Species (<http://endangered.fws.gov>).

Species of Special Concern - Species listed in Birds of Conservation Concern; by Natural Heritage Programs that are known or suspected to be rare, endemic, disjunct, threatened or endangered; and species of high value such as migratory or other game birds.

Golden Eagles may be included in this checklist because of special protective status afforded under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668-668d). Other species (e.g., Sage Grouse) may be included because of recent concern over population declines range wide. Bats (other than bat Species of Special Concern) should be included due to generally unknown impacts of wind farms on individuals and populations.

ECOLOGICAL ATTRACTIVENESS CRITERIA - categories, max $\Sigma =$, (p =).

Migration Route - Indicates predominate direction of movement of seasonal migrations. Multiple categories may be checked.

Local - Some avian populations move only altitudinally & direction may be East-West (Sage Grouse, owls, Bald Eagles).

Continental - Some migratory corridors experience mass movements in only one season/direction annually (e.g., Bridger Mountains autumn eagle migration).

Ecological Magnets - Special, unique, unusual, or super ordinary habitats or conditions within the vicinity of the site that may attract wildlife. Lotic systems include small perennial or seasonal creeks to major rivers. Lentic systems include stock ponds to lakes to marine environments. Multiple categories may be checked.

Vegetation/Habitat - Unique or exceptionally diverse vegetation or habitat in the vicinity may indicate exceptional diversity and abundance of avian species or bats.

Significant Ecological Event - Special, unique, unusual, or super ordinary events that occur or are suspected to occur in the vicinity of the site, e.g., up to one third of the Continental population of Trumpeter Swans visit Ennis Lake, < 2.5 miles from a proposed Wind Resource Area; the Continental migration of shorebirds passes over (many stop) at Benton Lake National Wildlife Refuge) and up to 2,000 Golden Eagles pass over the Bridger Mountains in autumn. If unknown but suspected a “?” is entered. Specifics regarding the cell are then addressed in the appropriate box of the SITE SPECIFIC COMMENTS sheet to focus follow-up investigation and assist in definition of study objectives.

Site of Special Conservation Status - Any existing or proposed covenants, conservation easements, or other land development limitations intended to conserve, protect, or enhance wildlife or habitat. This criterion is weighted (2 entered if true) because of previous financial or other investment in ecological values. Specifics regarding the easement are then addressed in the appropriate box of the SITE SPECIFIC COMMENTS sheet to focus follow-up attention.

SITE SPECIFIC COMMENTS

	Site			
Checklist				
Physical				
Species Occurrence				
Ecological				

PHYSICAL ATTRIBUTE CHECKLIST

Site

Physical Attribute				Snowy Mtn.Range			
Topography	Mountain Aspect	Side	W	X			
			F				
			N				
			S				
		Top					
		Foothill	W	X			
			E				
			N				
	S						
	Valley			X			
	Pass						
	Gap						
	Ridge			X			
Bluff							
Butte							
Wind Direction	S						
	N			X			
	E						
	W						
	Updrafts			X			
Migratory Corridor Potential	Latitudinal (N ↔ S)						
	Longitudinal (E ↔ W)			X			
	Wide Approaches (>30 km)						
	Funnel Effect	Horizontal		X			
Vertical							
Site Size (acres) & Configuration	<640			X			
	>640 <1000			X			
	>1000 <1500			X			
	Turbine Rows not Parallel to						
Infrastructure To Build	Transmission			X			
	Roads			X			
	Buildings			X			
	Maintenance			X			
	Daily Activity			X			
	Substation				X		
Increased Activity				X			
Totals				18			

Bat Species Of Concern Checklist
 (Complete prior to SPECIES OCCURRENCE & STATUS Checklist)

Bats (n = 2)	Site											
	Snowy Mtn. Range											
Occurrence	B	M/W	Σ	B	M/W	Σ	B	M/W	Σ	B	M/W	Σ
Fringed Myotis	X		1									
Spotted Bat	X		1									
Subtotals	2		2									
Total			2									

ECOLOGICAL ATTRACTIVENESS CHECKLIST

Site

Ecological Attractor			Snowy Mtn. Range			
Migration Route	Local					
	Continental	N	X			
		S	X			
		E				
		W				
Ecological Magnets	Lotic System					
	Lentic System					
	Wetlands		X			
	Native Grassland		X			
	Forest		X			
	Food Concentrated					
	Energetic Foraging		X			
	Vegetation/ Habitat	Unique				
Diverse		X				
Significant Ecological Event						
Site of Special Conservation Status						
Total			7			

Appendix 2

DEFINITIONS RELATED TO WIND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION

AGL: height above ground level in feet.

Breco Bird Scaring Buoy: a device developed to disperse seabirds at oil spills, which emits some 30 different sounds (including alert calls) up to 130 dB, generally effective in scaring birds at distances up to 200 yards, but may deter birds to 0.5 mile radius. The floating device can be used daytime or night, in fog, wind or storms.

Deterrent Devices: specific equipment, devices, or techniques which are intended to be seen or heard to alert and deter birds from contacting turbine towers, rotors, guy wires, or related equipment. These include diverters installed on turbine or meteorological tower guy wires, dark (e.g., black) paint on single turbine blades or portions of a blade, or noise-making devices that alert (e.g., infrasound) or frighten (e.g., Breco Buoys) birds.

Fish and Wildlife: any member of the animal kingdom, including any bird (including any migratory, non-migratory, or endangered bird for which protection is afforded), mammal, fish, amphibian, reptile, mollusk, crustacean, arthropod, or other invertebrate. Unless otherwise indicated, the Fish and Wildlife Service is particularly concerned about the impacts of wind turbines on birds and bats.

Flyway: a concentrated, predictable flight path of migratory bird species (e.g., particularly water birds such as ducks, geese, large waders, and shorebirds, but also raptors, and sometimes songbirds) from their breeding ground to wintering area. Except along coast lines, the flyway concept may not generally apply to songbirds because they tend to migrate in broad fronts rather than down specific flyways. The term “corridors” has sometimes been used. These frontal movements of songbirds can change within and between seasons and years – as can, for example, movements of waterfowl – making specific designations more difficult. The concept applies both biologically and administratively. For administrative purposes, for example, there are four waterfowl flyways (Atlantic, Pacific, Central, and Pacific and three shorebird flyways (East, Central, and Pacific). “Daily flyways” may also exist between roosting, breeding, and feeding areas.

Lek: A traditional site used year after year by males of certain species of birds (in North America, Greater and Lesser Prairie-chickens, Sage and Sharp-tailed grouse, and Buff-breasted Sandpiper), within which the males display communally to compete for female mates. Dominant males secure the majority of all the matings. Pair bonds are not formed; females leave to nest and raise the young, and males do not take part in parental care.

Passerines: a scientific term for the order of songbirds, many of which winter in tropical areas.

Precautionary Approach: a conservative, scientific approach to conserving and managing habitats and species. Absent definitive data, the approach suggests taking the best steps available to initiate appropriate conservation actions. Those actions should then be refined through the use of principles of adaptive management and sound science. The absence of complete or definitive scientific information should not be used as a reason for postponing or failing to take measures to conserve target species, associated or dependent species, or non-target species and their environments. Specifically, developers should apply a precautionary approach widely to conservation and management of birds, bats, other fauna, flora, and affected habitats. This will protect the resources and preserve Wind Resource Areas by taking account of the best scientific evidence available.

Reference Site: an area of high wildlife value which is used to evaluate the suitability of other areas for wind energy development. Reference sites are selected by biologists familiar with the wildlife in the geographic area and habitat types where wind energy development is contemplated, and evaluated using the Ranking Protocol in Appendix 1. The reference site having the highest score, i.e., the area where wind energy development would have the greatest negative impact on wildlife, is used as the standard against which potential wind energy development sites are ranked.

Riparian Area: The vegetation, habitats, or ecosystems that are associated with streams, rivers, or lakes, or are dependent upon the existence of perennial, intermittent, or ephemeral surface or subsurface water drainage. Relative to other habitats, riparian habitats have a disproportionately high wildlife value in the drier western states due to the

Appendix 3

WILDLIFE LAWS RELEVANT TO WIND POWER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703-712; MBTA), which is administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), is the cornerstone of migratory bird conservation and protection in the United States. The MBTA implements four treaties that provide for international protection of migratory birds. It is a strict liability statute wherein proof of intent is not an element of a taking violation. Wording is clear in that most actions that result in a “taking” or possession (permanent or temporary) of a protected species can be a violation. Specifically, the MBTA states:

“Unless and except as permitted by regulations ... it shall be unlawful at any time, by any means, or in any manner to pursue, hunt, take, capture, kill ... possess, offer for sale, sell ... purchase ... ship, export, import ... transport or cause to be transported ... any migratory bird, any part, nest, or eggs of any such bird ... (The Act) prohibits the taking, killing, possession, transportation, and importation of migratory birds, their eggs, parts, and nests, except when specifically authorized by the Department of the Interior.” The word “take” is defined as “to pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or attempt to pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect.”

A 1972 amendment to the MBTA resulted in inclusion of Bald Eagles and other birds of prey in the definition of a migratory bird. The MBTA provides criminal penalties for persons who, by any means or in any manner, pursue, hunt, take, capture, kill, attempt to take, capture, or kill, possess, offer for sale, sell, offer to barter, barter, offer to purchase, purchase, deliver for shipment, ship, export, import, cause to be shipped, exported, or imported, deliver for transportation, transport or cause to be transported, carry or cause to be carried, or receive for shipment, transportation, carriage, or export, any migratory bird (including Bald Eagles) as well as possessing Bald Eagles, their parts, nests, or eggs without a permit. A violation of the MBTA by an individual can result in a fine of up to \$15,000, and/or imprisonment for up to 6 months, for a misdemeanor, and up to \$250,000 and/or imprisonment for up to 2 years for a felony. Fines are doubled for organizations. Penalties increase greatly for offenses involving commercialization and/or the sale of migratory birds and/or their parts. Under authority of the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668-668d; BGEPA), Bald and Golden Eagles are afforded additional legal protection. Penalties for violations of the BGEPA are up to \$250,000 and/or 2 years imprisonment for a felony, with fines doubled for an organization.

While these Acts have no provision for allowing unauthorized take, the FWS realizes that some birds may be killed even if all reasonable measures to avoid the take are implemented. The FWS Office of Law Enforcement carries out its mission to protect migratory birds not only through investigations and enforcement, but also through fostering relationships with individuals, companies, and industries who seek to eliminate their impacts on migratory birds. Unless the activity is authorized, it is not possible to absolve individuals, companies, or agencies from liability even if they implement avian mortality avoidance or similar conservation measures. However, the Office of Law Enforcement focuses on those individuals, companies, or agencies that take migratory birds with disregard for their actions and the law, especially when conservation measures have been developed but are not properly implemented.

The Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531-1544; ESA) was passed by Congress in 1973 in recognition that many of our Nation’s native plants and animals were in danger of becoming extinct. The purposes of the Act are to protect these endangered and threatened species and to provide a means to conserve their ecosystems. To this end, Federal agencies are directed to utilize their authorities to conserve listed species, as well as “Candidate” species which may be listed in the near future, and make sure that their actions do not jeopardize the continued existence of these species. The law is administered by the Interior Department’s FWS and the Commerce Department’s National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The FWS has primary responsibility for terrestrial and freshwater organisms, while the NMFS has responsibility for marine species such as whales and salmon. These two agencies work with other agencies to plan or modify Federal projects so that they will have minimal impact on listed species and their habitats. Protection of species is also achieved through partnerships with the States, with Federal financial assistance and a system of incentives available to encourage State participation. The FWS also works with private landowners, providing financial and technical assistance for management actions on their lands to benefit both listed and non-listed species.

Section 9 of the ESA makes it unlawful for a person to “take” a listed species. Take means “. . . to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect or attempt to engage in any such conduct.” The Secretary

Appendix 4

RESEARCH NEEDS ON THE IMPACTS OF WIND POWER DEVELOPMENT ON WILDLIFE

Representatives of the Fish and Wildlife Service's Wind Turbine Siting Working Group have suggested the following research needs:

- Effects of inclement weather in attracting birds and bats to lighted turbines, e.g., drawing birds and bats to within rotor-swept area of turbines, particularly for passerines during spring and fall migrations.
- Localized effects of turbines on wildlife: habitat fragmentation and loss; effects of noise on both aquatic and terrestrial wildlife; habituation.
- Effects of wind turbine string configuration on mortality, e.g., end of row turbine effect, turbines in dips or passes or draws, setbacks from rim/cliff edges.
- Effectiveness of deterrents: alternating colors on blades (particularly, effect of black/white and UV gel coats on the smear effect); lights (e.g., color, duration, and intensity of pilot warning lights; lasers); infrasound (Breco Buoys, other noisemakers such as predator and distress calls if not irritating to humans, other wildlife, or domestic animals); visual markers on guy wires.
- Utility of acoustic, infrared, and radar technologies to detect bird species presence, abundance, location height, and movement.
- Accuracy of mortality counts: estimate of the number of carcasses (especially of passerines) lost because they have been fragmented and lost to collision momentum and the wind; size and shape of dead bird search areas; possibility of recording collisions acoustically or with radar or infrared monitoring.
- Annual variability (temporal and spatial) in migratory pathways; what is the utility of Geographic Information System to assess migratory pathways and stopovers, particularly for passerines and bats.
- Effectiveness of seasonal wind turbine shutdowns at preventing mortalities, including the feasibility of using "self-erecting" turbines that are easily erected and dismantled without cranes, and taking them down during critical periods such as migrations.
- Impacts of larger turbines versus smaller models.
- Changes in predator-prey relationships due to placing potential perching sites in prairie habitats.

direct or indirect. Justification: No construction is proposed in listed species habitat or in an area that may affect listed species. In addition, the project proponent has charted a route for heavy equipment moving onto the construction site that avoids listed species habitat.

2. **May Affect, but Not Likely to Adversely Affect** – The appropriate conclusion when effects on listed species are expected to be discountable, insignificant, or completely beneficial. Beneficial effects are contemporaneous positive effects without any adverse effects to the species. Insignificant effects relate to the size of the impact and should never reach the scale where take occurs. Discountable effects are those extremely unlikely to occur. Based on best judgment, a person would not (a) be able to meaningfully measure, detect, or evaluate insignificant effects, or (b) expect discountable effects to occur.

Example: The applicant contacts the FWS to request information on listed species. The FWS provides a species list containing 2 birds and 1 fish. The proposed project would be constructed at an upland site, 200 yards from the stream (fish habitat) and adjoining riparian vegetation (bird habitat). The migratory birds use the riparian vegetation to nest between April 15 and August 15. The uplands are highly erodible soils. The project proponent agrees not to construct during the nesting season. He flags the riparian vegetation to indicate an avoidance zone and installs silt fencing between the riparian vegetation and the construction site. He states that he will plant the disturbed soils surrounding the project with native vegetation after construction. He also agrees to monitor the vegetation planted for 3 years to assure that it establishes sufficiently to prevent any additional erosion in the project area caused by construction. Conclusion: Although the project proponent is working in very close proximity to listed species habitat, the action is not likely to adversely affect listed species. Justification: The proponent has incorporated sufficient avoidance and other mitigation measures into the project that any effects to listed species would be discountable. The project proponent prepares a Biological Assessment that includes a complete description of the project, all proposed avoidance and other mitigation measures, and the resulting effects of the project on the listed species. The Biological Assessment is sent to the FWS to request concurrence that the project is not likely to adversely affect listed species.

3. **May Affect, and Likely to Adversely Affect** – The appropriate finding in a Biological Assessment (or conclusion during informal consultation) if any adverse effect to listed species may occur as a direct or indirect result of the proposed action or its interrelated or interdependent actions, and the effect is not discountable, insignificant, or beneficial. In the event the overall effect of the proposed action is beneficial to the listed species, but is also likely to cause some adverse effects, then the proposed action “is likely to adversely affect” the listed species. If incidental take is anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed action, an “is likely to adversely affect” determination should be made. This determination requires the initiation of formal section 7 consultation.

Example: The applicant contacts the FWS to request information on listed species. The FWS provides a species list containing 10 birds. The proposed project would be constructed at an upland site within a significant migratory bird corridor that is utilized by the 10 listed birds. Construction will permanently alter the character of the corridor and will likely cause take of listed birds every year during the migration periods. Conclusion: Formal consultation will be required. The project proponent prepares a Biological Assessment to submit to the action agency to accompany their request to initiate formal consultation. Justification: The project is likely to cause take of listed birds every year during their migration periods.

- 5) Spoil material from the excavated turbine pad shall not be deposited in wetlands and must be stored or deposited off easement lands using established roads to transport the material off site.
- 6) Turbines shall be sited as close to existing roads or the edge of the grassland tract as practical. Disturbance of grassland to construct and maintain a wind turbine shall be done in such a manner as to minimize the destruction or alteration of the habitat. Use of existing roads as a means of accessing a turbine within protected habitats is strongly encouraged. Conservation measures shall be used to avoid the impacts of erosion and sedimentation in order to protect grasslands and wetlands during the construction of the access road. Buried transmission lines, electric lines, and other cables shall be co-located on the access road when practical. Turbine construction should be encouraged to occur outside the breeding season for migratory birds when practical.
- 7) Regardless of a Service permit the developer is responsible for adhering to all local, state, and federal regulations in siting turbine location and construction. In the event that location and construction criteria conflict between the various levels of government, the criteria providing the maximum protection to the habitat shall be the criteria used during turbine location and construction.
- 8) In the event that a turbine is no longer utilized for power generation and has been abandoned for that purpose, the turbine owner shall remove the turbine at his/her own expense from the easement tract. The turbine site and associated facilities shall be reclaimed by the turbine owner by planting these areas to a grass mixture consistent with the surrounding grassland or such mixture as is mutually agreed upon by the Service and the turbine owner.
- 9) The turbine owner must update bird strike avoidance equipment on turbines and implement techniques that reduce the disturbance to nesting birds at turbine sites as future research and evaluation by the Service and the industry indicate.

These guidelines provide flexibility for the Service Refuge Manager in evaluating compatibility determinations and to negotiate with the energy company and the easement landowner to allow wind turbine development consistent with the purposes of the conservation easements. Where development is found to be compatible with easement purposes the guidelines will be used to negotiate siting, lighting, and other restrictions to grant rights-of-way and easement permits for wind turbines.

References:

Avian Power Line Interaction Committee (APLIC). 1994. Mitigating bird collisions with power lines: The state of the art in 1994.

Avian Power Line Interaction Committee (APLIC). 1996. Suggested practices for raptor protection on power lines: the state of the art in 1996.

Attachment 2

Potential Effect of Wind Turbine Presence on Numbers of Breeding Grassland Birds and Nesting Ducks on Grassland Easement Properties in North and South Dakota.

Ron Reynolds, Project Leader, Habitat And Population Evaluation Team, Bismarck, North Dakota.
Neal Niemuth, Biologist, Habitat And Population Evaluation Team, Bismarck, North Dakota

Recently, companies that develop wind-powered electricity generation have begun operations in areas of South Dakota and North Dakota where the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has purchased or intends to purchase conservation easements on grasslands. Questions have been raised within the FWS as to whether the placement of wind towers on easement tracts would violate terms of the easement contract, and whether the Service would consider purchasing easements on lands after towers are in place. Before allowing turbines on easement lands, the Service must address the issue of whether placement of wind turbines on grassland easements is compatible with the

Brewer's Sparrow	0	0	0	0
Brown-headed Cowbird	2.88	3.632	0.10175	0.0407
Chestnut-collared Longspur	15.584	19.696	0.55125	0.2205
Clay-colored Sparrow	2.08	1.92	0.0625	0.025
Common Yellowthroat	0.144	0.112	0.004	0.0016
Dickcissel	0.304	0.32	0.00975	0.0039
Ferruginous Hawk	0.032	0.24	0.00425	0.0017
Field Sparrow	0.24	0	0.00375	0.0015
Grasshopper Sparrow	6.368	8.928	0.239	0.0956
Gray Catbird	0	0	0	0
Gray Partridge	0.16	0.128	0.0045	0.0018
Horned Lark	6.88	12.544	0.3035	0.1214
Killdeer	0.544	0.848	0.02175	0.0087
Lark Bunting	8.416	4.16	0.1965	0.0786
Lark Sparrow	0.448	0.128	0.009	0.0036
Le Conte's Sparrow	0	0.192	0.003	0.0012
Northern Harrier	0.304	0.512	0.01275	0.0051
Red-winged Blackbird	1.616	1.248	0.04475	0.0179
Ring-necked Pheasant	0.16	0.368	0.00825	0.0033
Savannah Sparrow	1.184	2.144	0.052	0.0208
Sedge Wren	0.16	0	0.0025	0.001
Sharp-tailed Grouse	0.432	0.464	0.014	0.0056
Sharp-tailed Sparrow	0.032	0	0.0005	0.0002
Short-eared Owl	0.032	0.032	0.001	0.0004
Sprague's Pipit	0.256	0.576	0.013	0.0052
Swainson's Hawk	0.032	0.16	0.003	0.0012
Upland Sandpiper	1.52	1.552	0.048	0.0192
Vesper Sparrow	1.312	0.976	0.03575	0.0143
Western Meadowlark	7.088	11.184	0.2855	0.1142
SUM	59.97	75.31	2.11	0.85

Ducks. To assess the impact of wind turbines on ducks, we used the Mallard Productivity Model (Cowardin et al. 1988). The Mallard Model is particularly useful for this exercise because it allowed us to predict any “net” change in nest site selection and recruitment that might occur as a result of simulating the reduction of grasslands available to nesting hens due to the placement of wind turbines. For example, if grassland availability is reduced as a result of disturbance, displaced hens may select other habitat types (e.g., cropland, hayland etc.) in the area for nesting, or they may elect to nest elsewhere in the grasslands protected by easement. If other habitats are selected, this could result in reduced recruitment because, most other habitats are characterized by lower nest success compared to grass habitats. However, if these hens select nest sites in the remaining grasslands outside the influence of the wind turbines, nest success will not change materially and recruitment rate will be the same with-or-without turbines. For this exercise, we selected six study areas from Four Square Mile plots used for breeding population and production surveys (Cowardin et al. 1995) in the Kulm Wetland Management District in North Dakota. Plots were selected that had ≥ 160 acres of grassland in one unit, and were accessible to ≥ 60 breeding duck pairs (≥ 12 mallard pairs) based on the “thunderstorm map” (HAPET 2000) for North Dakota. These criteria are consistent with those used by FWS Realty Office, Bismarck, ND for focusing grassland easements, and the Kulm WMD is representative of areas where the grassland easement program is being targeted. For the purpose of our assessment, all grasslands on study plots selected were treated as protected by easement. This was done to obtain sample acreage similar to easement acreage being purchased. We ran the model on plots with-and-without wind turbines in place and compared the response by mallard hens. The area of influence for turbines was set at 5 acres and was converted to barren habitat which simulated eliminating all nesting activity in that area. To reduce variability, and thus increase the precision of our estimates we conducted eight model runs (1000 hens each) and then scaled the average results to the estimated mallard population on each study plot.

Five-acre impact:

80-m zone of reduced density surrounding tower

80 m * 80 m * 3.14

~ 2.5 acres per ha

2.0 ha

5.0 acres

Attachment 3

Memorandum

To: Regional Directors, Regions 1-7

From: Director

Subject: Service Guidance on the Siting, Construction, Operation and Decommissioning of Communications Towers

Construction of communications towers (including radio, television, cellular, and microwave) in the United States has been growing at an exponential rate, increasing at an estimated 6 percent to 8 percent annually. According to the Federal Communication Commission's *2000 Antenna Structure Registry*, the number of lighted towers greater than 199 feet above ground level currently number over 45,000 and the total number of towers over 74,000. By 2003, all television stations must be digital, adding potentially 1,000 new towers exceeding 1,000 feet AGL.

The construction of new towers creates a potentially significant impact on migratory birds, especially some 350 species of night-migrating birds. Communications towers are estimated to kill 4-5 million birds per year, which violates the spirit and the intent of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Code of Federal Regulations at Part 50 designed to implement the MBTA. Some of the species affected are also protected under the Endangered Species Act and Bald and Golden Eagle Act.

Service personnel may become involved in the review of proposed tower sitings and/or in the evaluation of tower impacts on migratory birds through National Environmental Policy Act review; specifically, sections 1501.6, opportunity to be a cooperating agency, and 1503.4, duty to comment on federally-licensed activities for agencies with jurisdiction by law, in this case the MBTA, or because of special expertise. Also, the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act requires that any activity on Refuge lands be determined as compatible with the Refuge system mission and the Refuge purpose(s). In addition, the Service is required by the ESA to assist other Federal agencies in ensuring that any action they authorize, implement, or fund will not jeopardize the continued existence of any federally endangered or threatened species.

A Communication Tower Working Group composed of government agencies, industry, academic researchers and NGOs has been formed to develop and implement a research protocol to determine the best ways to construct and operate towers to prevent bird strikes. Until the research study is completed, or until research efforts uncover significant new mitigation measures, all Service personnel involved in the review of proposed tower sitings and/or the evaluation of the impacts of towers on migratory birds should use the attached interim guidelines when making recommendations to all companies, license applicants, or licensees proposing new tower sitings. These guidelines were developed by Service personnel from research conducted in several eastern, midwestern, and southern States, and have been refined through Regional review. They are based on the best information available at this time, and are the most prudent and effective measures for avoiding bird strikes at towers. We believe that they will provide significant protection for migratory birds pending completion of the Working Group's recommendations. As new information becomes available, the guidelines will be updated accordingly.

Implementation of these guidelines by the communications industry is voluntary, and our recommendations must be balanced with Federal Aviation Administration requirements and local community concerns where necessary. Field

**Service Interim Guidelines For Recommendations On
Communications Tower Siting, Construction, Operation, and Decommissioning**

1. Any company/applicant/licensee proposing to construct a new communications tower should be strongly encouraged to collocate the communications equipment on an existing communication tower or other structure (e.g., billboard, water tower, or building mount). Depending on tower load factors, from 6 to 10 providers may collocate on an existing tower.
2. If collocation is not feasible and a new tower or towers are to be constructed, communications service providers should be strongly encouraged to construct towers no more than 199 feet above ground level, using construction techniques which do not require guy wires (e.g., use a lattice structure, monopole, etc.). Such towers should be unlighted if Federal Aviation Administration regulations permit.
3. If constructing multiple towers, providers should consider the cumulative impacts of all of those towers to migratory birds and threatened and endangered species as well as the impacts of each individual tower.
4. If at all possible, new towers should be sited within existing "antenna farms" (clusters of towers). Towers should not be sited in or near wetlands, other known bird concentration areas (e.g., State or Federal refuges, staging areas, rookeries), in known migratory or daily movement flyways, or in habitat of threatened or endangered species. Towers should not be sited in areas with a high incidence of fog, mist, and low ceilings.
5. If taller (>199 feet AGL) towers requiring lights for aviation safety must be constructed, the minimum amount of pilot warning and obstruction avoidance lighting required by the FAA should be used. Unless otherwise required by the FAA, only white (preferable) or red strobe lights should be used at night, and these should be the minimum number, minimum intensity, and minimum number of flashes per minute (longest duration between flashes) allowable by the FAA. The use of solid red or pulsating red warning lights at night should be avoided. Current research indicates that solid or pulsating (beacon) red lights attract night-migrating birds at a much higher rate than white strobe lights. Red strobe lights have not yet been studied.
6. Tower designs using guy wires for support which are proposed to be located in known raptor or waterbird concentration areas or daily movement routes, or in major diurnal migratory bird movement routes or stopover sites, should have daytime visual markers on the wires to prevent collisions by these diurnally moving species. (For guidance on markers, see *Avian Power Line Interaction Committee (APLIC). 1994. Mitigating Bird Collisions with Power Lines: The State of the Art in 1994. Edison Electric Institute, Washington, D.C., 78 pp*, and *Avian Power Line Interaction Committee (APLIC). 1996. Suggested Practices for Raptor Protection on Power Lines. Edison Electric Institute/Raptor Research Foundation, Washington, D.C., 128 pp*. Copies can be obtained via the Internet at <http://www.eei.org/resources/pubcat/enviro/>, or by calling 1-800/334-5453).
7. Towers and appendant facilities should be sited, designed and constructed so as to avoid or minimize habitat loss within and adjacent to the tower "footprint" @ However, a larger tower footprint is preferable to the use of guy wires in construction. Road access and fencing should be minimized to reduce or prevent habitat fragmentation and disturbance, and to reduce above ground obstacles to birds in flight.
8. If significant numbers of breeding, feeding, or roosting birds are known to habitually use the proposed tower construction area, relocation to an alternate site should be recommended. If this is not an option, seasonal restrictions on construction may be advisable in order to avoid disturbance during periods of high bird activity.
9. In order to reduce the number of towers needed in the future, providers should be encouraged to design new towers structurally and electrically to accommodate the applicant/licensee's antennas and comparable antennas for at least two additional users (minimum of three users for each tower structure), unless this design would require the addition of lights or guy wires to an otherwise unlighted and/or unguyed tower.
10. Security lighting for on-ground facilities and equipment should be down-shielded to keep light within the boundaries of the site.
11. If a tower is constructed or proposed for construction, Service personnel or researchers from the Communication Tower Working Group should be allowed access to the site to evaluate bird use, conduct dead-bird searches, to place net catchments below the towers but above the ground, and to place radar, Global Positioning

Appendix 7

KNOWN AND SUSPECTED IMPACTS OF WIND TURBINES ON WILDLIFE

While wind-generated electrical energy is renewable, emission-free, and generally environmentally clean (American Wind Energy Association [AWEA] unpubl. data, <<http://www.awea.org>>), it does have one significant downside -- rotor blades kill birds, especially raptors (Hunt 2002) and bats. Birds can strike the towers; electrocutions can occur if designs are poor; and wind farms may impact bird movements, breeding, and habitat use.

Wind turbine technology is not new to the United States. In the 1800s, Cape Cod supported over 1,000 working wind turbines (Ferdinand 2002). In the late 1930s, Vermont boasted the world's then-largest turbine, which was likely disabled by high winds due to design flaws. But wind turbine 'farms' and their impacts to birds are a recent phenomenon compared to power lines and communication towers, where mortality has been documented for decades or longer (Boeker and Nickerson 1975, Olendorff et al. 1981, APLIC 1994, APLIC 1996, Harness 1997, Ainley et al. 2001, Manville 2001). The problem in the U.S. surfaced in the late 1980s and early 1990s at the Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area, a facility then containing some 6,500 turbines on 73 mi² of gently rolling hills just east of San Francisco Bay, California (Davis 1995). Orloff and Flannery (1992) estimated that several hundred raptors were killed each year due to turbine collisions, guy wire strikes, and electrocutions. The most common fatalities were those of Red-tailed Hawks (*Buteo jamaicensis*), American Kestrels (*Falco sparverius*) and Golden Eagles (*Aquila chrysaetos*), with fewer mortalities of Turkey Vultures (*Cathartes aura*), Common Ravens (*Corvus corax*), and Barn Owls (*Tyto alba*). The impacts of this wind farm were of most concern to the population of Golden Eagles, which was showing a "disturbing source of mortality" to a disproportionately large segment of the population (Southern Niagara Escarpment [WI] Wind Resource Area unpubl. report). More recent studies indicate that a model previously used to assess Golden Eagle mortality was defective, and that nonbreeding Golden Eagles representing a "floater" population were likely suffering less mortality based on a new model (Hunt 2002). Research continues at this time to further assess the impacts of Altamont turbines on raptors. The Altamont turbines are still estimated to kill 40-60 subadult and adult Golden Eagles each year, as well as several hundred Red-tailed Hawks and American Kestrels -- a continuing concern for the FWS. Of the variety of wind turbines at the site, the smaller, faster moving, Kenetech-built, lattice-supported turbines caused most of the mortality. As part of a re-powering effort, these turbines are now being replaced with slower moving, tubular-supported turbines. While Europeans have used tubular towers almost exclusively, the U.S. has almost solely used lattice support, at least until recently (Berg 1996).

Colson (1995) indicated that some 16,000 wind turbines operated in California, making the State the largest concentration of wind energy development in the world. Since 1995, that statistic has changed. While California still boasts the greatest number of turbines in the U.S., many smaller turbines are being replaced by fewer but larger models. Worldwide, an estimated 50,000 turbines are generating power (AWEA unpubl. data; Ferdinand 2002), of which over 15,000 are currently in 29 states in the U.S. Turbine numbers are often difficult to track since statistics are generally presented in megawatts (MW) of electricity produced rather than number of turbines present. The latter statistic is of greater concern to ornithologists. In 1998, for example, Germany was the greatest producer with 2,874 MW of electricity produced by turbines, followed by the U.S. (1,884), and Denmark (1,450); (AWEA unpubl. data). While some project that the number of wind turbines in the U.S. may increase by another 16,000 in the next 10 years, current trends indicate an even greater potential growth. Although the U.S. presently produces less than 1% of its electrical energy from turbines -- compared, for example, to Norway's 15% -- 2001 was a banner year for U.S. turbine technology, doubling the previous record for installed wind production. Companies installed 1,898 turbines in 26 states, which will produce nearly 1,700 MW, at a cost of \$1.7 billion for the new equipment (J. Cadogan, U.S. Department of Energy, 2002, pers. comm.). Over the past decade, wind power has been the fastest growing energy industry in the world. By 2020, the AWEA (unpubl. data) predicts that wind will provide 6% of this nation's electricity, serving as many as 25 million households. Enron Wind Corporation constructed some 1,500 of the 1,898 turbines installed in the U.S. in 2001. Although Enron is now bankrupt, General Electric purchased the company and is now producing wind turbines.

In March 2002, President Bush signed the Job Creation and Worker Assistance Act, extending the production tax credit to the wind industry for another two years. There are presently attempts in Congress to amend the reauthorization of this legislation for five or more years. However, even with a bright future for growth, and with low speed tubular-constructed wind turbine technology now being stressed, larger and slower moving turbines still kill raptors, passerines, waterbirds, other avian species, and bats. Low wind speed turbine technology requires much larger rotors, blade tips often extending more than 420 ft. above ground, and blade tips can reach speeds in excess of 200 mph under windy conditions (J. Cadogan, U.S. Department of Energy, 2002, pers. comm.). When birds

seaduck movements. Only a few studies have been conducted in Denmark, the Netherlands, and Sweden, so further research is needed. Studies deal mostly with wintering species (Noer et al. 2000, Percival 2001, Langstron and Pullan 2002, Christensen et al. 2002, and Bruns et al. 2002).

In an attempt to begin addressing the bird mortality issue – and ancillary to this, the issue of ESA-listed bat strikes – the National Wind Coordinating Committee was created in 1994 as part of President Clinton’s Global Climate Change Action Plan (Colson 1995). Shortly following the creation of the Committee, the Avian Subcommittee (now called the Wildlife Work Group) was formed, co-founded by the Service. In 1999, the Avian Subcommittee published a *Metrics and Methods* document to study turbine impacts on birds (Anderson et al. 1999). The document provides an excellent resource for conducting research on proposed and existing turbines and wind farms.

- Drewien, R.C. 1973. Ecology of Rocky Mountain Greater Sandhill Cranes. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Idaho. 152 pp.
- Erickson, W.P., G.D. Johnson, M.D. Strickland, K.J. Sernka, and R.E. Good. 2001. Avian collisions with wind turbines: a summary of existing studies and comparisons to other sources of avian collision mortality in the United States. Western EcoSystems Technology, Inc., Cheyenne, WY. National Wind Coordinating Committee Resource Document, August: 62 pp.
- Federal Aviation Administration. 2000. Obstruction marking and lighting. Advisory Circular AC 70/7460-1K, Air Traffic Airspace Management, March 2000. 31 pp.
- Ferdinand, P. 2002. Windmills on the water create storm on Cape Cod. Washington Post, August 20, A3.
- Field and Stream. 1874. The St. Augustine Press. 3(10):150.
- Green, R.H. 1979. Sampling design and statistical methods for environmental biologists. John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY. 257 pp.
- Guillemette, M., and J.K. Larsen. 2002. Postdevelopment experiments to detect anthropogenic disturbances: the case of sea ducks and wind parks. Ecological Applications 12(3):868-877.
- Harmata, A.R., J.R. Zelenak, and K.M. Podruzny. 1998. Avian use of Norris Hill Wind Resource Area, Montana. US Dept. of Energy, National Renewable Energy Lab., Wind Tech. Ctr., Golden CO. 72 pp plus appendices.
- Harness, R.E. 1997. Raptor electrocutions caused by rural electric distribution powerlines. M.S. thesis, Colorado State University. 110 pp.
- Harvey, M. J., J. S. Altenbach, and T. L. Best. 1999. Bats of the United States. Arkansas Game & Fish Commission. Bat Conservation International, Austin, TX. 64 pp.
- Hodos, W., A. Potocki, T. Storm, and M. Gaffney. 2001. Reduction of motion smear to reduce avian collisions with wind turbines. Proceedings of the National Avian-Wind Power Planning Meeting IV: 88-105.
- Howell, J.D., and J. Noone. 1992. Examination of avian use and mortality at a U.S. windpower, wind energy development site, Montezuma Hills, Solano County, CA.
- Huckabee, J.W. 1993. Proceedings: avian interactions with utility structures, international workshop, September 13-16, 1992, Miami, FL. Electric Power Research Institute, Project 3041, EPRI TR-103268.
- Hunt, W.G. 2002. Golden eagles in a perilous landscape: predicting the effects of mitigation for wind turbine blade-strike mortality. Public Interest Energy Research, CA Energy Comm. Consultant Report P500-02-043F. 52 pp.
- Johnson, G.D., W.P. Erickson, M.D. Strickland, M.F. Shepherd and D.A. Shepherd. 2000. Final report. Avian monitoring studies at the Buffalo Ridge, Minnesota Wind Resource Area: Results of a 4-year study. Prepared for Northern States Power Co. Western EcoSystems Technology, Inc. Cheyenne, WY. 262 pp.
- Johnson, G.D., W.P. Erickson, D.A. Shepherd, M. Perlik, M.D. Strickland, and C. Nations. 2002a. Bat interactions with wind turbines at the Buffalo Ridge, Minnesota, wind resource area: 2001 field season. Electric Power Research Inst., Palo Alto, CA.
- Johnson, G.D., W.P. Erickson, M.D. Strickland, M.F. Shepherd, D.A. Shepherd, and S.A. Sarappo. 2002b. Collision mortality of local and migrant birds at a large-scale wind power development on Buffalo Ridge, Minnesota. Wildlife Society Bulletin 30(3): 879-887.
- Johnson, G.D., W.P. Erickson, and M.D. Strickland. 2003. What is known and not known about bat collision mortality at windplants? In R.L. Carlton (ed.), Proc. Workshop on Avian Interactions at Wind Turbines, 16-17 October, 2002, Jackson Hole, WY. Electric Power Research Inst., Palo Alto, CA.

- Olendorff, R.R., A.D. Miller, and R.N. Lehman. 1981. Suggested practices for raptor protection on powerlines: the state of the art in 1981. Raptor research report No. 4. Raptor Research Foundation, University of Minnesota, St. Paul. 111 pp.
- Orloff, S., and A. Flannery. 1992. Wind turbine effects on avian activity, habitat use and mortality in Altamont Pass and Solano County Wind Resource Areas. Report to the Planning Departments of Alameda, Contra Costa and Solano Counties and the California Energy Commission, Grant No. 990-89-003 to BioSystems Analysis, Inc., Tiburton, CA.
- Percival, S.M. 2001. Assessment of the effects of offshore wind farms on birds. ETSU W/13/00565/REP, DTI/Pub URN 01/1434. 66 pp.
- Tordoff, H.B., and R.M. Mengel. 1956. Studies of birds killed in nocturnal migration. University Kansas Museum Natural History Publication 10:1-44.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002. Evaluating potential impacts of wind resource areas on wildlife in Montana: A strategy for identification of study and monitoring needs. Ecological Services Division, Helena, MT. 21 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2003. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory Bird Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arlington, VA. 99 pp.
- van der Winden, J., A.L. Spaans, and S. Dirksen. 1999. Nocturnal collision risks of local wintering birds with wind turbines in wetlands. *Bremer Beitrane fur Naturkunde und Naturschutz Band 4:33-38.*
- van der Winden, J., H. Schekkerman, I. Tulp, and S. Dirksen. 2000. The effects of offshore windfarms on birds. Pp 126-135 In T. Merck and H. von Nordheim (editors). *Technische Eingriffe in marine Lebensraume*, BfN-Skripten 29, Bundesamt fur Naturschutz.
- Winkelman, J.E. 1992. The impact of the SEP wind park near Oosterbierum (Fr.), the Netherlands, on birds, 2: nocturnal collision risks (Dutch, English summary). RIN- report 92/3, DLO-Institute for Forestry and Nature Research, Arnhem.
- Woodward, A. J., S. D. Fuhlendorf, D. M. Leslie Jr., and J. Shackford. 2001. *American Midland Naturalist*, 145: 261-274.



July 11, 2011

Mr. Scott Koziar
Element Power
222 South Ninth Street, Suite 2870
Minneapolis, MN 55402

RE: New Frontier Wind Project
McHenry County, North Dakota

Dear Mr. Koziar:

Job Service North Dakota administers the employment service and unemployment insurance programs.

We have no comments regarding the proposed project and have no applicable permits that are required from Job Service North Dakota.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Maren Daley", is written over a thin, curved line.

Maren L. Daley
Executive Director



July 12, 2011

Scott Koziar, Senior Project Manager
Element Power
222 South Ninth Street, Suite 2870
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Dear Mr. Koziar,

I would like to thank you for your letter advising us about the New Frontier Wind Project that is planned for McHenry County, North Dakota.

There are currently no identifiable aviation concerns within the project area that you have submitted to us. However it is relevant to note that the closest public airport to the area is the Garrison Airport which is located 25 miles to the Southwest of the project boundary line. Garrison Airport (D05) is located at Lat: 47-39.36'N and Long: 101-26.33'W.

I would also like to advise your company of the North Dakota Senate Bill No. 2206 that was passed this last legislative session (see enclosure). This Senate Bill is regarding anemometer towers and discusses marking requirements. The North Dakota Aeronautics Commission is also tasked with the development of a database for all met towers to be used by pilots to view for increased safety. If Element Power has any current or future met towers in North Dakota, please submit the coordinates to us via e-mail at ndaero@nd.gov.

We wish you continued success in your efforts to provide renewable energy while at the same time helping us to promote aviation safety and flying for the state of North Dakota. If you have any further questions please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kyle C. Wanner".

Kyle C. Wanner
Aviation Planner

Cc: Larry Taborsky, Director, NDAC

Enclosure

**Sixty-second Legislative Assembly of North Dakota
In Regular Session Commencing Tuesday, January 4, 2011**

SENATE BILL NO. 2206
(Senators Miller, Olafson, Murphy)
(Representatives Belter, Boe, Schmidt)

AN ACT to create and enact a new section to chapter 2-05 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to anemometer towers; to provide a penalty; to provide an appropriation; to provide for application; and to declare an emergency.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NORTH DAKOTA:

SECTION 1. A new section to chapter 2-05 of the North Dakota Century Code is created and enacted as follows:

Anemometer towers - Definitions - Penalty.

1. As used in this section, unless the context otherwise requires:
 - a. "Anemometer" means an instrument for measuring and recording the speed of wind.
 - b. "Anemometer tower" means a structure, including all guy wires and accessory facilities, on which an anemometer is mounted for the purposes of documenting wind resources for the operation of a wind turbine generator.
 - c. "Commission" means the North Dakota aeronautics commission.
2. An anemometer tower that is fifty feet [15.24 meters] in height above the ground or higher, is located outside the zoning jurisdiction of a city, and the appearance of which is not otherwise regulated by state or federal law must be marked, painted, flagged, or otherwise constructed to be recognizable in clear air during daylight hours and:
 - a. Must be painted in equal, alternating bands of orange and white, beginning with orange at the top of the tower and ending with orange at the bottom of the tower;
 - b. One or more seven-foot [2.13-meter] safety sleeves must be placed at each anchor point and must extend from the anchor point along each guy wire attached to the anchor point; and
 - c. At least one marker bail must be attached to each guy wire in the highest set of guy wires which does not affect the stability of the tower and the measurement of wind speed.
3. The commission may establish and maintain a database that contains locations of all existing anemometer towers by January 1, 2012. The commission may contract with a governmental entity or a private entity to create and maintain the database.
 - a. Within sixty days after the effective date of this Act, an owner of any anemometer tower erected in the state shall provide the commission with global positioning system coordinates of the center of the anemometer tower.
 - b. At least ten days before the erection of an anemometer tower, an owner of the tower shall provide coordinates to the commission.
 - c. Within ten days after the removal of an anemometer tower, an owner of the tower shall notify the commission.
4. The commission may enforce this section. A violation of this section is an infraction.

SECTION 2. APPROPRIATION. There is appropriated out of any moneys in the general fund in the state treasury, not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$4,500, or so much of the sum as may be necessary, to the aeronautics commission for the purpose of establishing a database for anemometer towers, for the biennium beginning July 1, 2011, and ending June 30, 2013.

SECTION 3. APPLICATION. Any anemometer tower that was erected before August 1, 2011, must be marked as required in this Act before August 1, 2014. Any anemometer tower that is erected after July 31, 2011, must be marked as required in this Act at the time the tower is erected. An anemometer tower that has been erected in an existing wind energy generating facility on the effective date of this Act is exempt from the provisions of this Act.

SECTION 4. EMERGENCY. This Act is declared to be an emergency measure.



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS, OMAHA DISTRICT
NORTH DAKOTA REGULATORY OFFICE
1513 SOUTH 12TH STREET
BISMARCK ND 58504-6640

July 12, 2011

North Dakota Regulatory Office

Element Power
Attn: Scott Koziar
222 South Ninth Street, Suite 2870
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

Dear Mr. Koziar:

This is in response to a letter received July 11, 2011 requesting Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) comments on behalf of Meadowlark Wind I LLC (Meadowlark) regarding developing the New Frontier Wind Project in McHenry County, North Dakota.

Corps regulatory offices administer Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act regulates work impacting navigable waters. Work over, in, or under navigable waters is considered to have an impact. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act regulates the discharge of dredge or fill material (temporarily or permanently) in waters of the United States. Waters of the United States may include, but are not limited to, rivers, streams, ditches, coulees, lakes, ponds, and their adjacent wetlands. Fill material includes, but is not limited to, rock, sand, soil, clay, plastics, construction debris, wood chips, overburden from mines or other excavation activities and materials used to create any structure or infrastructure in the waters of the United States.

Please submit a location map and completed Corps permit application (copy enclosed) describing all proposed work and construction methodology, to the letterhead address if a Section 10/404 permit is required.

Do not hesitate to contact this office by letter or telephone (701-255-0015) if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Daniel E. Cimarosti".

Daniel E. Cimarosti
Regulatory Program Manager
North Dakota

Enclosure

**Instructions for Preparing a
Department of the Army Permit Application**

Blocks 1 through 4. To be completed by Corps of Engineers.

Block 5. Applicant's Name. Enter the name and the E-mail address of the responsible party or parties. If the responsible party is an agency, company, corporation, or other organization, indicate the name of the organization and responsible officer and title. If more than one party is associated with the application, please attach a sheet with the necessary information marked Block 5.

Block 6. Address of Applicant. Please provide the full address of the party or parties responsible for the application. If more space is needed, attach an extra sheet of paper marked Block 6.

Block 7. Applicant Telephone Number(s). Please provide the number where you can usually be reached during normal business hours.

Blocks 8 through 11. To be completed, if you choose to have an agent.

Block 8. Authorized Agent's Name and Title. Indicate name of individual or agency, designated by you, to represent you in this process. An agent can be an attorney, builder, contractor, engineer, or any other person or organization. Note: An agent is not required.

Blocks 9 and 10. Agent's Address and Telephone Number. Please provide the complete mailing address of the agent, along with the telephone number where he / she can be reached during normal business hours.

Block 11. Statement of Authorization. To be completed by applicant, if an agent is to be employed.

Block 12. Proposed Project Name or Title. Please provide name identifying the proposed project, e.g., Landmark Plaza, Burned Hills Subdivision, or Edsall Commercial Center.

Block 13. Name of Waterbody. Please provide the name of any stream, lake, marsh, or other waterway to be directly impacted by the activity. If it is a minor (no name) stream, identify the waterbody the minor stream enters.

Block 14. Proposed Project Street Address. If the proposed project is located at a site having a street address (not a box number), please enter it here.

Block 15. Location of Proposed Project. Enter the latitude and longitude of where the proposed project is located. If more space is required, please attach a sheet with the necessary information marked Block 15.

Block 16. Other Location Descriptions. If available, provide the Tax Parcel Identification number of the site, Section, Township, and Range of the site (if known), and / or local Municipality that the site is located in.

Block 17. Directions to the Site. Provide directions to the site from a known location or landmark. Include highway and street numbers as well as names. Also provide distances from known locations and any other information that would assist in locating the site. You may also provide description of the proposed project location, such as lot numbers, tract numbers, or you may choose to locate the proposed project site from a known point (such as the right descending bank of Smith Creek, one mile downstream from the Highway 14 bridge). If a large river or stream, include the river mile of the proposed project site if known

Block 18. Nature of Activity. Describe the overall activity or project. Give appropriate dimensions of structures such as wing walls, dikes (identify the materials to be used in construction, as well as the methods by which the work is to be done), or excavations (length, width, and height). Indicate whether discharge of dredged or fill material is involved. Also, identify any structure to be constructed on a fill, piles, or float-supported platforms.

The written descriptions and illustrations are an important part of the application. Please describe, in detail, what you wish to do. If more space is needed, attach an extra sheet of paper marked Block 18.

Block 19. Proposed Project Purpose. Describe the purpose and need for the proposed project. What will it be used for and why? Also include a brief description of any related activities to be developed as the result of the proposed project. Give the approximate dates you plan to both begin and complete all work.

Block 20. Reasons for Discharge. If the activity involves the discharge of dredged and/or fill material into a wetland or other waterbody, including the temporary placement of material, explain the specific purpose of the placement of the material (such as erosion control).

Block 21. Types of Material Being Discharged and the Amount of Each Type in Cubic Yards. Describe the material to be discharged and amount of each material to be discharged within Corps jurisdiction. Please be sure this description will agree with your illustrations. Discharge material includes: rock, sand, clay, concrete, etc.

Block 22. Surface Areas of Wetlands or Other Waters Filled. Describe the area to be filled at each location. Specifically identify the surface areas, or part thereof, to be filled. Also include the means by which the discharge is to be done (backhoe, dragline, etc.). If dredged material is to be discharged on an upland site, identify the site and the steps to be taken (if necessary) to prevent runoff from the dredged material back into a waterbody. If more space is needed, attach an extra sheet of paper marked Block 22.

Block 23. Description of Avoidance, Minimization, and Compensation. Provide a brief explanation describing how impacts to waters of the United States are being avoided and minimized on the project site. Also provide a brief description of how impacts to waters of the United States will be compensated for, or a brief statement explaining why compensatory mitigation should not be required for those impacts.

Block 24. Is Any Portion of the Work Already Complete? Provide any background on any part of the proposed project already completed. Describe the area already developed, structures completed, any dredged or fill material already discharged, the type of material, volume in cubic yards, acres filled, if a wetland or other waterbody (in acres or square feet). If the work was done under an existing Corps permit, identify the authorization, if possible.

Block 25. Names and Addresses of Adjoining Property Owners, Lessees, etc., Whose Property Adjoins the Project Site. List complete names and full mailing addresses of the adjacent property owners (public and private) lessees, etc., whose property adjoins the waterbody or aquatic site where the work is being proposed so that they may be notified of the proposed activity (usually by public notice). If more space is needed, attach an extra sheet of paper marked Block 24.

Information regarding adjacent landowners is usually available through the office of the tax assessor in the county or counties where the project is to be developed.

Block 26. Information about Approvals or Denials by Other Agencies. You may need the approval of other federal, state, or local agencies for your project. Identify any applications you have submitted and the status, if any (approved or denied) of each application. You need not have obtained all other permits before applying for a Corps permit.

Block 27. Signature of Applicant or Agent. The application must be signed by the owner or other authorized party (agent). This signature shall be an affirmation that the party applying for the permit possesses the requisite property rights to undertake the activity applied for (including compliance with special conditions, mitigation, etc.).

DRAWINGS AND ILLUSTRATIONS

General Information.

Three types of illustrations are needed to properly depict the work to be undertaken. These illustrations or drawings are identified as a Vicinity Map, a Plan View or a Typical Cross-Section Map. Identify each illustration with a figure or attachment number.

Please submit one original, or good quality copy, of all drawings on 8½ x11 inch plain white paper (electronic media may be substituted). Use the fewest number of sheets necessary for your drawings or illustrations.

Each illustration should identify the project, the applicant, and the type of illustration (vicinity map, plan view, or cross-section). **While illustrations need not be professional (many small, private project illustrations are prepared by hand), they should be clear, accurate, and contain all necessary information.**

**U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
APPLICATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY PERMIT
(33 CFR 325)**

OMB APPROVAL NO. 0710-0003
EXPIRES: 31 AUGUST 2012

Public reporting for this collection of information is estimated to average 11 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of the collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters, Executive Services and Communications Directorate, Information Management Division and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0710-0003). Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. Please DO NOT RETURN your form to either of those addresses. Completed applications must be submitted to the District Engineer having jurisdiction over the location of the proposed activity.

PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT

Authorities: Rivers and Harbors Act, Section 10, 33 USC 403; Clean Water Act, Section 404, 33 USC 1344; Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act, Section 103, 33 USC 1413; Regulatory Programs of the Corps of Engineers; Final Rule 33 CFR 320-332. Principal Purpose: Information provided on this form will be used in evaluating the application for a permit. Routine Uses: This information may be shared with the Department of Justice and other federal, state, and local government agencies, and the public and may be made available as part of a public notice as required by Federal law. Submission of requested information is voluntary, however, if information is not provided the permit application cannot be evaluated nor can a permit be issued. One set of original drawings or good reproducible copies which show the location and character of the proposed activity must be attached to this application (see sample drawings and/or instructions) and be submitted to the District Engineer having jurisdiction over the location of the proposed activity. An application that is not completed in full will be returned.

(ITEMS 1 THRU 4 TO BE FILLED BY THE CORPS)

1. APPLICATION NO.	2. FIELD OFFICE CODE	3. DATE RECEIVED	4. DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE
--------------------	----------------------	------------------	------------------------------

(ITEMS BELOW TO BE FILLED BY APPLICANT)

5. APPLICANT'S NAME First - Middle - Last - Company - E-mail Address -				8. AUTHORIZED AGENT'S NAME AND TITLE (agent is not required) First - Middle - Last - Company - E-mail Address -			
6. APPLICANT'S ADDRESS: Address- City - State - Zip - Country -				9. AGENT'S ADDRESS: Address- City - State - Zip - Country -			
7. APPLICANT'S PHONE NOS. w/AREA CODE a. Residence b. Business c. Fax				10. AGENTS PHONE NOS. w/AREA CODE a. Residence b. Business c. Fax			

STATEMENT OF AUTHORIZATION

11. I hereby authorize, _____ to act in my behalf as my agent in the processing of this application and to furnish, upon request, supplemental information in support of this permit application.

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT DATE

NAME, LOCATION, AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT OR ACTIVITY

12. PROJECT NAME OR TITLE (see instructions)			
13. NAME OF WATERBODY, IF KNOWN (if applicable)		14. PROJECT STREET ADDRESS (if applicable) Address	
15. LOCATION OF PROJECT Latitude: °N Longitude: °W		City - State- Zip-	
16. OTHER LOCATION DESCRIPTIONS, IF KNOWN (see instructions) State Tax Parcel ID Municipality Section - Township - Range -			

17. DIRECTIONS TO THE SITE

18. Nature of Activity (Description of project, include all features)

19. Project Purpose (Describe the reason or purpose of the project, see instructions)

USE BLOCKS 20-23 IF DREDGED AND/OR FILL MATERIAL IS TO BE DISCHARGED

20. Reason(s) for Discharge

21. Type(s) of Material Being Discharged and the Amount of Each Type in Cubic Yards:

Type Amount in Cubic Yards	Type Amount in Cubic Yards	Type Amount in Cubic Yards
-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------

22. Surface Area in Acres of Wetlands or Other Waters Filled (see instructions)

Acres
or
Linear Feet

23. Description of Avoidance, Minimization, and Compensation (see instructions)

24. Is Any Portion of the Work Already Complete? Yes No IF YES, DESCRIBE THE COMPLETED WORK

25. Addresses of Adjoining Property Owners, Lessees, Etc., Whose Property Adjoins the Waterbody (if more than can be entered here, please attach a supplemental list).

a. Address-

City - State - Zip -

b. Address-

City - State - Zip -

c. Address-

City - State - Zip -

d. Address-

City - State - Zip -

e. Address-

City - State - Zip -

26. List of Other Certificates or Approvals/Denials received from other Federal, State, or Local Agencies for Work Described in This Application.

AGENCY	TYPE APPROVAL*	IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	DATE APPLIED	DATE APPROVED	DATE DENIED

* Would include but is not restricted to zoning, building, and flood plain permits

27. Application is hereby made for permit or permits to authorize the work described in this application. I certify that this information in this application is complete and accurate. I further certify that I possess the authority to undertake the work described herein or am acting as the duly authorized agent of the applicant.

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

DATE

SIGNATURE OF AGENT

DATE

The Application must be signed by the person who desires to undertake the proposed activity (applicant) or it may be signed by a duly authorized agent if the statement in block 11 has been filled out and signed.

18 U.S.C. Section 1001 provides that: Whoever, in any manner within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals, or covers up any trick, scheme, or disguises a material fact or makes any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or representations or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or entry, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years or both.



July 12, 2011

Scott Koziar
Element Power
222 South Ninth St, Suite 2870
Minneapolis, MN 55402

RE: Proposed New Frontier Wind Project, McHenry County North Dakota

Dear Mr. Koziar:

Thank you for contacting this office for comment for the above referenced project. This office is in support of this project which will further wind energy development in North Dakota.

While no permits are required from our office, we would defer to the North Dakota Game & Fish Department, the ND Parks & Recreation Department, the State Historical Society of North Dakota, and the North Dakota Health Department for their input on any environmental concerns or issues within the boundaries of the proposed project. According to your letter it appears you have already initiated this process.

The North Dakota Public Service Commission is the authority which issues permits for locating power plant and transmission lines within the state.

With regards to land use, approvals are granted by the local land use/zoning authorities.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Paul T. Govig".

Paul T. Govig
Deputy Commissioner

sk



July 15, 2011

Mr. Scott Koziar
Element Power
222 S. 9th St., Suite 2870
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Re: New Frontier Wind Project, McHenry County

Dear Mr. Koziar:

This department has reviewed the information concerning the above-referenced project submitted under date of July 7, 2011, with respect to possible environmental impacts.

This department believes that environmental impacts from the proposed construction will be minor and can be controlled by proper construction methods. With respect to construction, we have the following comments:

1. All necessary measures must be taken to minimize fugitive dust emissions created during construction activities. Any complaints that may arise are to be dealt with in an efficient and effective manner.
2. Care is to be taken during construction activity near any water of the state to minimize adverse effects on a water body. This includes minimal disturbance of stream beds and banks to prevent excess siltation, and the replacement and revegetation of any disturbed area as soon as possible after work has been completed. Caution must also be taken to prevent spills of oil and grease that may reach the receiving water from equipment maintenance, and/or the handling of fuels on the site. Guidelines for minimizing degradation to waterways during construction are attached.
3. Projects disturbing one or more acres are required to have a permit to discharge storm water runoff until the site is stabilized by the reestablishment of vegetation or other permanent cover. Further information on the storm water permit may be obtained from the Department's website or by calling the Division of Water Quality (701-328-5210). Also, cities may impose additional requirements and/or specific best management practices for construction affecting their storm drainage system. Check with the local officials to be sure any local storm water management considerations are addressed.
4. Noise from construction activities may have adverse effects on persons who live near the construction area. Noise levels can be minimized by ensuring that construction equipment is equipped with a recommended muffler in good working order. Noise effects can also be minimized by ensuring that construction activities are not conducted during early morning or late evening hours.

Mr. Scott Koziar

2.

July 15, 2011

The department owns no land in or adjacent to the proposed improvements, nor does it have any projects scheduled in the area. In addition, we believe the proposed activities are consistent with the State Implementation Plan for the Control of Air Pollution for the State of North Dakota.

These comments are based on the information provided about the project in the above-referenced submittal. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers may require a water quality certification from this department for the project if the project is subject to their Section 404 permitting process. Any additional information which may be required by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under the process will be considered by this department in our determination regarding the issuance of such a certification.

If you have any questions regarding our comments, please feel free to contact this office.

Sincerely,



L. David Glatt, P.E., Chief
Environmental Health Section

LDG:cc
Attach.



Construction and Environmental Disturbance Requirements

These represent the minimum requirements of the North Dakota Department of Health. They ensure that minimal environmental degradation occurs as a result of construction or related work which has the potential to affect the waters of the State of North Dakota. All projects will be designed and implemented to restrict the losses or disturbances of soil, vegetative cover, and pollutants (chemical or biological) from a site.

Soils

Prevent the erosion of exposed soil surfaces and trapping sediments being transported. Examples include, but are not restricted to, sediment dams or berms, diversion dikes, hay bales as erosion checks, riprap, mesh or burlap blankets to hold soil during construction, and immediately establishing vegetative cover on disturbed areas after construction is completed. Fragile and sensitive areas such as wetlands, riparian zones, delicate flora, or land resources will be protected against compaction, vegetation loss, and unnecessary damage.

Surface Waters

All construction which directly or indirectly impacts aquatic systems will be managed to minimize impacts. All attempts will be made to prevent the contamination of water at construction sites from fuel spillage, lubricants, and chemicals, by following safe storage and handling procedures. Stream bank and stream bed disturbances will be controlled to minimize and/or prevent silt movement, nutrient upsurges, plant dislocation, and any physical, chemical, or biological disruption. The use of pesticides or herbicides in or near these systems is forbidden without approval from this Department.

Fill Material

Any fill material placed below the high water mark must be free of top soils, decomposable materials, and persistent synthetic organic compounds (in toxic concentrations). This includes, but is not limited to, asphalt, tires, treated lumber, and construction debris. The Department may require testing of fill materials. All temporary fills must be removed. Debris and solid wastes will be removed from the site and the impacted areas restored as nearly as possible to the original condition.



North Dakota Department of Transportation

Francis G. Ziegler, P.E.
Director

Jack Dalrymple
Governor

July 20, 2011

Scott Koziar
Element Power
222 S 9th Street, Suite 2870
Minneapolis, MN 55402

DEVELOPING A NEW WIND POWER PROJECT, PROJECT AREA AND TRANSMISSION
LINE ROUTE TO AN EXISTING SUBSTATION NEAR MCHENRY COUNTY, NORTH
DAKOTA

We have reviewed your July 7, 2010, letter.

Any impact to ND Highway 51 and ND Highway 53, which are both narrow and low volume roadways, with any temporary or permanent modifications for requested new drive locations must be visited with the District Engineer. There will also not be any storage of materials within the highway right of way; therefore, the developer will need to make those arrangements in advance.

Additionally, if because of this project any work needs to be done on highway right-of-way, appropriate permits and risk management documents will need to be obtained from the Department of Transportation District Engineer, Jim Redding at 701-837-7625.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Ronald Henke".

RONALD J. HENKE, P.E., DIRECTOR – OFFICE OF PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

57rjhjs

c: Jim Redding, Minot District Engineer



Jack Dalrymple, Governor
Mark A. Zimmerman, Director

1600 East Century Avenue, Suite 3
Bismarck, ND 58503-0649
Phone 701-328-5357
Fax 701-328-5363
E-mail parkrec@nd.gov
www.parkrec.nd.gov

July 25, 2011

Mr. Scott Koziar
Element Power
222 South 9th. Street
Suite 2870
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Re: Meadowlark Wind I LLC – New Frontier Wind Project in McHenry County

Dear Mr. Koziar,

The North Dakota Parks and Recreation Department (the Department) has reviewed the above referenced proposal to develop the New Frontier Wind Project in McHenry County, North Dakota.

Our agency scope of authority and expertise covers recreation and biological resources (in particular rare plants and ecological communities). The project as defined does not affect state park lands that we manage or Land and Water Conservation Fund recreation projects that we coordinate.


The North Dakota Natural Heritage biological conservation database has been reviewed to determine if any plant or animal species of concern or other significant ecological communities are known to occur within an approximate one-mile radius of the project area. Based on this review, there are no documented occurrences in our database within or adjacent to project area. Because this information is not based on a comprehensive inventory, there may be species of concern or otherwise significant ecological communities in the area that are not represented in the database. The lack of data for any project area cannot be construed to mean that no significant features are present. The absence of data may indicate that the project area has not been surveyed, rather than confirm that the area lacks natural heritage resources.

Given the potential for not only habitat disturbance and disruption but the threat to nesting, feeding and migratory bird and bats in the area we suggest that all efforts be made to avoid impacts to wildlife species and their habitats. In an effort to avoid or minimize impacts to wildlife and their habitats we encourage proper evaluation of all potential wind energy sites. To identify and assess adverse impacts to wildlife we suggest pre and post construction avian and bat monitoring studies be conducted.

The Department recommends that the project be accomplished with minimal impacts and that all efforts be made to ensure that critical habitats not be disturbed in the project area to help secure rare species conservation in North Dakota. Regarding any reclamation efforts, we recommend that any impacted areas be revegetated with species native to the project area.

We appreciate your commitment to rare plant, animal and ecological community conservation, management and inter-agency cooperation to date. For additional information please contact Kathy Duttonhefner (701-328-5370 or kgduttonhefner@nd.gov) of our staff. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed project.

Sincerely,


Jesse Hanson, Coordinator
Planning and Natural Resources Division
R.USNDNHI*2011-175 KD7/20/2011DL7.25.2011

.....
Play in our backyard!



North Dakota State Water Commission

900 EAST BOULEVARD AVENUE, DEPT 770 • BISMARCK, NORTH DAKOTA 58505-0850
701-328-2750 • TDD 701-328-2750 • FAX 701-328-3696 • INTERNET: <http://swc.nd.gov>

August 17, 2011

Scott Koziar
Element Power
222 South Ninth Street STE 2870
Minneapolis MN 55402

Dear Mr. Koziar:

This is in response to your request for review of environmental impacts associated with the New Frontier Wind Project in McHenry County, ND.

The proposed project has been reviewed by State Water Commission staff and the following comments are provided:

- The property is not located in an identified floodplain and it is believed the project will not affect an identified floodplain.

- It is the responsibility of the project sponsor to ensure that local, state and federal agencies are contacted for any required approvals, permits, and easements.

- All waste material associated with the project must be disposed of properly and not placed in identified floodway areas.

- No sole-source aquifers have been designated in ND.

There are no other concerns associated with this project that affect State Water Commission or State Engineer regulatory responsibilities.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide review comments. If you have any questions, please call me at 328-4969.

Sincerely,


Larry Knudtson
Research Analyst

LJK:dp/1570



**STATE
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY
OF NORTH DAKOTA**

Jack Dalrymple
Governor of North Dakota

August 17, 2011

North Dakota
State Historical Board

Mr. Todd Mattson, Director of Environmental Affairs
ElementPower
222 South Ninth Street, Suite 2870
Minneapolis MN 55402

Gerold Gerntholz
Valley City - President

ND SHPO REF: 11-2377 PSC/ElementPower Meadowlark Wind I LLC New Frontier Wind Energy Center, McHenry County, North Dakota

Calvin Grinnell
New Town - Vice President

A. Ruric Todd III
Jamestown - Secretary

Dear Mr. Mattson,

Albert I. Berger
Grand Forks

We reviewed your preliminary information on ND SHPO REF: 11-2377 PSC/ElementPower Meadowlark Wind I LLC New Frontier Wind Energy Center, McHenry County, North Dakota. There is potential for unrecorded and recorded cultural resource properties in a variety of physiographic settings in the overall project area. If the project requires permits issued by a federal and/or state agency (e.g., WAPA, RUS, COE, USFWS, BOR, PSC) then the respective agencies are to be consulted regarding their recommendations on the project. As a potential federal undertaking, we encourage agency consultation as part of the review process. Consultation should also include tribal nations, North Dakota Indian Affairs, ND DOT regarding any Scenic Byways, and managers or owners of properties maintained for recreational or scenic value.

Richard Kloubec
Fargo

Diane K. Larson
Bismarck

Chester E Nelson, Jr.
Bismarck

Thank you for the Class I Cultural Resource Inventory (file and records search with project maps) submittal. A Class II (reconnaissance) survey is warranted for standing structures in the visual Area of Potential Effect (APE). ND SHPO requests a map of the actual placement areas of Wind Turbines to determine the visual Area of Potential Effect, as we don't use a set distance for visual effects. Class III (pedestrian) surveys will be warranted for all areas directly impacted by the project, including crane paths, access roads, transmissions lines and turbine pads. We encourage that tribal monitors be invited to survey the APE. As part of the Class III Inventory, NDCRS site updates should be submitted on all sites resurveyed.

Sara Otte Coleman
*Director
Tourism Division*

Kelly Schmidt
State Treasurer

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project to date. We look forward to further review of cultural resource surveys and site forms. If you have any questions please contact Paul Picha, Chief Archaeologist (701) 328-3574 or Susan Quinnell, Review and Compliance Coordinator at (701) 328-3576, e-mail squinnell@nd.gov

Alvin A. Jaeger
Secretary of State

Mark Zimmerman
*Director
Parks and Recreation
Department*

Sincerely,

Francis Ziegler
*Director
Department of Transportation*

Merlan E. Paaverud, Jr.
State Historic Preservation Officer (North Dakota) and
Director, State Historical Society of North Dakota

Merlan E. Paaverud, Jr.
Director

C: Patrick Fahn, PSC

Accredited by the
American Association
of Museums since 1986