

WREZ Environment & Lands Work Group Meeting
March 11 – 12, 2009
Portland, OR
Meeting Summary

Next Steps

Wildlife Categorization Maps

- WGA will ask STG to refine and finalize data by March 18. They are encouraged to consider categorizations as specific to the renewable resource within a specific QRA. Also finalize revised and approved wildlife maps overlayed with QRAs by March 18.
- Next E&L webcast 3/25 @ 10am MDT to review avoid/high sensitive recommendations and citizens proposed wilderness on maps. Invite STG members to answer questions on their data.
- List in caveats that wildlife data is imperfect and the available data that was categorized was considered based on risk to large-scale development. While the data may not have been categorized based on risks from the specific resources in each QRA it was the best data that was available at the time.
- E&L will recommend to the Technical Committee that their work in Phase II of the WREZ should include refining the data within REZs. This would include wildlife data but also would include determining how to identify appropriate places for renewable energy development (i.e. already disturbed sites like brownfields)
- E&L will also recommend to the Technical Committee that their work in Phase II of the WREZ include providing information on wildlife impacts from transmission.
- Lynn Kutner, NatureServe, and Josh Finn, Black & Veatch, will send any updated state categorizations completed (e.g., CA or WA if done) by 3/13.
- NatureServe will incorporate all final state data and categorization instructions provided by COB 3/18 in time for the STG webinar.
- After 3/20 NatureServe is seeking final validation of their work from STG members and only getting corrections, not new data or changes on categorizations.
- Black & Veatch will revise MW chart with final maps, showing MW totals with all avoids removed. Include a total at the bottom. Include in MW chart calculations if citizens proposed wilderness areas are avoided.
- Black & Veatch will revise chart that shows % of avoid and non-avoid in each QRA.
- Black & Veatch will create, if possible, an example of the blurred REZ boundary concept by the 3/25 webcast.

Public Comments

- WGA will use E&L feedback to group comments by topic and prepare general responses for each topic.
- E&L will review general responses prior to posting on the WREZ website.

Areas for Further Consideration

- WGA will revise the recommendations for areas for further consideration based on E&L agreement at the meeting.
- Danielle Flynn and WGA will follow up to confirm BLM's recommendation that Visual Resource Management Classes 1 and 2 should be avoid areas.

- Sue Bonnyman will undertake to find GIS data for historic trails in British Columbia.
- E&L will review the recommendations before they are forwarded on to the Technical Committee for approval.
- Black & Veatch will map the data received for National Historic Landmarks and Landmark Districts as well as National Scenic Byways. Black & Veatch will include this point data as a data layer on the on-line portal for WREZ, but this point data will not be avoided from any REZ because the points do not represent the full area that the landmarks encompass.
- USFS will help gather GIS data for their areas and to try to get a recommendation on pending USFS lands: Archeological Areas, National Historic Trails, National Monuments and Special Areas.
- USFS will also work to get a description of each of the USFS management areas.
- Citizens proposed wilderness is the one area that still requires a recommendation. This will be reviewed again on the 3/25 webcast and E&L will be asked to finalize their recommendation at that time.

Public Comment Period on REZs – Late April

- E&L work group members should advise their constituencies that the second public comment period for reviewing proposed REZs will be very brief.
- E&L will develop an outline for public comment documents and language reflecting the process E&L and the STG took to incorporate wildlife sensitivities into the REZs. E&L members will have an opportunity to review the public comment materials before they are posted on the WREZ website.

Phase One Report

- WGA and the E&L co-chairs will work with a contractor to draft language in the summary report to the Governors related to E&L's recommendations. This language will be sent out to E&L members for review.
- WGA will begin to outline the topics for a more detailed report on the E&L work group which will be considered an appendix to the summary report and which will be posted on-line.
- WGA will schedule time for E&L members to review the outline and to consider some approaches for the report writing (i.e. create drafting subgroup, assign sections to members or have WGA draft and members review).
- WGA will capture the suggestions from E&L members for Appendices.
 - Chart documenting all environmental, wildlife and resource issues that can be found within each REZ (review RETI chart as a possible template).
 - Chart listing significant issues to consider when developing renewable energy, but that are more applicable for consideration and the project-siting level. Group by topic and include appropriate contact information for each area (i.e. cultural resources, conservation easements, rare/endangered plants).
 - Additional resources for information on wildlife interactions with renewable energy development (i.e. NWCC documents).

Discussion Summary

Wildlife Categorization Maps & Recommendation to Technical Committee

The WREZ Environment & Lands Work Group met in Portland over two days to form a recommendation to the Technical Committee on treatment of wildlife categorizations received from the Western Governors Wildlife Council. Work Group members reviewed preliminary maps depicting wildlife sensitivities within QRAs for a number of states, and members considered the recommendation to exclude wildlife “avoid” as a method to refine QRAs into renewable energy zones (REZ). As part of this exercise members also had access to a statistical analysis showing the amount of megawatts remaining in each QRA if the wildlife avoid areas were excluded.

NatureServe, supported by representatives from the state wildlife agencies, presented the preliminary wildlife maps and discussed the data analysis methodology. The WGWC, with input from the E&L work group, solicited data for wildlife corridors and crucial habitat. The state wildlife agencies compiled state data and in some instances incorporated non-state data. The wildlife data was then categorized into three categories, avoid, high sensitive and insufficient data, based on wildlife risk from large-scale development. Criteria for each category are listed below.

Lands within the Qualified Resource Areas (QRAs) will be evaluated based on the following wildlife criteria, and categorized accordingly.

1) Exclusion Areas

Designated lands where statute, regulation or other legal instrument precludes development.

2) Avoidance Areas

Areas crucial to wildlife conservation that are irreplaceable and where mitigation may not be feasible or effective. These areas reflect a relatively high standard of empirical knowledge, data analysis, or vetted process.

3) High Sensitivity

Areas where development would likely pose a significant risk to wildlife values. These areas also reflect a relatively high standard of empirical knowledge, data analysis, or vetted process.

4) Areas with Insufficient Data

Lands likely to have significant wildlife values, but for which there is insufficient data or a lack of information about the nature of the risk to wildlife.

In some instances state wildlife agencies categorized their data at the time it was submitted to NatureServe, other states did not specify categorizations and NatureServe applied the categorization using the above criteria. The preliminary maps viewed in Portland had not been quality checked by the states and several states still had to review and approve the categorization applied by NatureServe. These steps still need to occur before the wildlife maps are finalized.

Preliminary maps were used in Portland to provide a visual aid to work group members in considering the recommendation the treatment of wildlife sensitivities in refining QRAs into REZs. The maps were also used to produce a statistical analysis of remaining megawatts in each QRA if avoid areas were removed.

Work group members discussed a number of issues related to the maps, megawatt calculations, and possible recommendations to the Technical Committee. Several members had concerns about the wildlife data and the visual representation of ultimate REZ maps. Below are a number of concerns that the group voiced, and which most members agreed should be clearly explained in the WREZ Phase 1 report.

- It is important to remember that this analysis is being done on a coarse level. The REZ identification phase is intended to identify the best of the best places for locating a high voltage transmission line, meaning that the area should include the most high quality, cost effective resources that are the least controversial or impactful to wildlife and environmental concerns.
- The report should caveat that the wildlife data is imperfect. The wildlife data was categorized based generally on wildlife risk from large-scale development, and has not yet been refined to reflect more species-specific risks to the renewable resource in questions. This wildlife analysis has been conducted by the state wildlife agencies at a broad scale to assist E&L in the identification of appropriate REZs. While the data is not perfect, it is the best available information that each state agency can provide to help in decision-making. The refinement of the wildlife data within ultimate REZs was recommended by E&L as a Phase 2 task.
- While the wildlife categorization does not specifically indicate that one will or will not be able to develop a renewable generation facility in a particular area it is a broad-scale assessment of areas where may have more or less impacts to wildlife, and where development may be more difficult or more easy. The criteria above indicates that state wildlife agencies have endeavored to indicate areas with irreplaceable species or habitat and other areas that are sensitive but where mitigation measures could be appropriate. Finally, the states identified areas where there is not sufficient data, but where they believe sensitive habitats may occur. Areas that have not been categorized by the states are believed to be more appropriate for development, however there is no guarantee that no wildlife considerations exist in those areas. Specific information about the developability of a particular area will have to occur as part of the project-siting process.
- E&L initially intended to focus their WREZ work on identifying and mapping the most appropriate places for development within a REZ, such as already disturbed lands. There has not been sufficient time for E&L to consider these areas as most of their work thus far has been spent highlighting areas where development is precluded by law, where development may not be appropriate and where there may be conflicts, or where mitigation may be required.
- All of the caveats discussed would be added, as necessary, to the existing core premises E&L had set out early in their process.
- E&L maintains an interest in moving ahead on their Phase 2 task of providing recommendations for conceptual transmission planning in the WREZ.

When considering recommendations for treatment of the avoid and high sensitive areas in refining QRAs into REZs work group members raised a number of issues:

- Some E&L members had serious reservations in removing wildlife avoid areas from the QRAs because of the fact that the wildlife data had not yet been refined to account for species-specific impacts for a particular renewable resource.

- Other members were less concerned with the total resources that end up within a REZ, but wanted to make sure that the resources contiguous to REZ boundaries also be considered as developable. One member added that resources outside of REZ boundaries may actually be more appropriate for development from an environmental perspective.
- The visual representation of maps will be very important to the public. While many developers will be looking to see if their project is located within a REZ many environmental groups will be looking to make sure that their important areas are not. Members agreed that it would be preferable for the REZ boundaries to be blurred, and not shown as hard-line boundaries on the maps.
- WGA staff pointed out that the REZ assessment is being done on a very coarse scale and identifying a REZ does not assume that all the area within a REZ will be developed. Similarly, it does not assume that areas within the REZs are the only areas that will be developed. All development will have to work through permitting issues with the local siting jurisdiction.
- Some members were not comfortable that all the wildlife avoid areas would be identified as avoid if the state wildlife agencies had the ability to refine their data, therefore they did not want to remove all of the wildlife avoid areas from the QRAs to determine REZs. As a compromise, the work group discussed showing all of the avoid areas in the ultimate REZs, but calculating their development potential as zero in the economic model of the REZ. Again, the group tackled an issue of visual perception, where showing the avoid areas, but discounting them to zero percent, has the same mathematical affect as if the areas were not actually within a REZ boundary. The statistical analysis to discount wildlife avoid areas zero percent would result in a number of QRAs failing to meet the 1,500 megawatt threshold, so they would not become a REZ. The remaining REZs would show wildlife avoid areas within them with the assumption that those areas would receive further analysis to focus on the impact to wildlife from specific renewable energy generation.
- Another recommendation was to simplify the visual representation of resource and wildlife data in the REZs by having a separate map for the resource in a REZ and for the wildlife categorization of areas within a REZ. Separate maps would make it easier to see all of the layers of information, however if the avoid areas remain in a REZ but are treated as undevelopable in the economics they should be distinguished in some way from the more developable resources. A third map could show a theoretical “centroid” or location for transmission planning, and supply curve information for that REZ would be provided.
- For wildlife high-sensitive areas, the work group considered keeping the high sensitive areas within a REZ and applying the same discount factors that are applied to the resources within all areas of a REZ. This assumes that the current discount factor accounts in part for some of the environmental permitting issues developer may face for a specific project.

At the end of the meeting the E&L work group left with a number of options for recommendation to the Technical Committee. These options will be reviewed on a webcast once final wildlife maps are available (see Appendix A).

Areas for Further Consideration

At the March meeting E&L members also discussed additional areas for consideration, in an attempt to identify any remaining lands to categorize as “avoid” and remove from within Qualified Resource Areas (QRA). Work group members considered a proposal prepared by a subgroup prior to the meeting. This subgroup reviewed a list of additional areas that had been generated from public comments, as well as

areas that had been proposed during earlier work group conversations but which work group members had not been able to reach agreement on.

At the last E&L work group meeting in September 2008 members discussed some of these areas when developing their list of exclusion areas and initial avoidance areas. In considering a proposal for additional areas of consideration E&L members decided to add some areas to their existing list of avoidance areas. The basic decision-making process for considering additional areas was:

Is development precluded by statute/regulation?

- a. Yes – meets the definition of exclusion area. Obtain statute reference. Do not include in a REZ.
- b. No – Is the data in GIS format and available?
 - i. No - Note that the issue may be significant but do not have data at this time. Provide contact information for siting requirements, etc. that can be used as a resource for industry.
 - ii. Yes
 1. Map and incorporate GIS data as part of the process to refine qualified resource areas, and ultimately identify renewable energy zones targeted for utility-scale development of wind, solar, or geothermal energy.
 2. If area intersects with QRA maps - Can impact be reasonably mitigated or otherwise managed?
 - a. No - Initially consider as "avoid" area
 - b. Map for consideration in ultimate REZs as a potentially sensitive area

Using this decision-making process, and reviewing recommendations from a subgroup, E&L work group members made the following decisions about additional areas for consideration.

1) Mapped areas still under review for E&L consideration:

- BLM Citizens' Wilderness Inventories & Citizens proposed wilderness
- *Pending USFS Recommendation:* USFS Archeological Areas, National Historic Trails, National Monuments and Special Areas

2) Add to Exclude and Avoid list and remove mapped areas from within QRA boundaries:

Exclude Areas – use citation from individual land management plans

- USFS Inventoried Roadless Areas – excluded from QRAs by earlier E&L decision
- USFS Wilderness Study Areas – excluded for BLM and USFWS lands by earlier E&L decision
- USFS Recommended Wilderness
- USFS Wild and Scenic Rivers

Avoid Areas

- USFS Research Natural Areas and Proposed Research Natural Areas
- USFS Special Interest Areas
- USFS Congressional Reserved Areas - includes Riparian Conservation Areas
- USFS Administratively Withdrawn Areas
- USFS Backcountry, Non-motorized Land Management Zones
- USFS Critical Biological Areas

- Alberta Flagship Viewsheds - A rough viewshed analysis was completed around three flagship parks where the protection of the viewsheds was considered highly desirable

3) Show on maps, but do not exclude from any REZ because only point data is available:

- NPS National Historic Landmarks and Landmark Districts
- NPS National Scenic Byways

4) Create chart with areas that are significant when considering renewable energy development, but were not mapped in this process either because data is unavailable or because issue is more appropriately handled at the project level. Provide contacts for specific permitting information.

State/Provincial Lands

Complete GIS data for all state and provincial lands was not available in time for this process, nor was specific feedback received from each state on treatment of renewable energy development, so recommend listing areas as significant for considering renewable energy development and provide contacts for permitting information. Areas covered in this recommendation include:

- State/Provincial Forests (development precluded by statute/regulation only in CA)
- State/Provincial Trust Lands
- State/Provincial Historic Sites & Trails
- State/Provincial Administrative Lands
- State-held conservation easements (where development is precluded by statute/regulation that area should be considered an exclude area)
- Nevada Tahoe Parcels
- Laramer County conservation easements

Federal & Private Lands

- BLM Acquired lands – lands purchased with private finds and donated to BLM
- BLM Outstanding Natural Areas
- Private preserves
- Conservation easements
- USFWS Proposed HCPs
- Any areas identified as critical for adaptation to climate change
- Rare/endangered plants

Cultural Resources

- NPS National Historic Districts and Archaeological Districts eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places
- Traditional Cultural Properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of historic places or an equivalent state register
- Areas designated by Congress for the purpose of protecting cultural resources
- Sacred sites identified by an Indian tribe in accordance with Executive Order 13007
- Areas identified by experts as containing significant concentrations of cultural resources

Other

- Buffers, both for visual impacts and for species-specific requirement, are best considered at a project-specific level because most requirements are based on the specific renewable resource as well as the specific location.

5) Pending Review by British Columbia Government

Avoid

Government of BC, Ecological Communities of Provincial Conservation Concern

Government of BC, Wildlife Management Areas

Consider mapping as Sensitive

Government of BC, Lands within four bioclimatic zones that are of conservation concern

6) Phase Two for E&L:

- E&L will request that the Technical Committee allow them, in Phase Two, to refine areas within final REZs to determine how to identify and map appropriate places for development within REZs. Specific areas mentioned included already disturbed areas such as brownfields .

Public Comments

The WREZ project solicited public comments during the month of February, on a number of documents relating to identification of Qualified Resource Areas. The E&L work group specifically sought comments on the exclusion list and initial avoidance lists that were used to define QRA boundaries. Additional items available as background for the public comment period were the wildlife data request sent out by the Western Governors' Wildlife Council and the draft categorization criteria document, also developed by the Western Governors' Wildlife council with input from E&L. WGA synthesized each of the comments received, and organized those comments by topic and the appropriate WREZ work group. At the March meeting E&L members received a synthesis of each E&L-related comment, as well as the full comment. Members went through and discussed each comment. WGA staff will group the comments into general themes, and will use the E&L discussion to prepare responses to these general themes. General responses from each WREZ work group will be sent to the work group and posted on the WREZ website in April.

WGA is planning a second public comment period in late April once the Technical Committee has approved proposed REZs. This round of public comments will focus on the proposed REZs, and specifically related to E&L, the additional areas for consideration and wildlife data that was used to refine QRAs into proposed REZs.

Phase One Report

WGA is preparing a Phase One summary report for the Western Governors to adopt at their Annual Meeting in June. The summary report will summarize the Phase One actions within WREZ to identify REZs; the report will also include a map of the REZs. The summary report will be drafted by WGA staff and reviewed and approved by Technical Committee and Steering Committee members. A draft will also be sent to E&L work group members for review.

Most of the detailed work of E&L and the other WREZ work groups will be captured in appendices located on the WREZ website. Unlike the Phase One summary report which will be due to the Technical Committee in late April, the detailed E&L report will not need to be completed until early

June. WGA staff will begin by drafting an outline for the detailed E&L report, and will look to work group members to help draft and edit the E&L report and any attachments, such as tables or charts that were mentioned during this meeting.

**DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR E&L CONSIDERATION
Identified at the Mach 11 – 12 Work Group Meeting**

Treatment of Wildlife Avoid Areas - Recommendation A – *Exclude Avoid Areas*

- Exclude all wildlife avoid areas from QRAs, both spatially and quantitatively. REZs become what is left over and the megawatt potential will be calculated for those remaining areas.

Treatment of Wildlife Avoid Areas - Recommendation B – *Exclude Avoid Areas From Economic Analysis But Leave As Viewable on Maps*

- To focus E&L efforts further, eliminate the QRAs (or parts of a QRA) that are almost totally covered with wildlife avoid layers and that are non-contiguous with the rest of a QRA.
- After those eliminations have been made, the remaining QRAs will become REZs and the wildlife data for avoid, high sensitive and insufficient data within the REZs will be shown. The wildlife avoid layers will not, however, be quantified in the resource analysis as a discount factor of 0% will be applied to the avoid areas.
- Propose to the TC that a major next step for the E&L work group would be to work with the STG to obtain a more targeted assessment of the wildlife sensitivities within each REZ, specifically refining the avoid data with a focus on species-specific impacts from the renewable energy potential in each REZ. This approach will improve the data and help determine where E&L should direct development within each REZ.

Treatment of Wildlife Avoid Areas – Recommendation C – *Exclude Avoid Areas From Economic Analysis and Show All Resources and Wildlife Information But Blur REZ Boundaries*

- To focus E&L efforts further, take another cut to eliminate the QRAs (or parts of a QRA) that are almost totally covered with wildlife avoid layers and that are non-contiguous with the rest of the QRA.
- Separate out renewable resource information from wildlife information by creating a series of maps.
- One map will include the Qualified Resource Area maps – having removed ZITA technical exclusions as well as statutory/regulatory exclusions and “consensus avoid” areas. Resources that did not meet the QRA criteria will also be shown, but in a lighter shade to distinguish them as less desirable. [?? IS THIS RIGHT??]
- The second map will include the wildlife maps showing layers for the avoid, high sensitive and insufficient data categories. For the Technical Committee meeting the data will be shown within the QRAs, but the report for the WGA Annual Meeting will include state-wide wildlife data on the map layer.
- The third map would show a dot representing the “centroid” of each REZ, and the size of the dot would correlate to the relative amount of megawatts calculated for the REZ. The centroid will be placed based on the QRA and wildlife maps, however it will be considered a theoretical centroid identified for the purposes of indicating that a transmission line may be built somewhere in that area. This map will show the information that the transmission planners are viewing.
- Supply curves will be calculated for each REZ showing what resources are found within the REZ. A methodological description of how the megawatts and supply curve were obtained will also be provided.

- Wildlife avoid areas, while shown on the maps, will have a discount factor of 0% in the supply curves.

Treatment of Wildlife High Sensitive Areas:

Spatial data identifying the areas that the WREZ states and provinces consider as high sensitive for wildlife were received from many of the WREZ states and provinces. E&L considered that this determination is one that will be made on a case by case basis and is the responsibility of project developers in conjunction with the appropriate local, state or federal agencies during the project siting process. Given the fact that wildlife sensitivity is an unknown and unpredictable constraint on energy development, E&L cannot justify excluding all these areas from the WREZ resource analysis.

Recommendation A:

- Resource potential that falls inside high sensitive areas should be quantified and characterized in the resource assessment, as well as shown on the REZ maps.
- Keep the discount factor for wind and solar resources at 25% and 3.5% because they can already account for development issues arising within high sensitive areas. The model user will be able to change the discount factor, cost, or any other characteristic in the model if they choose.

Recommendation B:

- Resource potential that falls inside high sensitive areas should be quantified and characterized in the resource assessment, as well as shown on the REZ maps.
- Keep the discount factor for wind and solar resources at 25% and 3.5% but flag that resource potential as “high sensitive” in the ZITA resource assessment and GTM transmission planning models. which megawatts in REZs are characterized as high sensitive. The model user will be able to change the discount factor, cost, or any other characteristic in the model if they choose.
- Users of the maps, resource assessment and GTM model will be aware of which areas of QRAs and how much resource potential falls on areas that contain high wildlife sensitivity.

Western Renewable Energy Zones Project

Environment & Lands Work Group

Hilton Portland & Executive Tower

921 SW Sixth Ave.

Portland, OR 97204

March 11 – 12, 2009

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

Objectives:

- Review subgroup recommendations and make decisions on “areas for further consideration.”
- Develop recommendation for Technical Committee on how wildlife categorizations should help refine QRAs into REZs.
- Provide initial feedback on elements of WREZ Phase One report and Phases 2-4 participation.

Wednesday, March 11, 2008		
8:30 – 9:00am	<u>Welcome & Introductions (Breakfast)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions and overview of meeting • Overview of STG objectives and how wildlife categorizations will input into the WREZ process. • Overview of E&L role in recommending REZs. 	<i>Pam Eaton, The Wilderness Society, Brian Weber, MidAmerican Energy Paul Orbuch, Orbuch Consulting, Rich Halvey and Madeleine West, WGA</i>
9:00 – 10:30am	<u>Review E&L Public Comments Received</u> <i>Review comments received through the WREZ public comment process and consider new information.</i>	<i>Paul Orbuch</i>
10:30 – 12:00pm	<u>Review Areas for Further Consideration</u> <i>E&L will review subgroup recommendations on areas for further consideration and make decisions.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review E&L subgroup recommendations and any outstanding areas. • Develop recommendation for exclusion/inclusion in a REZ or other treatment. 	<i>E&L Work Group with Josh Finn, Black & Veatch & WGA staff</i>
12:00 - 1:00pm	<u>LUNCH Provided – Work Group Members and Staff Only</u>	<i>Hilton Portland</i>
1:00 – 4:30pm	<u>Review Wildlife Categorization Maps (Webcast available)</u> <i>Mapping exercise to review wildlife categorizations and intersection with QRAs.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Display different data layers to view and discuss intersection with QRAs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Which QRAs still have enough MW potential to become REZs? ○ Which need closer examination? ○ Which may not have enough potential to become 	<i>E&L Work Group with Patrick Crist, NatureServe, Josh Finn, Black & Veatch & WGA staff</i>

	<p>REZs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are technical options for adjusting QRAs? ○ Brainstorm consideration and options for recommending REZs. 	
4:30 – 5:00 pm	<u>Observer Comments and Discussion</u>	<i>Observers and Work Group</i>
6:00pm	<u>GROUP DINNER – Jake’s Grill</u> <i>Dinner will have to be paid for by each individual.</i>	<i>611 SW Tenth Avenue</i> <i>503-220-1850</i>

Thursday, March 12, 2009		
7:45 – 8:15am	<u>BREAKFAST – Work Group Members and Staff Only</u>	<i>Hilton Portland</i>
8:15 – 8:30am	<u>Overview of Day One, Review Objectives and Agenda for Day Two</u>	<i>Pam Eaton, The Wilderness Society, Brian Weber, MidAmerican Energy</i> <i>Paul Orbuch, Rich Halvey & Madeleine West, WGA</i>
8:30 – 10:30am	<u>Continue Wildlife Categorization Map Review</u> <i>Develop recommendation to Technical Committee for how wildlife sensitivities will revise QRAs into REZs.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some options include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Which QRAs can be adjusted slightly to be more appropriate as REZs? ○ Should a QRA not become a REZ if it does not meet the MW threshold once certain lands are excluded? ○ Should an “adder” for mitigation costs in the supply curve analysis be considered? 	<i>E&L Work Group</i>
10:30 – 10:45am	<u>BREAK</u>	
10:45 – 11:15am	<u>Finalize Items for E&L Recommendation to Technical Committee</u> <i>Review E&L recommendation to the Technical Committee and finalize.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional areas from “areas for further consideration” list to exclude/avoid from REZs; and • Wildlife application to QRAs, and REZ outcome. 	<i>E&L Work Group</i>

11:15 – 11:45am	<p><u>Review Wildlife Mapping of REZs - Forthcoming Public Comment Period</u></p> <p><i>Discuss components of April public comment period for REZs.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific aspects open for comment. • Timing • The best ways to communicate decisions to public. 	<i>E&L Work Group</i>
11:45 – 12:15pm	<p><u>E&L Chapter of Phase One Report</u></p> <p><i>Discuss significant issues to include in Phase One report and process for completion. Issues might include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary for Governors • Detailed E&L Report on Process (Attachment) • Appendix Documents • Additional resources for developers to use in siting decisions. • Establish a Drafting Review Group 	<i>E&L Work Group</i>
1215- 1230 pm	<u>Observer Comments and Discussion</u>	<i>Observers and Work Group</i>
12:30 – 1:30pm	<p><u>WORKING LUNCH</u></p> <p><i>E&L discuss input into future WREZ Phases</i></p>	<i>E&L Work Group</i>
1:30 – 2:00pm	<p><u>Wrap-Up & Adjourn</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Action Items • Future conference calls and meetings 	<i>Pam Eaton, The Wilderness Society, Brian Weber, MidAmerican Energy</i> <i>WGA staff</i>

Appendix C – Meeting Participants

Work Group Members

- Utilities
 - Brian Weber, MidAmerican Energy Holdings Company (**Co-chair**)
Proxy - Shay LaBray, PacifiCorp
 - Dan Belin, Walsh Environmental
 - Mark Murray, Tri-State Generation/Western Utility Group
- NGOs
 - Pam Eaton, The Wilderness Society (**Co-chair**)
 - Carl Zichella, Sierra Club
 - Brian Rutledge, WY Audubon
- Renewable Energy Industry
 - Arthur Haubenstock, BrightSource
Proxy - Kim Fiske, Iberdrola Renewables
 - Laurie Jodziewicz, American Wind Energy Association
- State Agencies
 - Laura Canaca, Arizona Game & Fish
 - John Pierce, Washington Department of Fish & Game
- Federal Agencies
 - Joseph Burns, USFS
 - Estyn Meade, USFWS
 - Danielle Flynn, BLM
- Canadian reps
 - Sue Bonnyman, British Columbia Ministry of Energy, Mines & Petroleum Resources

Observers

Audrey Hatch, Oregon Department of Fish & Game

Katie Kalinowski, Renewable Northwest Project

Laura Nagy, TetraTech

Cory Scott, PacifiCorp

WGA/Technical Staff

Linda Davis

Rich Halvey (phone)

Pam Inmann

Paul Orbuch

Madeleine West

Patrick Crist - NatureServe

Josh Finn – Black & Veatch

Dave Hurlbut – National Renewable Energy Lab

Lynn Kutner – NatureServe (phone)