

Existing Guidelines Subcommittee of the  
Wind Turbine Guidelines Advisory Committee  
Telephone Conference – March 27, 2008

Draft Summary

Participants:

Greg Hueckel	Aimee Delach	Abby Arnold
Mark Sinclair	Mike Azeka	Cheryl Amrani, Facilitator

- Prior to the call, the Subcommittee reviewed a draft document prepared by Greg Hueckel and staff summarizing guidance from Canada, FWS, and 25 U.S. States, according to the “elements” identified by the Subcommittee during the previous call. Greg explained the summary to the group. It was noted that the element “post-construction monitoring” was not included, and will be added.
- Several suggestions were made to improve the document’s usability:
  - ✓ Condense States that have adopted the USFWS interim guidelines
  - ✓ Combine other State guidelines that are very similar
  - ✓ Group together States with similar management concerns (e.g., Dakotas and Kansas focus on prairie grassland species)
  - ✓ Analyze and summarize the range of approaches under each element and discuss the merits of each type of approach
  - ✓ Assemble a “universe” of best approaches within elements, disassociated with the proponents of each approach, and provide the full Committee with this list for their consideration
  - ✓ Any list provided to the full Committee should include some form of commentary, and needs to be significantly pared down
- At this point, it was noted that the Subcommittee should avoid moving too quickly so that they don’t get ahead of the full Committee. Suggested approaches included:
  - ✓ Under each element, determine the range of approaches and highlight the differences, pros & cons, costs & benefits
  - ✓ Determine consistent themes of approaches, even if the details differ (e.g., requirement for post-construction studies although length of time, seasonal requirements may differ)
  - ✓ Develop a set of questions related to each element that the full Committee should address
- Other observations and thoughts that were shared included:
  - ✓ Recommend that USFWS guidelines be used only where States don’t have comprehensive guidelines of their own

ACTION ITEMS:

*Teams will analyze their chosen elements and fill out the template provided by Aimee via e-mail as soon as possible, but no later than **Tuesday, April 15<sup>th</sup>**, to allow the Subcommittee time to review prior to our next call on Thursday, April 17<sup>th</sup>.*

- It was decided by those on the call to have teams of 2 analyze each of the categories listed in Greg's draft document. "Post-construction monitoring" was added to this list, and it was agreed by those on the phone that "Research" could be addressed at a later time.
- For each category, the team will extract the range of approaches, identify any consistent theme(s), and provide pros and cons for each type of approach. Teams, to date, are as follows:
  - ✓ Mike Azeka and Mark Sinclair:
    - Retrofitting, Repowering & Decommission
    - Site Development (Micrositing)
  - ✓ Greg Hueckel and Ed Arnett:
    - Post-construction Monitoring
    - Mitigation
  - ✓ Aimee Delach and Andy Linehan:
    - Preliminary Assessment & Site Evaluation
    - Pre-construction Wildlife Assessment
- The following members should pick one or two topics to assist with:
  - George Allen
  - Kathy Boydston
  - Jeri Lawrence
  - Keith Sexson
- Those who were unable to participate on this call will have an opportunity to provide their comments.
- Rachel will contact you to schedule your next call for Thursday, April 17.