Emerging Threats on the Northern Great Plains from Energy
Oil, Gas & Wind Breakout Notes

Considerations – rate of time:

Problems
Opportunity
Data

Outreach important so it's not perceived as energy vs. wildlife
The goal would be a product with threats/solutions for the Recovery Team.

Problems Specific to PIPL
Key:
W = Wind
O = Oil & Gas
M = Mining
H = Hydropower
T = Transmission Lines

1. Increased traffic (from oil & gas) = dust on nesting areas & disturbance, especially associated with dust. (O)
2. Lack of understanding of the impact of wind on PIPL – potential direct & indirect impacts. (W)
3. potential for spills - petroleum or brine (O)
4. Water Usage (O)
    a. draw down wetlands
    b. groundwater shortage
    c. wetland drainage for biofuels (PPR)
    d. Impacting dry-run water flows (water inflow impacts)
5. Lack of consolidated info to guide site selection (W, O, T)
6. Landscape fragmentation (e.g. increased predation)
7. PIPL attraction to roads & pads for nesting (O, W)
8. Blame Game (PIPL's fault that MO River is managed a certain way)
9. data needs unanswered about impacts (O, W, H)
10. Water mgmt/power peaking impacts on reservoirs/ PIPL habitat (H)
11. Cumulative effects of all problems

Comment [CA1]: What does PPR stand for?

12. Lack of understanding of migratory patterns of PIPL & potential impacts of energy (Vanessa Pompei data (COE?) E.g. at what altitude do they migrate?
13. How will climate change act as a cumulative effect?
    Piecemeal environmental review (W) (How are cumulative effects considered – phase 1, 2, 3 . . .)

Suggested Actions & Impacts to PIPLS

Key:
B = Breeding
M = Migrating
W = Winter

1. Minimize # roads /# miles & other consolidation adjacent to wetlands (breeding)
    - identify corridors for pipeline use
2. Migration & breeding & winter (Gulf) info needs (monitoring of wind farms to determine direct mortality)
    - Indirect effects (behavior, chick production, before & after studies)
3. Siting specifics (e.g. TransCanada pipeline) (B, M, W)
    - -horizontal drilling under wetlands & rivers
    - installation of monitors to stop spills
    - minimize direct contact with brine
    - measure population & survival
4. measure by habitat loss (M & B)
    - real (not hypothetical) risk
5. Planning to coordinate between state, federal, NGO's (B, M & W)
    - MOU for data sharing
6. In high-risk areas, make sites less attractive to PIPLS (B)
7. Tap into PR expertise for assistance
8. Prioritize data gaps (pop level) (B, M, W)
9. Direct impact – measure egg & chick loss as it relates to habitat loss (B)
10. Direct physiological impacts – measure chick survival
11. Indirect habitat impacts – measure habitat changes
12. Rangewide assessment of cumulative impacts of energy (B, M, W)
    - wind energy HCP as an opportunity to assess
    - tie-in to broader group involved in environmental reviews of energy – encourage info sharing.

Opportunities

1. Wind HCP must include impact of offsets

2. State agency involvement unclear, but opportunities to help companies project "green" image
3. Justification for more systematic monitoring of PIPLS
4. Some companies welcome specific mitigation suggestions, funding for mitigation fund.