

**GLWC Best Practices Workgroup
Kick-off Meeting
October 7, 2009
Great Lakes Commission Office – Ann Arbor, MI**

Meeting Summary

Meeting Participants

In-Person

Maureen Brennan, Baker & Hostetler LLP
Emily Green, Sierra Club Great Lakes Program
Charlie Kubert, Clean Energy States Alliance/Clean Energy Group
Erik Nordman, Grand Valley State University
Angela Piner, HDR One Company
John Sarver, Michigan Energy Office
Erin Switala (for Anngelia Richter), JFNew
Terry Yonker, Marine Services Diversified, LLC

Remote – Via Conference Call and Webcast

Larry Flowers, National Renewable Energy Laboratory
Brianna Gary, New York State DEC
Jim Griffin, Schain, Burney, Ross & Citron Ltd.
Larry Hartman, Minn. Department of Commerce
Tony Logan, Ohio Department of Natural Resources
William Martin, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources
Ginny Plumeau, Cedarburg Science, LLC
Mark Sinclair, Clean Energy States Alliance/Clean Energy Group
Bob Sullivan, Argonne National Laboratory
Steve Ugoretz, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Matt Wagner, DTE Energy
Paul Zeph, Pennsylvania Dept. Environment Protection

GLC Staff

Becky Pearson
Victoria Pebbles
John Hummer
Anjali Patel

Welcome and Introductions

Victoria Pebbles welcomed everyone participating in-person and those who joined the meeting via conference call and webinar. She also welcomed project partners:

- 1 Clean Energy Group / Clean Energy States Alliance
- 2 Great Lakes Legislative Caucus
- 3 Midwestern Governors Association
- 4 Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Cities Initiative
- 5 State wind working groups
- 6 Canadian partners and agencies
- 7 Members of the new Best Practices Workgroup

Overview of Work Plan and Timeline

Victoria provided an overview of the Best Practices workplan and timeline, highlighting the 1st Year tasks:

- 1 Task 1: Refine and publish an analysis of wind policies in the Great Lakes region.
- 2 Task 2: Identify best practices and policy options from within the Great Lakes region that can enhance market acceptance of wind in the Great Lakes region and beyond. Engage Wind Powering America's Wind Working Groups (WWG) in the region to identify best practices in those states; where no WWG exists, work with state and provincial members of the GLWC.
 - o Subtask 2a: Determine what is considered a "best" policy or practice.
 - o Subtask 2b: Compile the suite of prospective best policies and practices that will be evaluated and ultimately selected for publication and promotion.

See project workplan and timeline at <http://www.glc.org/energy/wind/bestpractices.html> for further details.

Focus on Near-term Task 1 and Subtask 2a

Analysis of Wind Policies (focus on siting)

Victoria pointed to the draft summary and analysis that was prepared just in advance of this meeting: *State and Provincial Wind Farm Siting in the Great Lakes Region: Summary and Analysis*.

The group was asked whether the individual summaries of each jurisdiction's siting policies were helpful in addition to the regional analysis. Consensus was they are. There was additional discussion on the scope of the paper, its purpose in context of the overall project. It was clarified that the purpose is to provide an initial snapshot of siting policies in the region, which will inform follow-on tasks and activities to identify "best practices."

Additional discussion ensued on whether the project would focus on siting policies

exclusively or whether other “best practices” and policies would be part of the project. The group agreed that the focus should be on siting, but that the project would consider other innovative and successful policies and practices that enable environmentally- sound wind development.

It was suggested to identify which agencies are responsible for making what decisions for each jurisdiction; their scope and authority vary as well. A supplemental table to indicate this, including state agencies and contacts, was suggested.

A separated table for offshore wind was suggested. It was expected that we would include offshore information.

It was suggested that the information in Table 2 of summary document on state and provincial permitting requirements be fleshed out more. Another suggestion was to include what states may have wind siting guidance for local communities. This could include authorities at the local level. Another suggestion was to add the wind generating capacity in each jurisdiction as well as the jurisdiction’s RPS.

A narrower perspective was offered of possibly doing it on a regulation-level basis, including economic regs, land use regs, etc. and which organizations have responsibility for implementing them. Due to the tremendous amount of information collection required for this approach, the idea was noted as a potential option for a next phase of the project.

A comment indicated that it may not be worth spending time on evaluating RPS as a driver for wind development: The data are not strong enough to support a cause and effect relationship between RPS and effective siting, and therefore, there was general agreement that RPS should not be targeted for inclusion in the “toolbox“. However, depending on how the initial phases of this project unfold, it may be valuable to revisit the role of RPS.

Another suggestion was adding a federal component to the table, including NWCC and FACA siting guidelines.

Discussion concluded that we should focus Task 1 on siting; as we further embark on the project we can broaden the course to focus on other drivers like RPS, public policy, incentives, etc.

Victoria indicated the workgroup will have a call later this month to review this document and can include maps with wind capacity, RPS, etc. Indicated workgroup members could share with immediate contacts to get feedback prior to then.

Criteria to determine what is a best practice

Victoria opened this item with the question, “Who might have criteria developed for best practices?” Input that followed:

Possible sources of information to answer this question were identified, including:

AWEA siting handbook, and the state of Kansas siting work, NWCC, and Renew Wisconsin.

Minnesota has a process that works well. Key is that each state, county or permitting entity needs to look at what's out there and use what's best in the context of local environments.

Need to be careful about what "best" is. States that supersede local authorities may not be implementing what is "best."

"Best" can mean satisfaction with the process among the stakeholders – if we can find practices that satisfy most of the stakeholders.

Might be worth it to query environmental groups on what their ideas are. Satisfaction with the process is an important criteria.

Fish and Wildlife groups, like in PA, are working on best practices as well. PA has a good cooperative agreement process for birds and bats, pre-and-post-construction, but is primarily for uplands-onshore. Not sure how you would do pre-and-post monitoring for offshore. Need to ensure what we come up with is adaptable for offshore. Might be good to also identify needs for research; i.e., ice sheets that move around turbine towers that could scour the lake bottom.

Engineers at Case Western have been doing ice research. Icing issues have been included in offshore document.

Victoria indicated that what the Best Practices Workgroup comes up with will go to the Advisory Committee and other entities, e.g., utilities as necessary. She reviewed the work plan which includes focus group and outreach to stakeholders to identify and validate which practices are working "best."

It was noted that some practices that might be very effective onshore might be different from those in an offshore environment and that the group should consider separate best practices for each. The Offshore Workgroup will be looking at best practices as a follow-on to its "principles and guidelines" document. Victoria indicated that their work can be folded into this document.

Related Project: Clean Energy States Alliance (Charles Kupert)

Charles Kupert, Project Director with Clean Energy Group (CEG) and Clean Energy States Alliance (CESA), based in Vermont, provided an overview of their related best practices DOE grant project.

As far as their project objective, the key distinction is that CESA has national interest.

Specific Project Tasks:

- 1 Survey and document existing state wind energy policies ("leaders and

- laggards”) – RPS, siting, permitting, taxation.
- 2 Disseminate best practices through webinars, workshops, case studies and direct technical assistance.
 - 3 Visual Impact Recommendations: Develop standard process and recommendations for assessing and mitigating visual impacts – onshore only (with UVM landscape architect).
 - 4 Identify current and potential financing tools which states can use to support wind energy development (e.g., can states play role in providing loan guarantees at early stages of projects to get developers on board to build them).
 - 5 Assistance to Offshore Wind Collaboratives.

Mark Sinclair indicated that CESA will be creating an advisory group to ensure they'll get broad input from various regions and groups. He also stated that visual impacts methodology (created by U. of Va.) is standard in the Northeast – pilot projects lend itself to national use. It lends itself to onshore, offshore, on ridgelines, etc. Decision-makers at federal and state levels can analyze visual impacts through rigorous protocols. This tool is a key at managing discussions on this.

One commenter indicated that while methodologies may be similar, best practices may be different in offshore settings. Other differences regionally include air quality, topography, etc. to examine impacts.

Bob Sullivan, Argonne National Lab, indicated they are currently working on a PEIS for the Upper Great Plains; has asked DOE for funds to examine regional differences in wind turbines.

Larry Flowers asked whether the project plans call for addressing health impacts. Mark responded that he doesn't see health as a primary concern. Larry indicated that measuring health impacts is an emerging issue. He would be interested to see how it can be addressed.

A question was raised as to what criteria will be used to determine “leaders vs. laggards”? Mark responded that it will be about identifying innovative and effective solutions, including inventorying what's coming out and packaging them for utility and regulatory contexts. The value of having a method and criteria for determining what is innovative and effective was recognized. It was further recognized that such an effort is virtually the same as the GLWC effort to identify “criteria” to determine what constitutes a “best” practice. Charles indicated this will be one area of collaboration with the GLWC Best Practices Project.

Another question asked if they are looking at cross-jurisdictional issues? Charles replied that this is relevant mainly when addressing RPS among states, e.g., when one state builds a wind facility but the power is delivered to another state.

Developing trunk lines to service offshore wind might also bring in cross-jurisdictional issues. Mark added that CEG is more and more interested in cross-state issues. They will be determining how to do “joint procurement” in their grant project; also will be trying to work with states on cross-border transmission. However, this will create more siting and zoning issues at the local level.

Discussion on Opportunities for GLWC-CESA Collaboration

Joint constituencies can be addressed as opportunities come along. It was suggested to have once-a-month calls of GLWC, USOWC, Penn Future and Peri.

Mark volunteered to talk to point-person at DOE to arrange calls.

Mark also indicated they will want to partner with GLWC on identifying best practices.

One consideration to think about – how constraints on siting now may have impacts on projects in the future.

Eric Nordmann shared that he is working on a Sea Grant project in West Michigan on how to meet RPS and how communities are preparing via zoning and avoiding conflict.

Victoria mentioned GLWC’s partner with the Michigan Land Policy Institute on a Sea Grant Integrated Assessment looking at other areas in Michigan and that tools being developed for community concerns can be acknowledged in this project.

Another suggestion was to query developers to see if they have people looking at community outreach as a critical component.

Discussion of Additional Workgroup Members

Victoria indicated that one of the outcomes of the recent Midwestern Governors (MGA) was to identify consistent siting practices. They wanted to work with the GLWC on this. Mike Gregerson from MGA has now joined the Best Practices Workgroup.

A suggestion was offered to try to get a tribal rep. Victoria indicated that tribal staff is stretched but offered to call. Please send suggestions of tribal reps to Victoria.

Another suggestion was adding community or zoning folks. John Sarver suggested Russ Lindberg, the planning director from Huron County, MI. Matt Wagner seconded this suggestion. Becky Pearson will contact him. Larry Hartman, MN, mentioned that development impacts on roads are something to consider. On this note, a group of counties in MN is developing a document outlining potential road impacts and related guidelines. It is in a “shadow document” stage. He’ll share it with the workgroup when it’s completed.

Nomination of Workgroup State/Provincial Co-Chairs

Victoria indicated that staff is looking to develop leadership for the workgroup. Co-chairs should be from different sectors.

Role of co-chairs: Workgroup will have monthly calls; co-chairs will help develop agenda items; help to make decisions about the project; provide updates to the Advisory Committee; otherwise be more of a figurehead for the workgroup.

Angela Piner volunteered.

Another suggestion was for a utility regulator, PSC, etc. since they'll be critical players. Larry Hartman was nominated since his agency is an approval agency. He accepted.

A question was asked about the interface with Environmental Planning, Siting and Permitting Workgroup. Victoria replied that anything not related to this particular project will continue in that workgroup.

Victoria thanked Larry and Angela for accepting the nomination and volunteering, respectively. She asked participants if we should try to get another utility person nominated from the eastern side of the region.

Terry Yonker suggested the New York Power Authority.

Victoria indicated that staff will look at all of the options and come back at a later date with recommendations.

Additional item: Larry Hartman asked about regional wind power capacity for the next 2-5 years. Victoria responded that AWEA or NREL may have that info. Staff will aim to get it and tee it up for next call.

Next Steps/Action Items

- 1 Staff will modify the draft paper: *State and Provincial Wind Farm Siting in the Great Lakes Region: Summary and Analysis* to incorporate comments from this meeting and recirculate to the workgroup for final feedback/comments.
- 2 Mark Sinclair volunteered to talk to the point-person at DOE to arrange calls for Best Practices grantees.
- 3 Workgroup members should send suggestions of tribal reps for the workgroup to Victoria by October 30.
- 4 Larry Hartman will share a document (when a draft is completed) being developed by a group of counties in Minnesota outlining potential road impacts of wind power development and related guidelines. It is in a "shadow document" stage.
- 5 Staff will aim to get wind power capacity data for the region for the next 2-5

- years from AWEA and/or NREL and tee it up for the next call.
- 6 Staff will compile meeting summary.
 - 7 Staff will populate Best Practices web page with resource information.
 - 8 Workgroup members should participate in calls and review documents as they arise
 - 9 Staff will add additional members to the workgroup and finalize the process for determining co-chairs prior to the next workgroup call.
 - 10 A next workgroup conference call and/or web ex will be set up for late November/early December.

Meeting adjourned.

