

Subcommittee Name: Retrofitting, Repowering and Decommissioning
Membership: Mike Azeka

Status of Subcommittee Work:

Review of existing guidelines is complete and summarized. Nine states include language on decommissioning and site restoration, but they include few wildlife related statements, study requirements or habitat recommendations beyond “restoring” the site. Retrofitting is not specifically discussed in the state guidelines.

- Canada recommends preparing a decommission plan with removal and restoration components.
- CA identifies pre-permitting assessment recommendations for studies and general recommendations for consulting with wildlife agencies when repowering. In CA decommissioning non-operational turbines is identified as a mitigation measure and some BMP's are listed.
- KS, OR, SD ,WA recommend providing for decommissioning and site restoration
- MI and MN require a decommissioning plan that describes the manner in which the project will be decommissioned and the site restored.
- PA has extensive requirements for decommissioning but they focus on financial obligations
- VT states should include a Habitat Restoration Management plan and Reclamation Plan

Pros:

- Restoring habitat beneficial to wildlife and minimizes effects of fragmentation
- Decommissioning addresses non-wildlife goals such as visual impacts

Con:

- May conflict with local or state requirements
- FWS guidelines may not be the appropriate place to make extensive recommendation on this topic (outside the scope of wildlife issues)

Materials for review (discuss any materials you plan on distributing to the group):

None

Identify Next Steps:

Group should decide whether specific wildlife recommendations for Retrofitting, Repowering and Decommissioning should be addressed that go beyond suggesting that stipulations to decommission and restore the site should be prepared