US Fish and Wildlife Service
Wind Turbine Guidelines Advisory Committee
Scientific Tools & Procedures Subcommittee

Web Conference Call Summary
November 14, 2008

Participants:

Taber Allison	Caitlin Coberly
Dale Strickland	Aimee Delach
Ed Arnett	Rob Manes
Keith Sexson	Rene Braud
Cheryl Amrani	Rachel London
Elana Kimbrell	

Summary:

- The Subcommittee went over Dale Strickland's comments, and began discussing all of the suggested questions for the tiers.
- "Ecological Community" needs to be defined and put in the glossary when it is developed. There has been some mixing of concepts, between ecological communities and critical habitat, since habitat is species-specific. The term "landscape" is one possible alternative to "ecological community" although there was a comment that this might be too broad and not focused enough on wildlife. The subcommittee will come back to this.
- It was noted that the Scientific Tools & Procedures recommendations should be as measurable as possible. They should also outline to what degree the proposed site is unmodified (particularly by roads), in order to encourage developers to site projects in areas that already have roads and infrastructure rather than in pristine areas. It was suggested that we clarify the area as the 'area to be potentially affected by a project' so that it would be measurable.
- Some adjustments were made to the wording in Question Five of Tier One, and there were no objections.
- The question of implementation cost was raised, but there were no problems with the proposed questions for the tiers. The point will be raised to the full FAC that there are costs to the developer even at Tier One.
- The issue of creating explicit decision points in Tier 2 was discussed: how to make it clear when the developer should decide to go to the next tier. It was suggested that the question read along the lines of: What are the potential risks of impacts to individuals…?
- It was noted that Question Five in Tier 2 ("What are the potential risks of impacts to individuals, local populations, metapopulations and their habitats, and can the impacts be avoided, minimized, or mitigated?") should also be asked at the end of Tier Three.
- The group decided to avoid using the word "airspace" in their recommendations if possible because it tends to create controversy.

- Some questions were identified as “process” questions and moved to the “parking lot” for the time being.
- The subcommittee made some suggestions about the proper metric to use. The best one may be rate per *produced*-megawatt, as it is easily obtained and universally understood.

- **<u>Next steps:</u>**
    - Finish identifying all questions
    - Work on recommendations for how these questions should be used and addressed by developers.
    - Discuss how to refer to the developing Methods &Metrics document revision and the National Academy report
    - Discuss to what extent the subcommittee should provide guidance in the evaluation of the data collected, in the context of the decision framework. How should the developer respond and modify projects based on results?
    - Rob Manes will draft text on large block habitat requirements and send out to the subcommittee.
    - Taber Allison will send out a draft with the changes from this call incorporated.

- **<u>Next Call:</u>** Friday, November 21 from 12:00-2:00pm Eastern Time.