

FWS Unveils Guidelines For Assessing Wildlife Impacts

New guidelines from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service include requirements for pre-development and post-construction monitoring and adaptive management concepts that could require operational changes.

BY KEVIN DESHARNAIS

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) published a notice of availability in February of its Draft Land-Based Wind Energy Guidelines, which establish a comprehensive methodology for evaluating and addressing impacts to affected species as a result of land-based wind energy projects. Among the significant changes from previous guidance issued in 2003, the new guidelines include extensive requirements for pre-development and post-construction monitoring and apply expanded adaptive management concepts that could require the assessment and implementation of operational changes on an ongoing basis.

The guidelines are intended to implement the FWS's responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act, Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA). They outline a tiered approach for identifying potential impacts to fish, wildlife and their habitats arising from land-based wind energy projects and for considering measures to avoid, minimize and compensate for those impacts. The guidelines are intended to address direct effects, such as blade strikes, barotraumas and displacement, as well as indirect effects, such as decreased survival or reproduction, increases in predation pressure, barrier effects, habitat frag-

mentation and noise impacts.

The guidelines are voluntary; however, compliance will be considered evidence of due care with respect to avoiding, minimizing and mitigating adverse impacts to species protected under the MBTA and the BGEPA, and will be taken into account when the FWS is exercising its discretion with respect to any potential referral for prosecution related to the death or injury of a protected species. Compliance with the guidelines does not provide authorization to take protected species. If a take is expected, the developer must seek a take permit under the applicable statute.

Tiered approach

The tiered approach set forth in the guidelines follows an iterative process for collecting information, quantifying the potential risks and evaluating those risks for use in siting, construction and operation decisions at wind energy projects. Each successive tier refines the information and builds upon the issues raised and efforts undertaken in prior tiers as the project moves through the various stages of the development process. The guide-

lines establish the following five tiers:

■ Tier 1 is the preliminary evaluation or screening stage for the assessment of potential sites (defined as landscape-scale screening of possible project sites);

■ Tier 2 is the site characterization stage for the broad characterization of one or more potential project sites;

■ Tier 3 is the pre-construction monitoring and assessment stage for the site-specific assessment of a proposed project site (this is the first tier in which quantitative monitoring and assessments are conducted);

■ Tier 4 is the post-construction monitoring stage intended to monitor the effects of the project, including evaluation of fatalities and other effects; and

■ Tier 5 allows for additional research to further evaluate direct and indirect effects, and to address data gaps.

The first three tiers correspond to the pre-construction evaluation phase of development, while Tiers 4 and 5 refer to post-construction monitoring, assessment and research. Each tier contains a series of questions intended to guide the decision-making process.

At the conclusion of each tier, a range of outcomes is possible. These include abandonment of the project due to unacceptable impacts, continuation of the process with additional data



Desharnais

Wind Turbine Guidelines Advisory Committee Recommendations

When developing the Draft Land-Based Wind Energy guidelines, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) considered the recommendations of the Wind Turbine Guidelines Advisory Committee (WTGAC). The WTGAC was established by the Secretary of the Interior for the express purpose of providing recommendations to revise the guidelines related to land-based wind energy facilities. It comprises 22 members representing federal, state and tribal agencies, wildlife conservation organizations and the wind industry. The WTGAC's recommendations were formally submitted to the Secretary of the Interior on March 4, 2010.

The draft guidelines differ from the WTGAC's recommendations in significant ways. For example, the WTGAC's recommendations did not include specific requirements for study duration, while the draft guidelines include a pre-construction study minimum duration of three years and a post-construction study minimum duration of two years (extending

up to a minimum of five years of post-construction study for certain projects).

Furthermore, while the WTGAC recommended consideration of costs in various sections, the draft guidelines include no consideration of cost. The guidelines also include consideration of noise effects, which was not recommended by the WTGAC, and significantly expanded reliance on adaptive management concepts when compared to the WTGAC's recommendations.


The proposed guidelines establish significantly expanded methodologies for assessing and addressing impacts to potentially affected species at land-based wind energy projects. They include specified pre-development and post-construction monitoring requirements that have the potential to significantly expand the time horizon for wind project development. In addition, they incorporate adaptive management concepts that may require ongoing assessment and alterations to operational practices, introducing

uncertainty regarding future operational projections.

Wind industry members should review and carefully assess the impact of the proposed guidelines on their own projects and should consider submitting comments during the public comment period. The FWS is accepting public comments on the draft guidelines through May 19.

E-mail comments can be submitted to windenergy@fws.gov. Comments should include "Wind Energy Guidelines Comments" or "Eagle Conservation Plan Guidance Comments" in the subject line and the commenter's full name and return address in the body of the message.

Upon consideration of comments received, the FWS intends to issue final guidelines. Further information is available at the FWS wind energy website at fws.gov/windenergy.

The FWS intends to post updates on continuing developments and new information relating to these guidelines and related issues at the website. 

collection and/or implementation of mitigation measures and continuation of project development as designed without additional data collection. If, at the conclusion of a tier, the answers to the posited questions indicate little potential for risk, the developer may conclude that the application of the tiered approach may end at that particular tier. The FWS encourages consultation before finalizing a decision to end the assessment process.

Extent and duration of monitoring

The guidelines outline expectations regarding the scope and duration of the required investigations and studies under each tier. The information gathered at each stage is intended

to inform the studies required at each subsequent stage.

The Tier 1 preliminary evaluation or screening of potential sites is intended to be a broad review at the "landscape" level. It should include review of available databases and other publicly available information regarding wildlife values and potential restrictions on development, such as designated critical habitats and conservation areas.

In addition, developers should coordinate with the FWS and appropriate state resource agencies regarding potentially affected species and their ranges, as well as other relevant federal, state, tribal and local agencies. The guidelines further recommend coordination with private conserva-

tion organizations in the vicinity of a prospective site.

A Tier 2 site characterization is focused at the site level and is intended to identify potential sites within the geographic area under consideration that would be appropriate for wind energy development. The site characterization should include identification of the potentially affected species that are present at or may use the site, as well as suspected areas of congregation, such as nesting sites, maternity roosts and migration corridors. The assessment should include at least one site reconnaissance visit at each prospective site. In addition, site visits should be conducted at sufficient intervals to account for seasonal variation.

The Tier 3 pre-construction study is the first tier to require quantitative monitoring and assessment of potential sites to evaluate the risk of the proposed project. The pre-construction study is meant to accomplish several tasks, such as identifying local populations of potentially affected species, quantifying the distribution, abundance and site use, and quantifying the potential risks. In order to establish a trend in site use and conditions that accounts for annual and seasonal variation, the studies are expected to occur over multiple years. Generally, three years of pre-construction studies is considered appropriate.

Tier 4 investigations can be divided into two categories: fatality monitoring and monitoring for other effects. Fatality studies are considered necessary to confirm earlier predictions regarding species impact. As with pre-construction studies, there is an expectation that post-construction monitoring will generally be conducted over a period of years. At sites where the perceived risk is low, two years of monitoring may be sufficient. Where the risk is considered moderate, a minimum of three years will be required. Where the risk is considered high, a minimum of five years of assessment is required.

Tier 4 monitoring for “other effects” should generally include assessment for effects resulting from habitat impacts, including habitat loss or modification, habitat fragmentation, barrier effects, displacement and noise impacts. In addition, it should assess for demographic effects – including effects at the local, regional or population-wide level.

Tier 5 provides for additional research to be conducted at developed sites. Research should be pursued when there is a need to address risks and uncertainty; it may also be pursued by a developer to address gaps in knowledge and to evaluate the effectiveness of best management practices. It also serves as a key component of an adaptive management program.

Research may be appropriate where mortality rates or other direct or indirect effects are at higher levels post-construction than had been predicted pre-construction. It may also be appropriate when monitoring indicates that mitigation measures have been less effective than had been anticipated. Tier 5 research duration will depend on the research question and study design identified during earlier tiers and may require post-construction monitoring of durations longer than the minimum three years recommended for fatality monitoring.

Mitigation and adaptive management

Under the guidelines, where impacts to species resources are expected, mitigation measures must be pursued. Mitigation includes actions to avoid, minimize and compensate for adverse effects resulting from a project. Where such impacts are unavoidable, compensation may be required. Compensation is where a project induced losses to an affected species and resources are replaced or offset with resources of equivalent biological value, or through the provision of funds to enhance available resources. For example, compensation may be required where a take of affected species is unavoidable, or to offset unavoidable impacts

resulting from habitat loss. Avoidance and minimization of adverse effects are the preferred methods of mitigation and should be pursued before resorting to compensation. When used, compensation must be commensurate with the effects anticipated.

The guidelines specifically incorporate the concept of adaptive management into the assessment and decision-making process. Adaptive management is defined as a decision process that permits flexible decision making that can be adjusted in the face of uncertainties as outcomes from management actions and other events become better understood.

Adaptive management requires that management and mitigation measures be adjusted if monitoring indicates that goals are not being met. Changes to operations or to the implementation of evolving mitigation measures may occur on a continuing basis in response to ongoing assessment. This approach may introduce significantly greater uncertainty into the assessment process and extend the time frame for assessment.

The FWS’s use of adaptive management is guided by the U.S. Department of the Interior’s Adaptive Management Technical Guide and is available at doi.gov/initiatives/adaptive-management. **IS/P**

Kevin Desharnais is a partner in the Chicago office of Mayer Brown, whose practice is focused on environmental law, including air, land, water, wetlands and noise matters. He can be reached at (312) 701-8079 or kdesharnais@mayerbrown.com.