CATEGORY: Mitigation

Element	Level of repetition among guidance (high, med, low)	Pros	Cons
Avoid and minimize through placement and design	High	Natural resource damage is avoided and minimized	None
Land purchase to replace lost function that can not be avoided through placement and design	High	Ties up land that may be subject to development for the life of the project	Mitigation by purchasing land will lead to a net loss unless the value of the replacement habitat is increased or ratio higher than 1:1
May also include ecological restoration, conservation easements, and long-term management agreements	High	Flexibility	Ties up land for other uses for the life of the project.
May include onsite and offsite	High	Flexibility	Too far offsite may not adequately replace functions lost within the same geographic area
Offsite mitigation may not be appropriate for species identified by the State as Rare, Threatened, Endangered or In Need of Conservation/Candidate Species	Med	Special recognition for species whose population may be below tolerance levels for impacts.	Projects that are proposed to be built in areas with sensitive species would need to undergo additional avoidance measures.
Adaptive management is required for impacts not fully accessed or mitigated at the beginning of the project.	Med	Natural resource impacts would be mitigated.	Although impacts would be mitigated through adaptive management, unforeseen impacts are rarely mitigated to the fullest extent "after the fact". For industry, unplanned mitigation may result in loss of revenue and/or operation of the wind farm.

If a potential risk to the survival or recovery of a threatened or endangered species exists, the applicant must redesign or relocate the facility to avoid that risk or propose appropriate mitigation measures.	Low	Natural resource impacts would be mitigated.	Although impacts would be mitigated through adaptive management, unforeseen impacts are rarely mitigated to the fullest extent "after the fact". For industry, unplanned mitigation may result in loss of revenue and/or operation of the wind farm.
No mitigation if development is on existing agricultural lands.	Low	Incentive for wind developers to site farms in previously disturbed land.	Wildlife species living in the cropland will not be mitigated.
Mitigation required in ratios of 0.5:1 for temporary impacts up to 2:1 for permanent impacts to native shrub-steppe habitat.	Low	Gives developers guidance and costs to develop on native shrub-steppe habitat.	Set ratios may be too low/high for adequate mitigation for these native habitats.

***The Pros and Cons listed are examples only, and have not been circulated among the full subcommittee**.