



Via email dofaw.hcp@hawaii.gov

February 27, 2020

Lauren Taylor
Protected Species Habitat Conservation Planning Coordinator
Department of Land and Natural Resources
Division of Forestry and Wildlife
1151 Punchbowl Street, Room 325
Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: Comments on Draft Updated Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance (January 2020 version)

Dear Ms. Taylor:

Thank you for providing TerraForm Power ("TERP") the opportunity to submit this comment letter regarding the Endangered Species Recovery Committee ("ESRC") Draft Updated Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance for Renewable Wind Energy Proponents, dated January 2020 ("2020 Draft Guidance").

TERP has a strong interest in the 2020 Draft Guidance and its implications as the majority owner of a total of 81 MW across three existing wind farms in Hawaii, including (1) the 12-turbine, 30 megawatt ("MW") Kahuku Wind Project on Oahu; (2) the 20-turbine, 30 MW Kaheawa Wind Project on Maui; and (3) the 14-turbine, 21 MW Kaheawa II Wind Project also on Maui. TERP is committed to supporting Hawaii in reaching its ambitious renewable energy goals and achieving Hawaii's renewable portfolio standards while continuing to serve as a responsible steward of the rich biological diversity of the Hawaiian Islands.

As noted in the Draft Guidance,

The Endangered Species Recovery Committee (ESRC) is established under Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 195D (HRS 195D) in section 195D-25 (§195D-25) to serve as a consultant to the board and the Department of Land and Natural Resources (the department) on matters relating to endangered, threatened, proposed, and candidate species. Among the ESRC's required duties are to review all applications and proposals for Habitat Conservation Plans and Incidental Take Licenses (ITLs) and make recommendations, based on a full review of the best available scientific and other reliable data, and in consideration of the cumulative impacts of the proposed action on the recovery potential of the endangered, threatened, proposed, or candidate species, to the department and the board as to whether or not they should be approved, amended, or

rejected. The ESRC is also required to consult with persons possessing expertise in such areas as the Committee may deem appropriate and necessary in the course of exercising its duties.

Draft Guidance at 4 (emphasis added).

It is essential that the 2020 Draft Guidance be based upon “a full review of the best available scientific and other reliable data” and that the ESRC consult with appropriate parties prior to adopting the 2020 Draft Guidance. TERP respectfully submits that a full review of the best scientific and other reliable data, particularly as it relates to monitoring and mitigation, has not yet occurred. Accordingly, TERP requests the opportunity to participate in discussions and proposed revisions based on best available scientific and other reliable data of the 2020 Draft Guidance with the ESRC and other stakeholders including the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; the Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Forestry and Wildlife; researchers and field biologists; environmental consultants; fellow wind asset owners; and others. Given the significant implications of the 2020 Draft Guidance, we consider it essential that ample opportunity is provided for review and comment on a revised version of the Draft Guidance prior to formal consideration of adoption by the ESRC.

Lastly, TERP requests that relevant terms in the 2020 Draft Guidance are appropriately defined to avoid confusion and clarification is made upon adoption that the 2020 Draft Guidance represent recommendations made to the Department and are not rules associated with HRS 195D.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Whitney Wilson".

Whitney Wilson
Vice President, Wind Operations
TerraForm Power



An **AEP** Company

655 W. Broadway, Suite 950
San Diego, CA 92101

Via Email dofaw.hcp@hawaii.gov

February 19, 2020

Lauren Taylor
Protected Species Habitat Conservation Planning Coordinator
Department of Land and Natural Resources
Division of Forestry and Wildlife
1151 Punchbowl Street, Room 325
Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: Comments on Draft Updated Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance (January 2020 Version)

Dear Ms. Taylor:

At the Endangered Species Recovery Committee (ESRC) meeting on January 15, 2020, the ESRC Bat Task Force delivered the Draft Updated Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance for Renewable Wind Energy Proponents (dated January 2020). This is the first proposed revision of the original Bat Guidance issued in December 2015. The ESRC has requested comments on the Draft Updated Guidance prior to its Hawaiian Hoary Bat Workshop, scheduled for March 5-6, 2020.

AEP Renewables has an ownership interest in the 8-turbine, 21-megawatt (MW) Auwahi Wind project on the Ulupalakua Ranch on Maui, and nine additional wind energy projects in seven mainland states totaling 1,195 MW. AEP Renewables is a proven leader in renewable energy and has an excellent track record in providing clean and reliable wind energy on Maui. AEP Renewables and the Auwahi Wind project are committed to assisting the State of Hawaii and its electric utility companies in meeting the State law requiring that 100% of net electricity sales come from renewable energy sources by December 31, 2045 (Hawaii Revised Statutes §269-92), and doing so in a manner that minimizes potential environmental impacts. Currently, 73% of Hawaii's electricity production comes from fossil fuels (petroleum and coal) which will need to be retired in the coming years. A diversity of renewable energy technologies, including wind, will be essential to achieve the state standard and meet the load demand in Hawaii.

It is against that backdrop that we have reviewed the Draft Updated Bat Guidance. Simply put, adoption and implementation of the Draft Updated Guidance in its current form, including changes to bat related mitigation, monitoring, and siting considerations, would impede development of new wind energy and lead to increased cost of power for state residents. The Draft Updated Guidance imposes unattainable standards which are not supported by the best available science. It would also increase bat-related mitigation and monitoring costs for wind projects in Hawaii by more than 400%, thus rendering future potential projects or repowering of existing projects economically infeasible.

Our more detailed comments are set forth below, and are grouped into three categories (1) the failure of the Draft Updated Guidance to utilize the best available scientific information, (2) imposition of extremely burdensome and unnecessary additional monitoring requirements, and (3) the role of the Guidance in wind project permitting under HRS Chapter 195D.

We request that you circulate this letter to each ESRC member well in advance of the upcoming Workshop, and that the ESRC then discuss each of these concerns at the Workshop. We look forward to the ESRC producing a revised draft of the Guidance for public review and comment later this year.

Best Available Science

1. Failure to use best available scientific and other reliable data: The Draft Updated Guidance fails to identify or utilize extensive, recent information concerning the Hawaiian Hoary Bat, mainland hoary bat, and the impacts of wind turbines on bats, including information contained in the HCP/ITL Amendments for several Hawaii wind farms (including Auwahi Wind) approved by the Board of Land and Natural Resources (BLNR) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in late 2019, and the extensive bat information contained in the associated HRS Ch. 343 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statements and the USFWS Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) (2019) for those projects. Rather, the Draft Updated Guidance briefly summarizes the ecology of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat in just three short paragraphs (page 8). In so doing, it fails to acknowledge recent data (reflected in the documents noted above) showing that the bat appears to be both widespread and abundant in Hawaii. Breeding populations are now known to occur on all the main Hawaiian islands, and bat activity has also been documented on smaller islands and islets. The Draft Updated Guidance selectively includes only certain scientific literature references, and draws inappropriate conclusions from cited literature by taking citations out of context. For example, the Draft Updated Guidance cites Cryan 2011 in support of its assertions regarding the level of impacts to bats generally and bat population declines, however Cryan 2011 explicitly calls out the Hawaiian Hoary Bat as an exception to the main conclusions in the paper. In addition, the Draft Updated Guidance relies on outdated studies (e.g., Barclay et al. 2007) in its discussion of low wind speed curtailment (LWSC), which studies were based on outdated monitoring, outdated turbine equipment, and studies for which results are not comparable to current wind turbines being used in Hawaii and elsewhere. The Draft Updated Guidance makes numerous assertions that are not supported by scientific literature citations, which is inconsistent with best scientific practices. Instead, the Draft Updated Guidance relies repeatedly upon outdated information, unsubstantiated assumptions, and selectively chosen data to justify extreme and inappropriate recommendations which are not supported by the best available science.

2. Population: Although the Draft Updated Guidance states (page 8) that “population sizes are unknown, and it is generally accepted that it is not feasible at this point in time to ascertain an actual population estimate for a single island or the entire state,” it calls for assessing project impacts on the species, and making permitting decisions based on population analyses, by (a) assuming that bat populations on each island are stable or slightly increasing (0 to 1% annual population growth), (b) assuming that compensatory reproduction from project mitigation does not occur, and (c) assuming that an annual rate of take that exceeds the annual rate of increase of a population is likely to cause a decline in the population. Of course, unless one knows the population in question, it’s not possible to determine whether projected take will exceed an

assumed rate of population growth. Therefore, the Draft Updated Guidance also directs applicants to arbitrarily assume – based on no stated scientific support whatsoever – that the bat populations on Oahu, Maui and Hawaii are “not more than” 1,000, 1,500 and 5,000 bats, respectively. It then states that cumulative levels of take exceeding the annual rate of growth of the assumed population size “should not be authorized”, unless the expected “net benefits” (which term is not defined) outweigh the losses from take. Since the Draft Updated Guidance assumes that it is not possible to produce any additional bats through mitigation, this standard is impossible to satisfy. In short, the Draft Updated Guidance establishes a population-based test that has no scientific support and that is impossible to satisfy, meaning zero additional wind farms could be permitted in Hawaii.

3. Native forests: The Draft Updated Guidance effectively requires (pages 30-31) that all mitigation take the form of restoring or protecting “native forests” even though (1) there is no evidence (as the Draft Updated Guidance details) that doing so actually benefits or produces additional bats, and (2) the best available science has debunked prior assumptions that bats strongly prefer native forests as bats are now known to occur in and utilize a wide array of other natural and artificial habitat types in Hawaii. Requiring that mitigation be limited to native forest projects is not supported by the best available scientific information, and it unduly precludes other more effective, available and feasible mitigation options.

4. Core Use Area (CUA): The Draft Updated Guidance increases the size of a CUA for mitigation purposes by nearly 150%, from 40 to 97 acres per bat, without scientific justification (page 32). In so doing, the Draft Updated Guidance relies in part on unpublished information from H.T. Harvey and Associates in the form of a preliminary January 2019 slide presentation to the ESRC (a full analysis of the associated data had not been performed, and there has been no peer or public review of the H.T. Harvey dataset or analysis). The Bat Task Force appears to give this informal, preliminary slide presentation the same weight and credence it gives the peer reviewed publication by Bonaccorso et al (2015), which is scientifically unjustifiable.

5. Research: (1) The Draft Updated Guidance then uses the unjustified ~150% CUA increase to calculate a similarly unjustified research mitigation cost of \$125,000 per bat (Page 36). (2) The mitigation value of research cannot be measured by its dollar cost, but must instead reflect its contribution to the likelihood and extent of bat recovery. (3) Although the USFWS is a member of the ESRC, the Draft Updated Guidance fails to acknowledge that to date the USFWS has refused to accept bat research as mitigation. Unless the USFWS is willing to do so, and that willingness is reflected in the Guidance, there is zero incentive for applicants to spend money on research. The Guidance must clearly set forth the USFWS position on this issue.

6. Genetic Representation: The Draft Updated Guidance states that wind projects “should not cause the loss of genetic representation” of any endangered species. The concept of genetic representation in HRS Ch. 195D applies only to plants, not animals. See HRS 195D-4(g)(9).

7. Inconsistencies, and Conflicting Recommendations: The Draft Updated Guidance relies upon mainland studies to support recommended minimization measures, while simultaneously excluding mainland studies when discussing mitigation types and effectiveness. In this and other parts of the Draft Updated Guidance, the Bat Task Force appears to have chosen cited studies or excerpts selectively in order to support a pre-determined assumption or conclusion. Also, the Draft Updated Guidance contains several conflicting sets of findings and/or recommendations. For example, it states that seasonality in observed bat fatalities is well documented (Figure 1 on

page 10), yet it also states that curtailment should be applied year-round unless seasonality can be demonstrated (page 26). The Draft Updated Guidance notes that ungulates are positively correlated with bat activity (page 19), yet it recommends the control of ungulates (page 31). And as noted above the Draft Updated Guidance states that population levels are unknown and unknowable at this time, yet it requires that wind project applicants assess the impacts of their projects on a population using unsubstantiated and arbitrary population numbers.

8. Low Wind Speed Curtailment: The Draft Updated Guidance discusses LWSC but fails to use the most recent information, and also includes selective quotes that wrongly imply certainty regarding the effectiveness of LWSC (Section IV.D.2).

Monitoring

9. Acoustic Monitoring for Take Calculations: The Draft Updated Guidance recommends that wind projects with minimal or no existing bat monitoring data calculate a projected take level using a minimum of one year of acoustic monitoring in all months, supplemented by thermal imagery monitoring. Yes, acoustic monitoring can identify bat presence (and given their widespread occurrence throughout the State, as discussed in the 2019 PEIS, acoustic monitoring is highly likely to confirm bat presence in most locations). However, acoustic monitoring cannot determine the number of bats present in any given area – multiple acoustic detections could be caused by either a small number of bats circling repeatedly, or a large number of bats, and acoustic monitoring cannot differentiate between the two. Also, acoustic monitoring cannot be used to estimate fatality rates. Studies have shown that pre-construction data do not predict fatality rates (Hein et al. 2013). The Draft Updated Guidance also discusses (page 9) how bat behavior is altered by the presence of wind turbines, a further indication that baseline, pre-turbine monitoring would not be predictive of post-construction bat fatality rates: “Studies have indicated that tree-roosting bats may be attracted to turbines, potentially due to the resemblance of these structures to tall trees and/or the expectation of resources, such as insect prey or potential mates (Kunz et al. 2007, Cryan et al. 2014, and Gorresen et al. 2015c).”

10. Third Party Monitoring: The Draft Updated Guidance newly recommends that post-construction monitoring be performed by an independent third party approved by the agencies (it is unclear whether that could include a biological consultant retained by a wind project), or by an entity selected and retained by DOFAW at applicant expense. The stated reason for this new demand is to “avoid conflicts of interest, perceived or real.” However, there is no indication that wind project self-monitoring – a long-standing approach under most environmental laws, and one that is always subject to agency oversight – has been flawed or compromised in any way. Also, DOFAW lacks the organizational and staffing capacity to search for, select, retain and manage a monitoring entity. This proposed new requirement, which would add enormous cost and data quality uncertainties, appears aimed at a problem that does not exist.

11. “Activity” Monitoring: The Draft Updated Guidance calls for acoustic monitoring of bat “activity” for the life of the project (page 14), at both ground and nacelle levels, with the objective of detecting a 20% change in “activity” with a greater than 80% confidence level. These requirements are both unworkable and unwarranted.

- The Draft Updated Guidance does not define what it means by “activity” (occupancy, calls per night, or nights with detections).

- The selection of a “20% change” is arbitrary, and does not consider baseline acoustic bat activity or the period over which the change would be detected.
- A power analysis based on data from existing wind farms indicates such a monitoring effort would require at least 200 acoustic detectors, regardless of project size. This would be economically infeasible as it would likely cost at least \$1 million annually to maintain such a system, and analyze and report out the resulting voluminous data.
- ITL holders are required to monitor the *impacts of their projects* on the species (i.e., take), but not the generalized “activity” of the species in the vicinity of their projects.
- The objectives of such monitoring as stated by the Draft Updated Guidance either:
 - Can already be attained through standard downed wildlife monitoring and existing studies (which document avoidance and minimization, bat occurrence, and seasonal and temporal changes); or,
 - Cannot be attained through acoustic monitoring (evaluation of bat interactions with wind turbines, documentation of downed wildlife incidents, assessment of the effectiveness of deterrents, or identification of habitat preferences).

12. Additional 20% PCM Monitoring Area: The Draft Updated Guidance arbitrarily requires that a new 20% “buffer” should be added to the outer area established for fatality monitoring during the first few years of wind project operation to assure coverage is adequate. Search areas are based on fatality fall-out distributions. The Draft Updated Guidance recommends the use of Hull and Muir (2010) which provides suggested and maximum search radii for bats at large turbines of 74 and 82 meters, respectively. Wind farms in Hawaii have used 75% of maximum blade tip height as a standard maximum distance for intensive monitoring search plots which adequately captures the entire bat fatality distribution. There is no indication that current fatality monitoring standards are not adequate. Again, this 20% increase in required monitoring appears aimed at a problem that does not exist.

The Role of the Guidance Document

13. Role of Guidance/Underground Rulemaking: The revised Guidance that is ultimately adopted must state very clearly how the ESRC intends for the Guidance to be applied by the ESRC, the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) and the BLNR when they each evaluate and make decisions on proposed wind energy Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and Incidental Take License (ITL) applications under HRS Chapter 195D. In practice to date, the ESRC and DLNR have attempted to treat the 2015 Guidance elements as de facto mandatory requirements which must be satisfied in order for a proposed HCP and ITL to be approved. That approach constitutes illegal “underground rulemaking.” The ESRC does not have authority under Ch. 195D to create or establish permitting requirements, either through rulemaking or otherwise. DLNR does have such authority, but it may only be exercised through the formal notice and comment rulemaking process under Hawaii law. Accordingly, the revised Guidance that is ultimately adopted must state unequivocally that it does not establish new mandatory requirements under HRS Chapter 195D, and that proposed HCPs and ITLs that meet the issuance criteria under Chapter 195D will be approved even if such HCP and ITL do not comport with the Guidance recommendations.

14. HCPs/ITLs are Voluntary: The Draft Updated Guidance is incorrect when it states (page 6) that an ITL is required in order to lawfully operate a wind farm in Hawaii, and that all wind

projects which may cause take must obtain an ITL. While the take of listed species is illegal in the absence of an ITL authorizing such take, the decision whether to obtain an ITL is up to the wind farm operator. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has addressed this issue in official guidance under the federal Endangered Species Act, (<https://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/Guidance-on-When-to-Seek-an-Incidental-Take-Permit.pdf>) and the same is true under Ch. 195D.

15. Version 1 vs. Version 2: This Draft Updated Guidance should at the outset briefly recount the history of the original 2015 Guidance (and label it as “Version 1”), and then make clear that this Draft Updated Guidance constitutes “Version 2”. Differentiating between Versions 1 and 2 will provide context for identifying and explaining the new information and approaches which are reflected in Version 2. The Draft Updated Guidance should also explain in detail what the “publicly transparent process” (page 7) consists of.


16. Tiers: The Draft Updated Guidance states that the use of tiers may not be consistent with state law (page 16). This must be revised to state that tiers are not inconsistent with state law as a general matter, but they must be structured to ensure compliance with Ch. 195D requirements. Also, the Draft Updated Guidance recommends against the use of tiers. However, given the substantial continuing uncertainty about amounts of take, effects of take, potential effectiveness of minimization measures, effectiveness of mitigation, etc. (all of which are detailed in the Draft Updated Guidance itself), tiers are both biologically appropriate and beneficial, and necessary for wind project developers. Tiers enable the identification and implementation of more biologically effective mitigation based on new, best available information and research results. This is critical in light of the Draft Updated Guidance conclusion that current mitigation approaches are assumed to produce zero additional bats. Finally, the Draft Updated Guidance states that financial assurances “are required” for all authorized take at the time of ITL issuance, including all tiers. Nothing in Ch. 195D precludes establishing financial assurances for a later tier once that tier is triggered. The 195D scheme has a built-in safety mechanism to ensure financial assurances are timely provided under that approach – if they are not, then the authorization for additional take provided by that tier is not effective and the project must shut down at night to eliminate take or the State can revoke the ITL or both.

17. Strategic Mitigation: The Draft Updated Guidance says, “mitigation should focus on strategic island wide habitat protection and restoration efforts” and that “[i]deally, restoration efforts for HCPs would be coordinated island wide and with other organizations” (pages 30-31). That approach would be far more effective biologically than having each wind project craft its own separate mitigation. Realistically, however, that approach can only be implemented by DLNR/DOFAW and USFWS. The Draft Updated Guidance should therefore be far more forceful about advocating for and actually initiating such an approach, in collaboration with the wind energy industry. That approach could readily be implemented by the agencies through an in-lieu fee mitigation system, which the Draft Updated Guidance also suggests but doesn’t push for (“the agencies should consider development of an in-lieu fee framework” (page 37)). This has the potential to accomplish far more effective conservation for bats, as well as streamline the permitting system for applicants. The ESRC should pursue this with urgency, and we are eager to work with the ESRC and the agencies to institute this.

* * * *

We are extremely concerned that the Draft Updated Guidance, if ultimately adopted in anything close to its current form, will prevent the State from achieving the 100% renewables requirement. We appreciate the opportunity to bring these concerns to your attention at this early stage, and we look forward to working with the ESRC and the agencies to craft updated guidance that is based on the best available science and that accommodates both bat conservation and renewable energy development. Impede

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Marilyn Teague". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Marilyn" and the last name "Teague" clearly legible.

Marilyn Teague
Director of Renewable Services
AEP Renewables

cc: Linda Chow, Esq., Deputy Attorney General
Marie VanZandt, AEP Renewables
Alicia Oller/Matt Stelmach, TetraTech
David Moser, Esq., Ebbin Moser + Skaggs LLP
Hawaii State Energy Office



February 24, 2020

State of Hawaii
Department of Land and Natural Resources
Division of Forestry and Wildlife
1151 Punchbowl St., Room 325
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Attention: Lauren Taylor
Protected Species Habitat Conservation Planning Coordinator

Subject: Preliminary comments on the 2020 draft updated Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance Document
Na Pua Makani Power Partners, LLC
Incidental Take License: ITL-21
Incidental Take Permit: TE63452B-0

Dear Ms. Taylor,

Na Pua Makani Power Partners, LLC (NPMPP) would like to thank you for providing the opportunity for us to review and comment on the draft Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance Document updated January 2020.

NPMPP follows the current Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) which was based on the 2015 guidance and is committed to fulfilling the monitoring and mitigation associated with post-construction mortality, habitat restoration, and research funding identified in the HCP.

We are particularly concerned that the additional monitoring requirements proposed by this draft will impose a significant additional financial burden to our project beyond the substantial commitments already required under our HCP.

Furthermore, it has the potential to hinder the ability to develop any economically viable wind projects in the future. The development of such projects are critical to meeting the 100% renewable targets for the State of Hawaii per Act 97 by December 31, 2045.

We highlight several specific comments below.

- Section III, B (page 11), Section III, D (pages 13-14) and Section IV B Page 18 of the document proposes that the owners/operators of the facility implement additional mitigative measures, including but not limited to the installation of acoustic monitoring devices. Based on preliminary analysis, it appears that we will need to install about 200 acoustic monitors. The implications of these additional mitigative measures is concerning as it exponentially increases the cost to the operation.



- Section IV (page 38) of the document discusses adaptive management limiting the operation of the turbines. This would lead to commercial impacts that would prevent us from providing reliable power to our client.
- Please remove the reference to Na Pua Makani on Figure 3, as the site was not part of the study or data used for plot and is misleading to the audience.

We request that you consider our comments during the decision-making process towards the final guidance and that you include us in the iterative process of review and revision of the draft Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance Document. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Eric Pendgraft'.

Eric Pendgraft
President
Na Pua Makani Power Partners, LLC

Auwahi Wind

20100 Piilani Hwy
Kula, HI 96790

February 21, 2020

Lauren Taylor

Protected Species Habitat Conservation Planning Coordinator

Department of Land and Natural Resources

Division of Forestry and Wildlife

1151 Punchbowl Street, Room 325

Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: Comments on Draft Updated Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance (January 2020 Version)

Dear Ms. Taylor:

At the Endangered Species Recovery Committee (ESRC) meeting on January 15, 2020, the ESRC announced the delivery of the Draft Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance for Renewable Wind Energy Proponents (dated January 2020; Draft Updated Guidance). This is the first proposed revision of the original ESRC Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance Document issued in December 2015. The ESRC has requested comments on the Draft Updated Guidance prior to its Hawaiian Hoary Bat Workshop, scheduled for March 5-6, 2020. Auwahi Wind and American Electric Power Renewables read through the draft and is submitting this literature review in response to the ESRC request.

Auwahi Wind is owned and operated by American Electric Power Renewables that acquired the project from Sempra Renewables in 2019. Auwahi Wind is located on Ulupalakua Ranch, Maui, and began operations in 2012. Auwahi Wind developed a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and was issued an incidental take permit (ITP) and incidental take license (ITL) from US Fish and Wildlife service and the Hawai'i Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) Division of Forestry and Wildlife (DOFAW), for the project including coverage for the Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*). Starting in 2014, Auwahi Wind worked with USFWS, DOFAW, and ESRC to receive approval of an HCP amendment in 2019. Auwahi Wind has over eight years of experience since ITP/ITL issuance implementing the HCP responsibilities for minimization, downed wildlife monitoring, and Hawaiian hoary bat mitigation and conducted innovative research to better understand the species.

The Draft Updated Guidance is an opportunity to summarize the best available science to guide Hawaiian hoary bat conservation and recovery through applicable HCP development and implementation. The Draft Updated Guidance does not include all current best available information. Therefore, Auwahi Wind, American Electric Power Renewables, and Tetra Tech worked together to aggregate additional topics and available literature that will help identify the gaps in the Draft Updated Guidance. Attached is a summary of the additional topics and associated literature which enhance the depth and breadth of what is currently known about Hawaiian hoary bat ecology and their interactions with turbines; thus identifying management and recovery actions to provide benefits to Hawaiian hoary bats across the Hawaiian Islands.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "George Akau", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

George Akau

Project Biologist

Auwahi Wind

American Electric Power Renewables

Literature Compilation
For the
Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance for Renewable Wind Energy Proponents
Updated January 2020
Endangered Species Recovery Committee and
State of Hawai'i Department of Land and Natural Resources
Division of Forestry and Wildlife
February 2020

Overview

Tetra Tech, Inc. (Tetra Tech) conducted a literature review of the draft Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance for Renewable Wind Energy Proponents Updated January 2020 (Draft Guidance) prepared by Endangered Species Recovery Committee (ESRC) and Division of Forestry and Wildlife (DOFAW) to identify additional citations that should be considered for future revisions of the Draft Guidance. This literature compilation identifies the best available science related to wind farm operation and habitat conservation planning for the Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasirus cinereus semotus*) in 2020 and includes a suite of topics and relevant uncited literature to support key guidance topic areas. This information can support the ESRC's efforts to include a comprehensive analysis of the available literature in the Draft Guidance. Studies included below are those relevant to each major topic in the Draft Guidance.

The literature compilation is generally based on the structure of the Draft Guidance. Relevant headings provided in the Draft Guidance are included and additional recommended citations for inclusion in the Draft Guidance are listed alphabetically.

The Draft Guidance should be clear on what are the key findings from cited literature. In addition to considering these citations, the Draft Guidance would benefit from noting if findings are peer reviewed, supported by multiple sources, or conversely if they are preliminary, or conflict with other findings.

1. Background

A. Ecology and Status of The Hawaiian Hoary Bat

The ecology of the Hawaiian hoary bat has been the subject of many studies. The studies of the Hawaiian hoary bat have produced a depth and breadth of knowledge that can inform many aspects of Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) development. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (USFWS 2019), specifically Appendix G includes a review of information on Hawaiian hoary bat ecology. Where information is absent or limited, documentation of the limitation or absence is also valuable.

Additionally, research has demonstrated that the behaviors, diet preferences, and habitat selection and other aspects of Hawaiian hoary bat biology closely match mainland hoary bat (*Lasirus cinereus*) ecology. The similarity between Hawaiian hoary bats and mainland hoary bats demonstrates the importance of incorporating literature from mainland hoary bats to supplement the knowledge of the Hawaiian hoary bat. General bat biology is also applicable, and patterns of behavior or association seen across all species or comparable species provide additional insight for Hawaiian hoary bats. If aspects of

Hawaiian hoary bat ecology are documented to differ from mainland hoary bat or general bat ecology the difference should be noted.

The information on the Hawaiian hoary bat should include a discussion of the following topics:

- Monitoring methods
 - Metrics of activity
 - Detection definition
 - Limitations
- Distribution
 - Documented occurrence on each island
 - Maps of known observation relative to sampling effort and date
 - Elevation range
- Diet
 - Prey
 - Species
 - Size
 - Selection relative to abundance
 - Range of species identified
 - Seasonal changes
 - Foraging strategies
 - Water
 - Drinking
 - As a foraging substrate
 - Edge habitat
 - Open habitat
 - Requirements
- Physiology
 - Body size
 - Differences from mainland hoary bats and implications
 - Wing morphology and implications
 - Echolocation
 - Frequency
 - Amplitude
 - Range
- Patterns of activity
 - Seasonal activity
 - Call abundance
 - Elevation changes
 - Hour of night
 - Interspecies competition
 - Intraspecies competition
 - Bat activity correlation (positive and negative) with habitat types or other covariates by behavior

- Breeding
 - Roosting
 - Day
 - Night
 - Foraging
 - Drinking
 - Social
- Spatial patterns of activity
- Response to habitat management
- Demographic information
 - Average and maximum lifespan
 - Male to female ratio observed
 - Breeding
 - Seasonality
 - Changes to diet and habitat
 - Number of offspring
 - Age at first breeding
 - Frequency of breeding
 - Proportion of breeding population
- Genetics
 - Origin
 - Closest species
 - Species status
 - Most recent colonization
- Legal
 - Species status under HRS 195D
 - Listing determination criteria
 - Critical habitat
 - Downlisting criteria
 - Delisting criteria

Recommended Additional Literature Citations:

Baird, A.B., Braun, J.K., Mares, M.A., Morales, J.C., Patton, J.C., Tran, C.Q. 2015. Molecular systematic revision of tree bats (Lasiurini): doubling the native mammals of the Hawaiian Islands. *Journal of Mammology* 96(5):1-20.

Baird A.B., J.K. Braun, M.D. Engstrom, A.C. Holbert, M.G. Huerta, B.K. Lim, et al. 2017. Nuclear and mtDNA phylogenetic analyses clarify the evolutionary history of two species of native Hawaiian bats and the taxonomy of Lasiurini (Mammalia: Chiroptera). *PLoS ONE* 12(10): e0186085.

- Baker, R. J., J. C. Patton, H. H. Genoways, and J. W. Bickham. 1988. Genic studies of *Lasiurus* (Chiroptera: Vespertilionidae). Occasional Papers the Museum Texas Tech University Number 117.
- Banko, P. C., R. W. Peck, S. G. Yelenik, E. H. Paxton, F. J. Bonaccorso, K. Montoya-Aiona, and D. Foote. 2014. Dynamics and ecological consequences of the 2013–2014 koa moth outbreak at Hakalau Forest National Wildlife Refuge. Technical Report HCSU-058, Hawai'i Cooperative Studies Unit, University of Hawai'i at Hilo, Hawai'i, 89 pp
- Barclay, R. M. R. 1989. The effect of reproductive condition on the foraging behavior of female hoary bats, *Lasiurus cinereus*. Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology. 24: 31-37.
- Barclay, R., Dolan, M., Dyck, A., 1991. The Digestive Efficiency of Insectivorous Bats. Canadian Journal of Zoology, Vol 69, no 7. P 1853-1856.
- Barclay, R. M. R., J. H. Fullard, and D. S. Jacobs. 1999. Variation in the echolocation calls of the hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus*): influence of body size, habitat structure, and geographic location. Canadian Journal of Zoology 77:530-534.
- Bellwood, J.J. and J.H. Fullard. 1984. Echolocation and foraging behavior of the Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*). Can. J. Zoology 62:2113-2120.
- Bernard, R., and Mautz, W. 2016. Dietary overlap between the invasive coquí frog (*Eleutherodactylus coqui*) and the Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) on the Island of Hawai'i. Biological Invasions. 18. 10.1007/s10530-016-1232-0.
- Bogan, M.A. 1972. Observations on Parturition and Development in the Hoary Bat, *Lasiurus cinereus*. Journal of Mammalogy 53(3):611–614.
- Bonaccorso, F.J., 2010. Ope'ape'a: Solving the puzzles of Hawaii's only bat, Bat's Magazine article. Volume 28, Issue 4, Winter 2010
- Bonaccorso, F. J. and C. A. Pinzari. 2011. Hawaiian hoary bat occupancy at the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) and Satellite Facilities. Final Report. September 2011. 26 pp.
- Bonaccorso, F. J. and L. P. McGuire. 2013. Modeling the colonization of Hawai'i by hoary bats (*Lasiurus cinereus*). In: R. Adams and S. Pedersen (eds.) Bat Evolution, Ecology, and Conservation. Springer, New York, NY.
- Bonaccorso, F.J., C.M. Todd, A.C. Miles, and P.M. Gorresen. 2015. Foraging Range Movements of the Endangered Hawaiian Hoary Bat, *Lasiurus cinereus semotus*. Journal of Mammalogy 96(1):64-71.
- Bonaccorso, F., Montoya-Aiona, K., Pinzari, C., Todd, C. 2016. Winter distribution and use of high elevation caves as foraging sites by the endangered Hawaiian hoary bat, *Lasiurus cinereus semotus*. Technical Report HCSU-068. Hawai'i Cooperative Studies Unit University of Hawai'i at Hilo 200 W. Kawili St. Hilo, HI 96720 January 2016
- Corcoran, A.J. and T. J. Weller. 2018. Inconspicuous echolocation in hoary bats (*Lasiurus cinereus*). Proceedings of the Royal Society B 285: 20180441.
- DOFAW (Department of Forestry and Wildlife). 2015. Endangered Species Recovery Committee Hawaiian hoary bat guidance document. State of Hawaii Department of Land

and Natural Resources, Division of Forestry and Wildlife, Honolulu, HI. Draft dated December 2015.

- Frasier, H.R., Parker-Geisman, V., Parish IV, G.R., 2007. Hawaiian hoary bat inventory in national parks on Hawai'i, Maui and Moloka'i. PCSU TR-140.
- Gorresen, M.P., A.C. Miles, C.M. Todd, F.J. Bonaccorso, and T.J. Weller. 2008. Assessing Bat Detectability and Occupancy with Multiple Automated Echolocation Detectors. *Journal of Mammalogy* 89(1): 11-17.
- Gorresen, M.P., F.J. Bonaccorso, C.A. Pinzari, C.M. Todd, K. Montoya-Aiona, and K. Brinck. 2013. A Five-Year Study of Hawaiian Hoary Bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) Occupancy on the Island of Hawai'i. Technical Report HCSU-041.
- Gorresen, P.M., P.M. Cryan, M.M. Huso, C.D. Hein, M.R. Schirmacher, J.A. Johnson, K.M. Montoya-Aiona, K.W. Brinck, and F.J. Bonaccorso. 2015. Behavior of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) at wind turbines and its distribution across the North Ko'olau Mountains, O'ahu. Hawaii Cooperative Studies Unit, University of Hawaii at Hilo, Technical Report HCSU-064.
- Gorresen, P., Cryan, P., Montoya-Aiona, K., & Bonaccorso, F. 2017. Do you hear what I see? Vocalization relative to visual detection rates of Hawaiian hoary bats (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*). *Ecology and Evolution*, 7(17), 6669-6679.
- Gorresen PM, Brinck KW, DeLisle MA, Montoya-Aiona K, Pinzari CA, Bonaccorso FJ. 2018. Multi-state occupancy models of foraging habitat use by the Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*). *PLoS ONE* 13(10): e0205150. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0205150>
- H.T. Harvey. 2013. Kawailoa Bat Mitigation Project at Ukoa Wetland. Report on Capture and Tracking of a bat from June 28, 2013 to July 5, 2013. 6 pp.
- H.T. Harvey and Associates Ecological Consultants/SWCA Environmental Consultants. 2014. 'Uko'a wetland Hawaiian hoary bat mitigation management plan. Prepared for First Wind. 31 pp.
- Hosten, P. and R. Poland. 2018. How collaborative research has helped define Hawaiian hoary bat activity in Kalaupapa National Park, thus better informing park management strategies. 25th Annual Hawai'i Conservation Conference, July 24th 2018 - July 26th 2018. Honolulu, HI. Poster 119. http://www.hawaiiiconservation.org/wp-content/uploads/Full-Abstract-Book_FINAL_7.6.2018.pdf. Abstract last accessed July 30, 2018
- Jacobs, D.S. 1994. Distribution and Abundance of the Endangered Hawaiian Hoary Bat, *Lasiurus cinereus semotus*, on the Island of Hawai'i. *Pacific Science* 48(2):193-200.
- Jacobs, D. S. 1996. Morphological divergence in an insular bat, *Lasiurus cinereus semotus*. *Functional Ecology* 10:622-630.
- Jacobs, D.S. 1999. The diet of the insectivorous Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*). *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 77:1603-1607.

- Jantzen, M.K. 2012. Bats and the landscape: The influence of edge effects and forest cover on bat activity. Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository. 439. <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/439>.
- Johnston, D., K. Jonasson, and B. Yuen. 2018. Ecology of 'ōpe'ape' (Hawaiian hoary bat on Maui. 25th Annual Hawai'i Conservation Conference, July 24th 2018 - July 26th 2018. Honolulu, HI. Poster 141. http://www.hawaiiconservation.org/wp-content/uploads/Full-Abstract-Book_FINAL_7.6.2018.pdf. Abstract last accessed July 30, 2018.
- Kepler, C.B., and J.M. Scott. 1990. Notes on distribution and behavior of the endangered Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*), 1964-1983. 'Elepaio 50(7):59—64.
- Kunz, TH. 1982. Roosting ecology. In: Kunz TH (ed) Ecology of bats. Plenum Press, New York, p 1–55
- Menard, T. 2001. Activity Patterns of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) in Relation to Reproductive Time Periods. M.S Thesis. University of Hawaii.
- Montoya-Aiona, K., Pinzari, C., Peck, R., Brink, K., Bonaccorso, F., 2020. Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) Acoustic Monitoring At Hawaii Army National Guard (HAIRNG) Installations Statewide Technical Report HCSU-092
- Moura, S., K. Montoya-Aiona, and F. Bonaccorso. 2018. Investigating roosting behaviors of the Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) on Hawai'i Island. 25th Annual Hawai'i Conservation Conference, July 24th 2018 - July 26th 2018. Honolulu, HI. Presentation 137. http://www.hawaiiconservation.org/wp-content/uploads/Full-Abstract-Book_FINAL_7.6.2018.pdf. Abstract last accessed July 30, 2018.
- Peck, R. W., Banko, P.C., Cappadonna, J., Steele, C., Leonard, D.L., Mounce, H.L., Becker, C.D., Swinnerton, K. 2015. An Assessment of Arthropod Prey Resources at Nakula Natural Area Reserve, a Potential Site of Reintroduction for Kiwikiu (*Pseudonestor xanthopyrys*) and Maui 'alauahio (*Paroreomyza montana*) Hawai'i Cooperative Studies Unit Technical Report HCSU-059.
- Pinzari, C.A. 2014. Hawaiian Hoary bat occupancy at Kalokohonokōhau National Historical park. HCSU Technical report HCSU- 051Pollard, K., & Holland, J. (2006). Arthropods within the woody element of hedgerows and their distribution pattern. Agricultural And Forest Entomology, 8(3), 203-211.
- Pinzari, C. 2014. Hawaiian Hoary Bat Seasonal Acoustic Monitoring Study on O'ahu Army Installations 2010-2014. Prepared for CSU. Available at: http://manoa.hawaii.edu/hpicesu/DPW/2014_YER/appendices_edited.pdf.
- Pinzari, Corinna; and Bonaccorso, Frank. 2018. A Test of Sex Specific Genetic Markers in the Hawaiian Hoary Bat and Relevance to Population Studies. doi:10.5066/P9R7L1NS.
- Pinzari, C., Peck, R., Zinn, T., Gross, D., Montoya-Aiona, K., Brinck, K., Gorresen, P., Bonaccorso, F. 2019b. Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) activity, diet and prey availability at the Waihou Mitigation Area, Maui.
- Pinzari, C., Bonaccorso, F., Montoya-Aiona, K. 2019a. Hawaiian Hoary Bat Acoustic Monitoring on U. S. Army O'ahu Facilities. 10.13140/RG.2.2.14555.82727.

- Pinzari, C., Peck, R., Zinn, T., Gross, D., Montoya-Aiona, K., Brinck, K., Gorresen, P., Bonaccorso, F. 2019b. Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) activity, diet and prey availability at the Waihou Mitigation Area, Maui.
- Pinzari, C. A. 2019c. Genetic variation, population structure, and morphology of an endemic bat, *Lasiurus cinereus semotus* (Chiroptera: Vespertilionidae) across the Hawaiian islands. Master's Thesis. Department of Tropical Conservation Biology and Environmental Science. University of Hawai'i at Hilo, Hawai'i. Unpublished.
- Reynolds M. 1994. Surveys on the distribution and abundance of the Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) in the vicinity of proposed geothermal project subzones in the district of Puna, Hawai'i. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Starcevich, L.A., Thompson, J., Rintz, T., Adamczyk, E., Solick, D., 2019. Oahu Hawaiian Hoary Bat Occupancy and Distribution Study. Project Update and First-Year Analysis Prepared for: Hawaii Endangered Species Research Committee
- SWCA. 2011. Kawaihoa Wind Power Habitat conservation plan. Prepared for Kawaihoa Wind Power LLC by SWCA Environmental Consultants.
- Tetra Tech. 2019a. Auwahi Wind HCP Amendment. Prepared for Auwahi Wind LLC.
- Tetra Tech. 2019b. Kawaihoa Wind HCP Amendment. Prepared for Kawaihoa Wind Wind LLC.
- Todd, C.M. 2012. Effects of prey abundance on seasonal movements of the Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*). M.S. thesis, University of Hawai'i at Hilo.
- Todd, C.M. 2012. Effects of prey abundance on seasonal movements of the Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*). M.S. thesis, University of Hawai'i at Hilo.
- Todd, C.M., Pinzari, C.A., Bonaccorso, F.J. 2016. Acoustic Surveys of Hawaiian Hoary Bats in Kahikinui Forest Reserve and Nakula Natural Area Reserve on the Island of Maui. Hawaii Cooperative Studies Unit Technical Report HCSU-078.
- Tomich, P. Quentin. 1986. Mammals in Hawaii, second edition. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 76. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press. 375 pp. ISBN: 0-93087-10-2.
- USFWS (U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service). 1998. Recovery Plan for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Portland, OR. 50pp.
- USFWS. 2011. Ōpe`ape`a or Hawaiian Hoary Bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) 5-Year Review Summary and Evaluation. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, OR. 13 pp
- USFWS and DOFAW. 2016. Wildlife agency guidance for calculation of Hawaiian hoary bat indirect take. Honolulu, Hawaii. Version dated October 1, 2016.
- USFWS. 2018. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; initiation of 5-year status reviews of 18 species in Hawai'i, Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Idaho. Federal Register 83(14): 3014–3015.
- [WEST] Western EcoSystems Technology, Inc. 2015. Power analysis for trend detection in Hawaiian hoary bat occupancy in the Hawaiian Islands. November 11, 2015 report prepared by Western EcoSystems Technology, Inc, Corvallis, Oregon. 12pp.

- Whitaker, J.O., Jr., and P.Q. Tomich. 1983. Food habits of the hoary bat, *Lasiurus cinereus*, from Hawaii. *Journal of Mammalogy* 64:151–152.
- Wolfe, B. 2018. Presence of the endangered Hawaiian hoary bat on national wildlife refuges. 25th Annual Hawai'i Conservation Conference, July 24th 2018 - July 26th 2018. Honolulu, HI. Poster 208. http://www.hawaiiconservation.org/wp-content/uploads/Full-Abstract-Book_FINAL_7.6.2018.pdf. Abstract last accessed July 30, 2018.
- Zimpfer, J. and Bonaccorso, F. 2010. Barbed wire fences and Hawaiian hoary bats: what we know. Hawaii Conservation Conference Abstract <https://hawaii.conference-services.net/reports/template/onetextabstract.xml?xsl=template/onetextabstract.xsl&conferenceID=2069&abstractID=410279>. Accessed 10 August 2018.

B. Bats and Wind Energy

Bat fatalities have been found at many wind farms on the mainland. Multiple studies report observed bat species fatality composition includes a significant portion of mainland hoary bats. Most studies of mainland bat fatalities note the significance of migration, or only implement minimization in the migratory period. The greatest relevance for mainland studies of impacts applies to minimization measures which are discussed in Section 3.

C. Hawaiian Hoary Bats and Wind Energy

Hawaiian hoary bats have been covered by HCPs in Hawai'i since 2006 and associated acoustic and fatality monitoring data has been documented in annual reports. When combined over 40 years of monitoring has occurred at wind farms in Hawai'i providing an opportunity to summarize trends.

The information on Hawai'i Wind Energy should include a discussion of the following topics:

- Observed take
 - Seasonality
 - Relation to reproductive cycles
 - Relation to bat activity (acoustic and thermal)
 - Age
 - Gender ratio
 - Documented predictors of fatalities in Hawai'i
 - Impacts of observed take
- Take rates
 - Observed take rates at existing wind farms
 - Trends in take rates
 - Authorized take rates
- Minimization measures implemented and documented effectiveness in Hawai'i
 - Low wind speed curtailment (LWSC)
 - Acoustic Deterrents
- Acoustic monitoring results for existing projects
 - Trends in activity
 - Influence on minimization measures

Recommended Additional Literature Citations:

Auwahi Wind (Auwahi Wind Energy LLC). 2012. Final Auwahi Wind Farm Project Habitat Conservation Plan. Prepared for Auwahi Wind Energy LLC by Tetra Tech EC, Inc. January 2012.

Auwahi Wind. 2015. Auwahi Wind Farm Habitat Conservation Plan FY 15 Annual Report: Incidental Take Permit TE64153A-0/ Incidental Take License ITL-17. August 2015, Kula, HI.

Auwahi Wind. 2019. Auwahi Wind Farm Habitat Conservation Plan FY 19 Annual Report: Incidental Take Permit TE64153A-0/ Incidental Take License ITL-17. August 2019, Kula, HI.

Frasier, H.R., Parker-Geisman, V., Parish IV, G.R., 2007. Hawaiian hoary bat inventory in national parks on Hawai'i, Maui and Moloka'i. PCSU TR-140.

H.T. Harvey and Associates. January 24, 2019. Ecological Studies of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat on Maui: An Update. Presentation to the ESRC.
<https://dlnr.hawaii.gov/wildlife/files/2019/01/ESRC-HTHarvey-24-Jan-2019.pdf>

Kahuku Wind Power. 2010. Kahuku Wind Power Habitat Conservation Plan.

Kahuku Wind. 2019. Kahuku Wind Habitat Conservation Plan- FY-2019 Annual Report Year 2019. August 2019.

Kawailoa Wind Power (Kawailoa Wind Power, LLC). 2013. Kawailoa Habitat Conservation Plan—ITL 14: FY 2013 Annual Report—Year 1. Haleiwa, HI.

Kawailoa Wind. 2019. Kawailoa Wind Habitat Conservation Plan- FY-2019 Annual Report Year 2019. August 2019.

KWP LLC. 2006. Kaheawa Pastures Wind Energy Generation Facility Habitat Conservation Plan.

KWP I (Kaheawa Wind Power). 2017. Kaheawa Habitat Conservation Plan- FY-2017 Annual Report Year 2017. August 2017.

KWP I. 2019. Kaheawa Habitat Conservation Plan- FY-2019 Annual Report Year 2019. August 2019.

KWP II (Kaheawa Wind Power II). 2017. Kaheawa Habitat Conservation Plan- FY-2017 Annual Report Year 2017. August 2017.

KWP II. 2019. Kaheawa II Habitat Conservation Plan- FY-2019 Annual Report Year 2019. August 2019.

KWP II. 2011. Kaheawa Wind Power II Wind Energy Generation Facility Habitat Conservation Plan.

Montoya-Aiona, K., Pinzari, C., Peck, R., Brink, K., Bonaccorso, F., 2020. Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) Acoustic Monitoring At Hawaii Army National Guard (HAIRNG) Installations Statewide Technical Report HCSU-092

Pinzari, C., Peck, R., Zinn, T., Gross, D., Montoya-Aiona, K., Brinck, K., Gorresen, P., Bonaccorso, F. 2019b. Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) activity, diet and prey availability at the Waihou Mitigation Area, Maui.

- Tetra Tech. 2019a. Auwahi Wind HCP Amendment. Prepared for Auwahi Wind LLC.
- Tetra Tech. 2019b. Kawailoa Wind HCP Amendment. Prepared for Kawailoa Wind Wind LLC.
- Todd, C.M., Pinzari, C.A., Bonaccorso, F.J. 2016. Acoustic Surveys of Hawaiian Hoary Bats in Kahikinui Forest Reserve and Nakula Natural Area Reserve on the Island of Maui. Hawaii Cooperative Studies Unit Technical Report HCSU-078.
- Wolfe, B. 2018. Presence of the endangered Hawaiian hoary bat on national wildlife refuges. 25th Annual Hawai'i Conservation Conference, July 24th 2018 - July 26th 2018. Honolulu, HI. Poster 208. http://www.hawaiiconservation.org/wp-content/uploads/Full-Abstract-Book_FINAL_7.6.2018.pdf. Abstract last accessed July 30, 2018.

2. Assessment of Take and Impacts for HCPs

A. Take Calculations

USFWS and DOFAW have provided guidance documents for biological monitoring of wind farms which outline methods for assessing take. Within the established downed wildlife monitoring framework there are project specific optimizations for selected search methods and bias correction. Although search methods or bias trials may vary, the evaluation of impacts is equivalent through the use of standardized statistical tools.

The information on the take calculations should include a discussion of the following topics:

- Definitions
 - HRS 195 Definitions
 - Statistical definitions
- Existing guidance
- Fatality estimation (How unobserved take is estimated)
 - Relationship between observed take, detection probability, and unobserved take
 - Selecting a model
 - Evidence of Absence (EoA)
 - Generalized Estimator (GenEst)
 - Huso
 - Schoenfeld
 - Others
- Detection probability
 - Level of effort
 - Area searched
 - Search schedule
 - Seasonal variation
 - Changes to search parameters by year
 - Search interval
 - Search methods
 - Searcher Efficiency
 - Carcass Persistence
 - Uncertainty
 - Relationship to take estimate
- Density Weighted Proportion (DWP) of fall distribution
 - Hull and Muir
 - Empirical models
 - Other
- Credible level
 - Agency recommended credible level with calculations
 - Citation from Dalthorp et al. 2017 regarding credible levels
 - Assessment of impacts considering the credible level selected
- Translating a probability distribution to a point estimate

- Indirect take
 - Definition of indirect take
 - Biological basis for recommended calculations
 - Calculation

B. Fatality Monitoring

Fatality monitoring incorporates onsite monitoring for covered species and estimates of detection probability. Fatality monitoring is interrelated with fatality estimation and the topics could be addressed together.

- Requirements of HRS 195D
- Area searched
- Search interval
- Search methods
- Searcher Efficiency
- Carcass Persistence

Recommended Literature Citations:

Dalthorp, Daniel, and Huso, Manuela, 2015, A framework for decision points to trigger adaptive management actions in long-term incidental take permits: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2015-1227, 88 p., <http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/ofr20151227>.

Dalthorp, D., M. Huso, and D. Dail. 2017. Evidence of absence (v2.0) software user guide: U.S. Geological Survey Data Series 1055, 109 p., <https://doi.org/10.3133/ds1055>.

USFWS and NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2016. Revised Habitat Conservation Planning and Incidental Take Permit Processing Handbook. Version dated December 21, 2016. Available at: https://www.fws.gov/endangered/what-we-do/hcp_handbook-chapters.html

3. Hawaiian Hoary Bat Take Avoidance and Minimization

Avoidance and minimization measures to reduce bat fatalities have focused on two mechanisms: LWSC and bat deterrents. Both methods have been the subject of scientific tests of effectiveness for reduction in bat fatality rates. Neither LWSC nor deterrents have proven to equate to complete avoidance. Both methods have been implemented at wind farms in Hawai'i.

The information on minimization measures should include a discussion of the following topics:

- Definitions
- Influence of time on bat activity and the relevance to minimization measures
 - Documentation of the time of night of bat activity
 - Documentation of the seasonality of bat activity
- LWSC
 - Biological basis for LWSC from bat activity literature
 - Relationship between bat activity and wind speed
 - Averaging period
 - Measurement of wind speed
 - Wind speed variability
 - Proportion of activity explained and not explained by wind speed
 - Interaction between bat activity and other environmental variables
 - Insect activity
 - Precipitation
 - Humidity
 - Barometric pressure
 - Moon illumination
 - Demonstrated Effectiveness
 - Mainland
 - Hawai'i
 - Variation in effectiveness
 - Expected benefit by cut-in speed
 - Smart curtailment
 - Model inputs
 - Applicability or limitations in Hawai'i
 - Energy losses by cut-in speed
- Bat Deterrents
 - Biological basis for bat deterrent systems
 - Acoustic
 - Visual
 - Texture
 - Demonstrated Effectiveness
 - Mainland

- Hawai'i
 - Variation in effectiveness
- Estimating project impacts
 - Correlation between baseline activity and fatality rates
 - Changes to bat behavior correlated with wind turbines
 - Hawaiian hoary bat distribution
 - Habitat correlations for the Hawaiian hoary bat
 - Island distributions
 - Relative abundance
 - Correlation between fatality rates and wind project design with citations
 - Number of turbines
 - Layout
 - Turbine structure
 - Nacelle height
 - Rotor swept area
 - Impacts to other covered species
- Adaptive Management
 - Triggers
 - Actions
 - Incorporation of uncertainty
 - Incorporation of new information

Recommended Additional Literature Citations:

Allison, Taber & Diffendorfer, Jay & Baerwald, Erin & Beston, Julie & Drake, David & Hale, Amanda & Hein, Cris & Huso, Manuela & Loss, Scott & Lovich, Jeff & Strickland, M & Williams, Kathryn & Winder, Virginia. (2019). Impacts to wildlife of wind energy siting and operation in the United States. *Issues in Ecology*. 21. 1-24.

Azeka, M. 2019. Test of Acoustic Bat Deterrent with moderate blade feathering at Pilot Hill, Illinois. EDF Renewables.

Bonaccorso, F., Montoya-Aiona, K., Pinzari, C., Todd, C. 2016. Winter distribution and use of high elevation caves as foraging sites by the endangered Hawaiian hoary bat, *lasiurus cinereus semotus*. Technical Report HCSU-068. Hawai'i Cooperative Studies Unit University of Hawai'i at Hilo 200 W. Kawili St. Hilo, HI 96720 January 2016

Collins, J. and Jones, G. 2009. Differences in Bat Activity in Relation to Bat Detector Height: Implications for Bat Surveys at Proposed Windfarm Sites. *Acta Chiropterologica*, 11(2), 343-350.

Gorresen, P.M., P.M. Cryan, M.M. Huso, C.D. Hein, M.R. Schirmacher, J.A. Johnson, K.M. Montoya-Aiona, K.W. Brinck, and F.J. Bonaccorso. 2015. Behavior of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) at wind turbines and its distribution across the North

Ko'olau Mountains, O'ahu. Hawaii Cooperative Studies Unit, University of Hawaii at Hilo, Technical Report HCSU-064.

Hayes, M., Hooton, L., Gilland, K., Grandgent, C., Smith, R., Lindsay, S., Collins, J., Schumacher, S., Rabie, P., & Gruver, J., Goodrich-Mahoney, J. 2019. A smart curtailment approach for reducing bat fatalities and curtailment time at wind energy facilities. *Ecological Applications*. 29. e01881. 10.1002/eap.1881.

Hein, C.D., and M.R. Schirmacher. 2013. Preliminary field test of an ultrasonic acoustic deterrent device with the potential of reducing Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) fatality at wind energy facilities. Unpublished report submitted to First Wind, Portland, ME by Bat Conservation International, Austin, TX.

Hein, C. D., J. Gruver, and E. B. Arnett. 2013. Relating pre-construction bat activity and post-construction bat fatality to predict risk at wind energy facilities: a synthesis. A report submitted to the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Bat Conservation International, Austin, TX, USA

Romano, W.B., Skalski, J.R., Townsend, R.L., Kinzie, K.W., Coppinger, K.D. and Miller, M.F. (2019), Evaluation of an acoustic deterrent to reduce bat mortalities at an Illinois wind farm. *Wildl. Soc. Bull.*, 43: 608-618. doi:10.1002/wsb.1025

Weaver, S. and Castro-Arellano, I. 2019b. Studying Behavior and Testing Strategies to Reduce Impact of Wind Energy on Bats in Texas. Final Performance Report. Prepared for The State Wildlife Grant Program, Texas

4. Mitigation

Studies of the Hawaiian hoary bat document statistically significant habitat correlations, which should be prioritized when considering Hawaiian hoary bat mitigation. Existing Hawaiian hoary bat HCP holders have performed required mitigation, which is documented in annual reports and can inform future mitigation. As with Hawaiian hoary bat ecology, mainland hoary bat ecology and general bat biology provide valuable scientific literature to inform Hawaiian hoary bat mitigation.

The information on Hawaiian hoary bat mitigation should include a discussion of the following topics:

- Definitions
- Reference data from Hawaiian hoary bat ecology
 - Distribution
 - Diet
 - Patterns of activity
 - Demographic information
- Mitigation actions
 - Goals and objectives for mitigation
 - Status of existing mitigation projects
 - Timeline for mitigation actions
 - Success criteria
 - Direct measurement of individuals
 - Measurement of population trends
 - Proxy measurements (habitat, insects, or others)
 - Thresholds for success
- Monitoring methods
 - Level of effort relative to success criteria
 - Monitoring tools
 - Acoustic
 - Thermal
 - Insect
 - Habitat
 - Other
- Mitigation Offset
 - Requirements of HRS 195D
 - Comparison to baseline conditions and the absence of mitigation actions
 - Quantitative assessment of the benefit of the mitigation actions for the Hawaiian hoary bat and the likelihood of recovery for the species
 - Lands
 - Selection of mitigation location(s)
 - Size
 - Habitat
 - Legal protection
 - Connectivity relative to bat movement

- Duration
 - Lifespan of Hawaiian hoary bats
 - Average
 - Maximum
 - Hawaiian hoary bat reproduction
 - Average number of juveniles produced per bat per year
 - Growth model for subsequent reproduction
 - Management
 - Legal protections added
 - Prevention of habitat loss or degradation
 - Change in habitat
 - Change in foraging or drinking resources
 - Change in breeding resources
 - Research
 - Relationship to Hawaiian hoary bat recovery
 - Approved research and results
 - Requested research
 - Reduced uncertainty derived from management
 - Consistency with federal policy
- Adaptive Management
 - Triggers
 - Actions
 - Incorporation of uncertainty
 - Incorporation of new information

Recommended Literature Citations:

Ancillotto, Ariano, Nardone, Budinski, Rydell, & Russo. 2017. Effects of free-ranging cattle and landscape complexity on bat foraging: Implications for bat conservation and livestock management. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 241, 54-61.

Boyle, R. 2014. How to Help Bats Taking A Dip in Our Backyard Pools. *Popular Science*. <https://www.popsci.com/blog-network/EEK-squad/how-help-bats-taking-dip-our-backyard-pools> Accessed 13 August 2018.

Brooks, R. T., and Ford, W. M. 2005. Bat activity in a forest landscape of central Massachusetts. *Northeastern Naturalist*, 12(4), 447-462.

Downs, N., and Sanderson, L. 2010. Do Bats Forage Over Cattle Dung or Over Cattle? *Acta Chiropterologica*, 12(2), 349-358.

Duff, A., Morrell, T.E. 2007. Predictive Occurrence Models for Bat Species in California. *Journal of Wildlife Management*; May 2007; 71, 3; Research Library pg. 693

- Entwistle, A.C., Harris, S., Hutson, A.M., Racey, P.A., Walsh, A., Gibson, S.D., Hepburn, I., Johnston, J. 2001. Habitat management for bats A guide for land managers, land owners and their advisors Joint Nature Conservation Committee.
- Fenton, M.B. 1990. The foraging behavior and ecology of animal-eating bats. *CAN. J. ZOOL./J. CAN. ZOOL*, 68(3), 411-422.
- Frasier, H.R., Parker-Geisman, V., Parish IV, G.R., 2007. Hawaiian hoary bat inventory in national parks on Hawai'i, Maui and Moloka'i. PCSU TR-140.
- Grindal, S.D, and R.M. Brigham. 1999. Impacts of forest harvesting on habitat use by foraging insectivorous bats at different spatial scales. *Ecoscience* 6(1):25 – 34.
- Harvey, C., Medina, A., Sánchez, D., Vílchez, S., Hernández, B., Saenz, J., Sinclair, F. 2006. Patterns of Animal Diversity in Different Forms of Tree Cover in Agricultural Landscapes. *Ecological Applications*, 16(5), 1986-1999.
- Jackrel, S. L., & Matlack, R. S. 2010. Influence of surface area, water level and adjacent vegetation on bat use of artificial water sources. *American Midland Naturalist*, 164(1), 74-79.
- Jacobs, D.S. 1999. The diet of the insectivorous Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*). *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 77:1603-1607.
- Klug, B., Goldsmith, D., Barclay, R. 2012. Roost selection by the solitary, foliage-roosting hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus*) during lactation. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*. 90. 329-336. 10.1139/z11-139.
- Knight, T., Jones, G. 2009. Importance of night roosts for bat conservation: roosting behaviour of the lesser horseshoe bat *Rhinolophus hipposideros*. *Endang Species Res* 8: 79–86, 2009
- Lacoeuilhe, A., Machon, N., Julien, J., Kerbiriou, C. 2018. The Relative Effects of Local and Landscape Characteristics of Hedgerows on Bats. *Diversity* 10, 72; doi:10.3390/d10030072.
- Lewis, T. 1969. The Distribution of Flying Insects Near a Low Hedgerow. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 6(3), 443-452. doi:10.2307/2401510.
- Pinzari, C., Peck, R., Zinn, T., Gross, D., Montoya-Aiona, K., Brinck, K., Gorresen, P., Bonaccorso, F. 2019b. Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) activity, diet and prey availability at the Waihou Mitigation Area, Maui.
- Pollard, K., & Holland, J. (2006). Arthropods within the woody element of hedgerows and their distribution pattern. *Agricultural And Forest Entomology*, 8(3), 203-211.
- Pöyry, J., Lindgren, S., Salminen, J., & Kuussaari, M. 2004. Restoration of Butterfly and Moth Communities in Semi-Natural Grasslands By Cattle Grazing. *Ecological Applications*, 14(6), 1656-1670.
- Rainho, A, Augusto, A. M. and Palmeirim, J. M. 2010. Influence of vegetation clutter on the capacity of ground foraging bats to capture prey. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 47: 850-858. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2664.2010.01820.x.
- Rainho, A. and Palmeirim, J. 2011. The Importance of Distance to Resources in the Spatial Modelling of Bat Foraging Habitat. *PloS one*. 6. e19227. 10.1371/journal.pone.0019227.

- Reynolds M. 1994. Surveys on the distribution and abundance of the Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) in the vicinity of proposed geothermal project subzones in the district of Puna, Hawai'i. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Speakman, JR. 1995. Chiropteran nocturnality. Pp. 187–201. In: Ecology, Evolution and Behaviour of Bats (PA Racey and SM Swift, eds.). Oxford University Press, New York. Symp. Zool. Soc. Lond. (1995) No. 67.
- Taylor, D.A.R. 2007. Helping Western Bats Find a Place to Drink. BATS Magazine. Bat Conservation International. http://www.batcon.org/resources/media-education/bats-magazine/bat_article/168. Accessed August 13, 2018
- Taylor, D.A.R. and M.D. Tuttle. 2007. Water for Wildlife: A Handbook for Ranchers and Range Managers, Bat Conservation International.
- Tuttle, S., Chambers, C., and Theimer, T. 2006. Potential Effects of Livestock Water-Trough Modifications on Bats in Northern Arizona. Wildlife Society Bulletin, 34(3), 602-608.
- USFWS (Szymanski, J., Clark, F., Laughland, D.) 2014. Region 3 Indiana Bat Resource Equivalency Analysis Model for Wind Energy Projects
- USFWS and DOFAW. 2016. Wildlife agency guidance for calculation of Hawaiian hoary bat indirect take. Honolulu, Hawaii. Version dated October 1, 2016.
- Vindigni, Morris, Miller, & Kalcounis-Rueppell. 2009. Use of modified water sources by bats in a managed pine landscape. Forest Ecology and Management, 258(9), 2056-2061.
- Whitaker, J.O., Jr., and P.Q. Tomich. 1983. Food habits of the hoary bat, *Lasiurus cinereus*, from Hawaii. Journal of Mammalogy 64:151–152.

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 2, 2020

From: Dr. Fern P. Duvall II NEPM Maui-Nui Program Manager

To: Lauren Taylor HCP Program Manager

SUBJECT: comments to the Endangered Species Recovery Committee ESRC pertaining to recommendations for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance for wind energy projects, mitigation, and bat biology handled in the Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance document of January 2020.

My comments are based largely on two plus decades of professional wildlife biological work, observations, interactions, and studies of the Hawaiian Hoary bat on Maui Nui and thoughts on needs for the species' conservation and ultimately towards the recovery of the species. What follows are comments for the ERSC on the Bat Guidance document of January 2020 now before them.

The premise I support is that the ESRC is required to make recommendations based upon their full review of all pertinent best science, and data when considering the cumulative impacts by HCP applicant's actions on the recovery potential of endangered, threatened or candidate species when considering approval of HCPs.

The Hawaiian Bat which is so overwhelmingly cryptic in roosting, pupping, and even foraging behaviors, its life ecology, life history, and the constraints on the species are still poorly understood. Therefore, it is necessary for the ESRC to consider in their recommendations the species throughout its habitat range, if it is to have an overall net benefit to the species, so that ultimately the species survives and recovers.

More research into newer technologies to observe and monitor interactions, and take at wind power facilities must be enhanced for all HCPs to be approved. If the impacts cannot be assessed, and further if mitigation strategies too cannot be assessed with scientific certainty, modeling of bat populations to demonstrate population response to mortalities does not lead to population level decline for the species becomes necessary for ESRC scrutiny.

The ESRC should holistically for the time being, due to the fact that the cumulative impacts to the species remain unknown, portray as the authoritative body a conservative science-based stance, and require that any HCP's bat take not be authorized beyond the listed population sizes for the respective HCP's sites, and islands, and stipulate that net species recovery levels supercede any bat losses to be expected at the project.



Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance for Renewable Wind Energy Proponents

Endangered Species Recovery Committee
and
State of Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources
Division of Forestry and Wildlife

Updated January 2020
(First edition September 2015)

Cover Photo by Corinna Pinzari

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
A. Purpose	4
B. Need	6
C. Process.....	7
II. Background.....	8
A. Ecology and Status of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat.....	8
B. Bats and Wind Energy	8
C. Hawaiian Hoary Bats and Wind Energy in Hawai'i	9
III. Assessment of Take and Impacts for HCPs.....	10
A. Overview	10
B. Take Calculations	11
C. Fatality Monitoring	12
D. Bat Activity Monitoring.....	13
E. Impacts of Take.....	15
F. Use of Tiers.....	16
IV. Hawaiian Hoary Bat Take Avoidance and Minimization Measures.....	17
A. Overview	17
B. Project Siting.....	18
C. Turbine Specifications.....	19
D. Turbine Operations	21
1. Curtailment.....	21
2. Low Wind Speed Curtailment	21
3. Summary of Curtailment of Wind Turbines	24
4. Other Operational Factors	26
E. Bat Deterrence Technology	27
V. Mitigation.....	29
A. Overview	29
B. Mitigation Planning Framework.....	29
C. Mitigation Recommendations.....	30
1. Habitat Restoration.....	30
2. Land Acquisition.....	35
3. Research as Mitigation	36

4. In-lieu Fee Approaches..... 37

VI. Adaptive Management..... 37

VII. References 39

Appendix 1. Hawaiian Hoary Bat Research..... 44

Appendix 2. Habitat Conservation Plan Annual Report Template 50

Appendix 3. HCP Requirements per HRS 195D..... 51

Appendix 4. Evidence of Absence Indirect Take USFWS Guidance 54

Appendix 5. Downed Wildlife Protocol 2019 57

Appendix 6. Hawaiian Hoary Bat Vortex Population Exercise..... 58

DRAFT

Introduction

A. Purpose

The Hawaiian Hoary Bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) is an endemic subspecies that is listed as an endangered species under state and federal laws. The operation of wind turbines in Hawai'i may result in take of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat. Under state law, take of endangered species is prohibited, but may be permitted by the Board of Land and Natural Resources (BLNR; the board) under certain conditions if the take is incidental to, and not the purpose of, the carrying out of an otherwise lawful activity, and when accompanied by an approved Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). The Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Forestry and Wildlife (DOFAW) provides technical assistance to landowners in developing, reviewing, and monitoring Habitat Conservation Plans.

The Endangered Species Recovery Committee (ESRC) is established under Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 195D (HRS 195D) in section 195D-25 (§195D-25) to serve as a consultant to the board and the Department of Land and Natural Resources (the department) on matters relating to endangered, threatened, proposed, and candidate species. Among the ESRC's required duties are to review all applications and proposals for Habitat Conservation Plans and Incidental Take Licenses (ITLs) and make recommendations, based on a full review of the best available scientific and other reliable data, and in consideration of the cumulative impacts of the proposed action on the recovery potential of the endangered, threatened, proposed, or candidate species, to the department and the board as to whether or not they should be approved, amended, or rejected. The ESRC is also required to consult with persons possessing expertise in such areas as the Committee may deem appropriate and necessary in the course of exercising its duties.

The purpose of this guidance document is to provide advice and assistance to the board, department, and applicants for the development, review, and monitoring of Habitat Conservation Plans that accompany ITLs that are proposed or approved for the incidental take of Hawaiian Hoary Bats resulting from the operation of wind turbines. This document provides guidance on selected issues related to the development of HCPs for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat, including, but not limited to the assessment of impacts to Hawaiian Hoary Bats and the avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of those impacts. It does not supersede a detailed analysis of take, avoidance or minimization measures, or mitigation under state (or federal) criteria, nor does it constitute state (or federal) rule-making. Information is provided for clarity and to assist in informing recommendations but may change based on in-progress or future research on the species.

A complete account of requirements for the issuance of an Incidental Take License under state law is provided in HRS 195D. This guidance does not serve as a comprehensive guide to all of the requirements contained in HRS 195D. The purpose of this document is to provide detailed guidance on selected statutory requirements identified in HRS 195D that warrant particular consideration for the issuance of ITLs for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat.

HRS Chapter 195D requires generally that all HCPs describe the activities contemplated to be undertaken within the plan area with sufficient detail to allow the department to evaluate the impact of the activities on the particular ecosystems, natural communities, or habitat types

within the plan area that are the focus of the plan (§195D-21(b)(2)(B)). The statute provides further that HCPs contain: objective, measurable goals, the achievement of which will contribute significantly to the protection, maintenance, restoration, or enhancement of the ecosystems, natural communities, or habitat types; time frames within which the goals are to be achieved; provisions for monitoring (such as field sampling techniques), including periodic monitoring by representatives of the department or the Endangered Species Recovery Committee, or both; and provisions for evaluating progress in achieving the goals quantitatively and qualitatively (§195D-21(b)(2)(G)). The HCP shall provide for an adaptive management strategy that specifies the actions to be taken periodically if the plan is not achieving its goals (§195D-21(b)(2)(H)).

Specific requirements for approval include further that the HCP shall:

- 1) Minimize and mitigate impacts of take, such that:
 - a) The applicant, to the maximum extent practicable, shall minimize and mitigate the impacts of the take (§195D-4(g)(1)); and
 - b) The HCP shall identify the steps that will be taken to minimize and mitigate all negative impacts, including without limitation the impact of any authorized incidental take, with consideration of the full range of the species on the island so that cumulative impacts associated with the take can be adequately assessed (§195D-21(b)(2)(C)).
- 2) Ascertain impacts, so that the plan will:
 - a) Contain sufficient information for the board to ascertain with reasonable certainty the likely effect of the plan upon any endangered, threatened, proposed, or candidate species in the plan area and throughout its habitat range (§195D-21(c));
 - b) Identify the impact of any authorized incidental take, with consideration of the full range of the species on the island so that cumulative impacts associated with the take can be adequately assessed (§195D-21(b)(2)(C)); and
 - c) Take into consideration the full range of the species on the island so that the cumulative impacts associated with the take can be adequately assessed (§195D-4(g)(5)).
- 3) Provide benefits, such that:
 - a) The plan will increase the likelihood that the covered species will survive and recover (§195D-4(g)(4));
 - b) The cumulative impact of the activity, which is permitted and facilitated by the license, provides net environmental benefits (§195D-4(g)(8)); and
 - c) The HCP is designed to result in an overall net gain in the recovery of Hawai'i's threatened and endangered species (§195D-30).
- 4) Avoid specific impacts so that:
 - a) Take is not likely to cause the loss of genetic representation of an affected population of any endangered, threatened, proposed, or candidate plant species (§195D-4(g)(9)); or
 - b) The cumulative activities within the areas covered by the plan do not reach the level that they cannot be environmentally beneficial (§195D-21(c)(1)); or
 - c) Implementation of the plan is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered, threatened, proposed, or candidate species identified in the plan area (§195D-21(c)(1)).

A checklist of HCP requirements pursuant to HRS 195D is provided in Appendix 3.

B. Need

The state of Hawai'i has established ambitious renewable energy goals with the adoption of Act 97 in 2015 requiring "each electric utility company that sells electricity for consumption in the State" to establish a renewable energy portfolio standard of 100 percent of its net electricity sales by 2045. Wind energy generation is expected to be one of the largest sources of renewable energy to meet this goal. From 2006 to 2012, eight wind energy production facilities were constructed and became operational to provide approximately 200 megawatts (MW) of renewable energy potential in Hawai'i, with a ninth wind farm due for completion in 2020. On August 22, 2019, Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc. issued a request for proposals for the generation of up to 250 MW of additional renewable energy on Hawai'i Island, Maui, and O'ahu, much of which is expected to be proposed through the construction and operation of additional wind energy facilities (Hawaiian Electric 2019). A request for proposals for Moloka'i on August 6, 2019 specified wind turbines of 100 kW or less as a potential option for renewable energy development (Maui Electric 2019).

Monitoring of wind energy facilities in Hawai'i to date has shown that their operation during nighttime hours results in take of Hawaiian Hoary Bats, and that the numbers killed by those facilities are higher than was expected during the initial review of the applications for incidental take of the species. Between 2014 and 2017 several of the authorized wind projects exceeded approved take levels. Based on fatality monitoring and the application of the Evidence of Absence (EoA) model at the 80% credibility level for the assessment of unobserved and indirect take, the calculated take as of June 30, 2019 is 190 bats and the current permitted take for all HCPs in Hawai'i is 334.

In order to lawfully operate a commercial wind farm in Hawai'i, state and federal incidental take authorizations are required, among other environmental compliance measures. All projects which may result in incidental take under HRS 195D are required to develop and implement an approved HCP and obtain an associated Incidental Take License that specifies their permitted level of incidental take. HCPs integrate development activities with conservation and must be designed to ensure that licensed activities do not appreciably reduce the likelihood of the survival and recovery of at-risk species through establishment of impact avoidance and minimization measures, as well as mitigation efforts to offset take. Mitigation required under HRS 195D must be consistent with established recovery goals, must provide a net environmental benefit, and must increase the likelihood that the affected species will survive and recover from its reduced state.

Development of HCPs for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat is problematic because much of the basic information on ecology and life history of the species that is essential for designing an HCP to meet the requirements under HRS 195D is limited or lacking. Among the six HCPs that have been approved for take of Hawaiian Hoary Bats by wind energy projects, guidance provided, and terms and conditions approved for essential components of the HCPs have varied considerably. Recommended and approved mitigation, minimization, and monitoring requirements, for example, have changed among HCPs as new ecological information has become available. As a result, scale and cost of mitigation has been inconsistent, adding to the challenges faced by applicants seeking to develop HCPs that will meet the requirements for

approval by the state. Those challenges are unparalleled among the numerous endangered species for which incidental take is currently authorized or requested in Hawai'i, and are a clear indication of the need for consistent guidance developed for Hawaiian Hoary Bats through a scientifically rigorous and publicly transparent process.

C. Process

The ESRC, advisory to the BLNR and the department regarding HCP approval and management, has acknowledged the challenges and inconsistencies regarding HCPs and the Hawaiian Hoary Bat. At the request of the ESRC, a Hawaiian Hoary Bat workshop was held April 14 and 15, 2015 in Honolulu, Hawai'i to discuss issues related to Hawaiian Hoary Bat conservation with particular reference to guidance for agencies and applicants seeking to develop and secure approval of HCPs. Participants included Hawaiian Hoary Bat researchers from DOFAW, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), U.S. Forest Service, University of Hawai'i, Pacific Cooperative Studies Unit, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), as well as government regulators, consultants, stakeholders, and the public.

This guidance document was developed from the outcome of that workshop and is meant to serve as a "living document" to be revisited and updated by DOFAW staff, with ESRC review and input, at least every five years, or as significant advancements are made in the understanding of Hawaiian Hoary Bat ecology and management. The 2020 version of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat guidance document includes the following additions and modifications from the original guidance document of 2015, in addition to numerous lesser changes:

- Revises Section III, Assessment of Take and Impacts for HCPs;
- Adds additional discussion to Section IV, Hawaiian Hoary Bat Take Avoidance and Minimization Measures, and Section V, Mitigation;
- Updates research on Low Wind Speed Curtailment;
- Adds new Section VI, Adaptive Management;
- Summarizes the research initiatives currently underway in Appendix 1; and
- Provides a checklist of HCP requirements pursuant to HRS 195D in Appendix 3.

This document provides assistance to wind energy project proponents to develop HCPs in compliance with HRS 195D, with discussions on topics related to assessment of take and measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate effects to Hawaiian Hoary Bats during the development of new HCPs and HCP amendments. It should be supplemented with other guidance, in particular the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service HCP Handbook (https://www.fws.gov/endangered/what-we-do/hcp_handbook-chapters.html).



A key element for the ongoing evaluation of Hawaiian Hoary Bat issues and updates to this guidance document are annual reports provided by ITL license-holders. Given the importance of these documents, uniformity of reporting is essential. Therefore, a template has been provided for annual reports in Appendix 2.

II. Background

A. Ecology and Status of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat

The Hawaiian Hoary Bat, also known as the 'ōpe'ape'a, is an endemic subspecies of the North American Hoary Bat (*L. c. cinereus*) and is listed as endangered under both the federal and state endangered species laws. The Hawaiian Hoary Bat has not been evaluated as a distinct subspecies by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), but the subspecies is listed as imperiled by NatureServe. Recent genetic research indicates that hoary bats in Hawai'i likely colonized the Hawaiian Islands in multiple events and that there may be two distinct subspecies of Hawaiian Hoary Bats present (Baird et al. 2015, Russel et al. 2015, and Baird et al. 2017). Baird et al. (2015) proposed, and Baird et al. (2017) further argued, that red, yellow, and hoary bats should be placed in separate genera (*Lasiurus*, *Dasypterus*, and *Aeorestes*, respectively) and proposed full species status for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat as *Aeorestes semotus*. Federal and state regulatory agencies may make a listing determination in the future in light of new information but at the present time only one bat species is considered present in Hawai'i. In April 2015 the Hawaiian Hoary Bat was officially designated as the state land mammal, and it is in fact the only extant native terrestrial mammal in the Hawaiian Islands.

Due largely to the cryptic and solitary nature of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat, knowledge of its ecology, life history, and population constraints is limited. It is known that the Hawaiian Hoary Bat occurs on all of the main Hawaiian Islands, and breeding populations have been documented on all of the main Hawaiian Islands except for Ni'ihau and Kaho'olawe. Recent studies suggest Hawaiian Hoary Bats roost primarily in woody vegetation exceeding 15 feet in height (Bonaccorso et al. 2015), their diet consists principally of nocturnal aerial beetles and moths (Jacobs 1999 and Todd 2012), and they may use several distinct core use areas, each with a mean size of about 63 acres (25.5 hectares) with little to no overlap (Bonaccorso et al. 2015). Hawaiian Hoary Bats may travel as far as six to eight miles (11 to 13 kilometers) one-way in a night to forage (Jacobs 1994 and Bonaccorso et al. 2015). Additional discussion on core use area is provided in Section IV B.

 Hawaiian Hoary Bat population sizes are unknown, and it is generally accepted that it is not reasonable at this point in time to ascertain an actual population estimate for a single island or the entire state. Understanding population status and specific habitat requirements of the species has been identified as a primary data need for species recovery (USFWS 1998 and Gorresen et al. 2013). Occupancy models and genetic studies have been and continue to be conducted to attempt to come up with population indices and effective population sizes, although effective population does not necessarily equate to actual population size (Gorresen 2008 and Gorresen et al. 2013). Although population estimates are not currently available, studies suggest that the Hawaiian Hoary Bat population on Hawai'i Island may be stable and potentially increasing (Gorresen et al. 2013). 

B. Bats and Wind Energy

With the increasing development of wind energy facilities, the number of bat fatalities due to collisions with wind turbines has continued to grow to the point that hundreds of thousands of bats are killed each year nationwide, making wind power a significant threat to the continued survival of these species (Cryan 2011).

Bat collisions and mortality at wind facilities are well-documented throughout the U.S., mostly involving migratory tree-roosting bat species such as silver-haired, hoary, and eastern red bats (Johnson and Strickland 2003, Kunz et al. 2007, Arnett et al. 2008, and Cryan 2011). Arnett and Baerwald (2013) estimated that from 2000 to 2011, between 650,000 and 1,300,000 bats were killed at wind facilities in the U.S. and Canada. Hoary bats have been documented to have the highest proportion of fatalities at most continental U.S. wind energy facilities, ranging from nine to 88 percent of all bat fatalities (Arnett et al. 2008). The national average is about 50 percent, with the majority of collisions occurring between July and September during fall migration, with another smaller peak of fatalities documented during spring migration (Cryan 2011).

Fatality rates vary by facility and the national average has been estimated at approximately 12.5 bats per MW per year (Arnett et al. 2008). It is unclear exactly what is driving these fatalities but factors that may influence bat mortality at wind facilities include bat distribution, behavior (e.g. attraction to turbines), weather, turbine height, habitat degradation or loss, and/or siting near certain topographic or landscape features (e.g. proximity to forest or wetlands). Studies have indicated that tree-roosting bats may be attracted to turbines, potentially due to the resemblance of these structures to tall trees and/or the expectation of resources, such as insect prey or potential mates (Kunz et al. 2007, Cryan et al. 2014, and Gorresen et al. 2015c). Other research has shown bats at wind turbines engaging in flight patterns that resemble those of bats swooping down to drink water, indicating that perhaps bats perceive the smooth surface of the turbine as resembling water (McAlexander 2013).

C. Hawaiian Hoary Bats and Wind Energy in Hawai'i

Take records suggest there may be a seasonal pattern for Hawaiian Hoary Bat collision fatalities, although it is not as pronounced as on the continental U.S. (Figure 1). While it is thought that the Hawaiian Hoary Bat completes a seasonal altitudinal migration on a similar time frame, there are still many questions surrounding timing, and whether bats migrate on all islands regardless of maximum elevation, or perhaps migrate to a lesser extent or not at all on lower elevation islands.




Figure 1. Observed bat fatalities by month across all wind facilities with approved ITLs in Hawai'i as of June 30, 2019. 

III. Assessment of Take and Impacts for HCPs

A. Overview

Pursuant to statutory requirements in HRS 195D, HCPs should include measures to employ the best available data and methods to determine the number of individuals of the covered species that are expected to be taken during the term of the ITL in order to establish a credible estimated maximum take limit for that license. During the implementation of the HCP, the applicant should conduct appropriate, quantitative field methods to monitor the project for any observed take and employ appropriate analytical techniques and models to assess the calculated actual number taken annually and during the full term of the ITL. To assess potential impacts on endangered species resulting from the take, the HCP should provide for field surveys and monitoring of those species and employ the best available science to assess the full extent of impacts of the take on Hawaiian Hoary Bats in the plan area, on the island, and throughout its range. Resolving those impacts, including cumulative impacts, should result in net recovery benefits for the species, and should not cause the loss of genetic representation or jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species. Guidance on the development of these measures for HCPs is provided in this section.

B. Take Calculations

For wind energy sites to obtain an ITL, a maximum take limit must be identified. For proposed new sites or sites with minimal or no existing Hawaiian Hoary Bat monitoring data, the recommended process for determining the appropriate requested bat take is as follows:

1. Use information from the most comparable wind energy site(s) currently permitted with take data available as a baseline.
2. Adjust the take level based on specific conditions at the proposed new site, including but not limited to: size of turbines and rotors (including tower height and maximum height of blade), wind speeds, results of local or regional Hawaiian Hoary Bat studies, site-specific monitoring (with a minimum of one year of acoustic monitoring in all months, supplemented by thermal imagery monitoring, to gauge the effectiveness of the acoustic monitoring), and ecologic and landscape considerations.
3. Adjust the estimated maximum take, with justification, based on the implementation of any avoidance/minimization proposed.

For existing wind energy facilities with at least several years of monitoring data, a requested take limit should be determined using results of take calculated using Evidence of Absence (EoA) indirect take guidance that has been provided by the USFWS in a separate guidance document (Appendix 4), and bullet 3 above, also adjusting for any factors in bullet 2 that may have changed and that could affect take. For all sites, regardless of prior history, requested take levels should be thoroughly justified with detailed documentation.

Currently, the EoA model developed by statisticians at USGS (Dalthorp et al. 2014, or as updated) for determining incidental take is the model recommended by the agencies and in use by all wind energy projects with permits in Hawai'i. This model is designed to estimate take in situations when very few actual observed take events are recorded, as is the case in Hawai'i, and is used to project future take and to calculate take at any point in time. The model accounts for both observed and unobserved takes. It incorporates the spatial distribution of the location of carcasses found during monitoring to estimate the fraction of carcasses landing outside the searched area, and includes correction factors for searcher efficiency and carcass removal estimates based on field trials (see Section II C for detailed information on fatality monitoring). With this information the model is then used to calculate a maximum credible number of fatalities. Both DOFAW and USFWS specify the use of 80% credibility levels for a conservative estimate of take. If, for example, 25 bats is the direct take value calculated by the model at the 80% credibility level it can be stated with 80% certainty that the actual amount of take is 25 bats or less.

When using the EoA model to calculate the ongoing take, a *rho* value (when used as a factor by which an adaptive management action may change the fatality rate) should not be applied unless a baseline from site-specific monitoring is first established at a site. To justify the use of a *rho* factor in the EoA calculation, information should be provided on how site-specific or other data were used to determine requested take; specific topics include: average wind speed at site, pre-operational monitoring of bat activity, rotor diameter, nacelle height, and minimization methods (i.e., low wind speed curtailment and/or deterrents).

Annual reports should provide outputs from the EoA model and include a graphical representation of estimated and projected take over the authorized life of the ITL (Figure 2).




Figure 2. Example of graphic representation of estimated take that should be provided in annual reports. From Evidence of Absence modeling.


Demographic data to calculate indirect take for Hawaiian Hoary Bats are currently limited. Hawaiian Hoary Bat data should foremost be used for analytical purposes; where Hawaiian Hoary Bat data are not available, demographic data from the mainland hoary bat can be used as an appropriate surrogate. Calculations are recommended as described below. Indirect take assessed should follow USFWS guidance (Appendix 4).


C. Fatality Monitoring


Determination of the numbers of Hawaiian Hoary Bats taken under an ITL is essential for compliance with legal requirements under HRS 195D .

Obligations under an HCP include monitoring impacts caused by project activities to ensure compliance with authorized take limitations. For wind farms, a post-construction monitoring plan is designed by the licensee/permittee and must be approved by the wildlife agencies. The method, frequency, size of search plots, number of turbines, and monitoring period are project-specific and dependent on carcass persistence at the site, as well as effectiveness of the searcher.

Fatality monitoring may not represent all individuals killed as some carcasses may 1) fall outside the searched area, 2) be removed by scavengers, 3) deteriorate beyond recognition prior to detection, or 4) remain undiscovered by searchers even when present. Current protocols involve routine searches within a specified distance from the turbine. Hull and Muir (2010) and current findings should be used to determine the fall-out pattern for the fatalities. The maximum height of blade tip and wind direction should be considered when determining the


maximum area in which fatalities may fall. A 20% buffer should be added to the outer area during the first few monitoring years to assure coverage is adequate. This is especially important at sites with high wind. There is new data showing that impacted bats fall farther from wind turbines at higher wind speeds (Hein 2017) which has implications for Hawai'i wind energy facilities that should be evaluated. 

Independent searcher efficiency (SEEF) and carcass removal trials (CARE) are conducted parallel to the search process to estimate probability that a carcass persists until the next search and to estimate the probability that it is then discovered by a searcher. Details of these trials should be provided in HCPs, describing how and when they are to be conducted at a specific site during the year. Treatment of carcasses found during fatality monitoring, or incidental to the regular monitoring, should follow the most current standardized protocol provided by the agencies (Appendix 5). Canine-assisted searches have been demonstrated to provide cost effective and highly efficient searching (e.g. 80-90% of bat trials found, and 97-100% of bird trials found, SunEdison 2014 and 2015) and should be used for all Hawaiian Hoary Bat fatality monitoring and SEEF trials. 

Downed wildlife reports for bats should follow the recommended format and content in the most recent Downed Wildlife Protocol (Appendix 5). For bat fatalities the information recorded should include wind speeds, wind directions, temperature, precipitation, moon phase, acoustic detector results (including temporal aspects and call types), and turbine activity for the period between the date the fatality was found and the date of the previous fatality search and,  separately, for the fatality search period before that (total of two search periods analyzed). Location of any open water in the area, including watering troughs, should be provided due to the potential to attract bats. Ungulate grazing activity or other relevant land uses in the project area and distances involved should also be provided as there is potential for a relationship with bat activity (Todd et al. 2016). If deterrent devices are installed their operational status during the search period should be reported.

§195D-4(g)(3) provides that the applicant shall cover all costs to monitor the species. To ensure transparency and avoid conflicts of interests, perceived or real, the ESRC recommends that fatality monitoring, SEEF, and CARE trials be carried out by an independent, qualified, third party entity approved by the agencies. Alternatively, for consistency and efficiency of statewide monitoring of Hawaiian Hoary Bat HCPs, DOFAW may wish to procure the appropriate services through a request for proposals process consistent with state procurement rules to carry out those monitoring functions, with the costs to be borne by the applicants.

D. Bat Activity Monitoring

Bat acoustic monitoring at and in the vicinity of wind facilities is necessary to document bat occurrence, habitat preferences at the project site, and seasonal and temporal activity changes that may be associated with take. Monitoring results are expected to help with the development of avoidance and minimization strategies at wind facilities by helping to design smart curtailment regimes or assess the effectiveness of installed deterrent devices. 

HCPs should include a description of the experimental design to be employed to monitor Hawaiian Hoary Bat activity in the project area. The description should specify the number and types of devices to be used, the spatial configuration, and the analytical techniques to be used.

The design should be informed by a statistical analysis of the sample size required to detect a given level of change with known level of confidence. The recommended objective is to detect a 20% change in activity in the project area with >80% confidence. The design and methods used should be adaptive, with the results analyzed annually and any modifications employed to achieve the desired level of power to detect the target change.

Acoustic monitoring of bat activity at the site should occur throughout the permit period. Intensive monitoring after the early years of a project may be scaled back if reduced monitoring levels can be demonstrated to maintain acceptable power to establish temporal trends in bat activity through the permit period as well the ability to evaluate bat interactions with wind turbines, to develop methods to more accurately document downed wildlife incidents, and to evaluate adjustment of curtailment protocols. Effective monitoring may also provide information on correlations to other factors that will better inform management decisions. Activity monitoring is recommended at both nacelle and ground levels.

Project proponents should enhance techniques to monitor bat activity at their facilities as new methods become available in order to better understand the impacts of the project on the Hawaiian Hoary Bat, and to potentially reduce impacts by adjusting curtailment protocols based on monitoring results. Research on new monitoring technology could be very beneficial, both to analyze bat interactions with wind turbines as well as to develop methods to more accurately capture downed wildlife incidents.

Newer technologies such as thermal infrared and near-infrared cameras have been used in three studies at wind facilities on the continental U.S. and in Hawai'i to observe interactions between bats and wind turbines at night (Horn et al. 2008, Gorresen et al. 2015c, and Cryan et al. 2014). Thermal imaging provides more detailed information about bat behaviors as compared to other monitoring techniques. In Hawai'i, during a USGS six-month video surveillance study at the Kawaihoa Wind Farm, over 3,000 bat events were observed in almost four thousand hours of video, which was nearly 75% more than detections obtained only with concurrent acoustic monitoring. Bat interactions including chasing blades, investigating nacelles, blade bouncing, foraging near turbines, and some additional unexplained behaviors were documented.

Although video imaging can uncover many interactions between bats and wind turbines, it is not an effective substitute for conducting regular carcass searches at wind energy facilities. The field of view from thermal and infrared cameras is limited; therefore, multiple cameras would be required to adequately monitor each turbine. Furthermore, finding rare events such as bat strikes at wind turbines in Hawai'i requires sifting through many hours of data causing a lag time from the time the event occurred to the identification of the event. Due to this lag time, it is unlikely that carcasses would be found to confirm sex, or gather other information, if the monitoring only relied on this search method.

In addition to acoustic or thermal bat activity monitoring, monitoring other weather-related variables such as temperature, wind speed, wind direction, or changing barometric pressure may also be important in determining patterns of observed mortality (Baerwald and Barclay 2011). Moon phase may be important as there is some indication that moon phase may affect how much Hawaiian Hoary Bats use echolocation (Gorresen et al. 2017).

E. Impacts of Take

HRS 195D requires that HCPs include mitigation that will compensate for individuals of a species impacted by the project actions, increase the likelihood that the covered species will recover, contain sufficient information to ascertain with reasonable certainty the likely effect of the plan on the covered species in the plan area and throughout its habitat range, and adequately assess the cumulative impacts associated with the take on the island. The preferred strategy to meet these requirements is to implement mitigation actions designed to offset take of the affected population through enhancement of survival or reproductive success, or both, and to monitor the results of that mitigation to quantitatively confirm its success. Where the impacts of mitigation can be quantitatively assessed with confidence, the impacts of take on the population may be ascertained with reasonable certainty. For the Hawaiian Hoary Bat however, this approach poses significant challenges because of practical and technical limitations associated with quantitative assessment of demographic and population level benefits of mitigation.

Where the impacts of mitigation on take cannot be assessed with reasonable certainty, it is appropriate to explore other approaches to improve understanding of how take may affect the covered species. For example, population models may be used to predict the impact of a given level of take on a population, providing an additional tool to aid planning. Population models may be used to identify levels of take that are likely to cause a population decline, and can be useful to guide HCP planning by allowing the applicant or agency to establish a take limit that is not likely to cause a decline in the population in the event that the effectiveness of mitigation is not known. Population models have been used recently to examine the potential population impacts of take of several mainland species (Frick et al. 2017). Those models were used to predict population responses to mortality resulting from take by wind turbines and to assess the sensitivity of model inputs on the outcomes of the simulations.

Population models for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat are expected to be considerably less robust than those reported by Frick et al. (2017) for mainland species because the demographic information needed to inform those models is poorly known and imprecise for Hawaiian Hoary Bats. While this currently limits the predictive ability of the models, useful results and insights may nevertheless be gained from their development. The ESRC conducted preliminary population viability assessments using Vortex to identify (1) specific population dynamics parameters that are needed to conduct an acceptable population viability analysis (PVA), (2) particularly impactful parameters that should be prioritized for research, and (3) general trends or outcomes that could inform discussions on the impacts of wind projects on the Hawaiian Hoary Bat. Those models used plausible values for demographic inputs based on best available data to explore potential impacts on Hawaiian Hoary Bat populations, examining how impacts would differ for Hawaiian Hoary Bat populations depending on the starting size of a population, whether suitable habitat is limited, and whether that population was stable, increasing, or decreasing at the onset of take. While the models are not meant to predict the outcome of take for any given application, they do suggest what scenarios may be expected under certain circumstances. A detailed account of those exploratory efforts is provided in Appendix 6.

Based on the preliminary models explored by the ESRC, the following recommendations are provided:

1. That additional research is supported to improve estimation of life history and demographic variables that inform the population models.
2. That additional efforts are supported to explore population models for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat that employ alternative assumptions and approaches.
3. That applicants and agencies, in assessing cumulative impacts to Hawaiian Hoary Bat populations resulting from take, should, until such time as the best available science informs otherwise, adopt prudent and relatively conservative assumptions regarding Hawaiian Hoary Bat populations. Until data to the contrary are obtained, analyses should, as a minimum, include the following conservative assumptions:
 - a. that Hawaiian Hoary Bat populations on each island are stable or slightly increasing (i.e., a 0 to 1 percent annual population increase as found by Gorresen et al. (2013)),
 - b. that compensatory reproduction is not occurring (because no studies have shown that compensatory reproduction is occurring), and
 - c. that an annual rate of take that exceeds the annual rate of increase of a population is likely to cause a decline in the population. For example, if the pre-project population is thought to increase by one percent annually then the take of more than one percent of the population annually would be expected to cause a declining population; similarly, if a population is stable, then any take would be expected to result in a comparable population decline.
4. That applicants and agencies should assume, until such time as the best available science informs otherwise, that the Hawaiian Hoary Bat populations on O'ahu, Maui, and Hawai'i are not more than 1,000, 1,500, and 5,000 bats, respectively.
5. That cumulative levels of take exceeding the annual rate of growth or the assumed population sizes for each island should not be authorized unless the expected net benefits to Hawaiian Hoary Bat recovery outweigh the potential losses from take.

Additional details of the exploratory models employed are provided in Appendix 6.

F. Use of Tiers

From 2006 to 2018, the BLNR and the USFWS approved six HCPs for wind energy projects that included authorization for incidental take of Hawaiian Hoary Bats. Due to high levels of uncertainty regarding the levels of take projected, unknown effectiveness of projects approved as compensatory mitigation, and the expectation that the results from ongoing research would provide improved guidance for HCP development and implementation, the approved HCPs structured take levels into sequential tiers, each with associated plans and conservation measures. The tiered approach was meant to provide the HCPs with flexibility to implement the appropriate suites of conservation measures in the face of unknown take probabilities and uncertainties in the effectiveness of the minimization measures to be employed.

The ESRC acknowledges the rationale and utility of this approach for early HCPs. In and of itself, the use of tiers to define an incremental approach to the implementation of conservation measures, as part of an otherwise effective and compliant HCP that authorizes an appropriate level of take, may serve a functional purpose. However, the ESRC cautions that the use of tiers may not be consistent with state law and that the use of tiers may have negative outcomes. Inappropriate uses of tiers may include:

- Use of tiers to avoid financial assurances. HRS 195D requires that the applicant identify an adequate funding source (i.e., bond, irrevocable letter of credit, insurance, or surety bond, or provide other similar financial tools) to ensure that the HCP will be implemented in accordance with the schedule, and that the applicant guarantee that those funds will be available. These assurances are required for all authorized take, including all tiers.
- Establishment of tiers that are unjustifiably low. If the initial tier levels are lower than the expected or actual take levels, the project may not be able to meet its statutory requirements during the permit period. For example, use of a tier that is well below the actual take will effectively delay the implementation of the mitigation measures that are ultimately required to compensate for that take, jeopardizing the effectiveness of mitigation, and placing the covered species at risk.
- Establishment of tiers that effectively create a “pay as you take” situation. Establishing tiers that simply keep pace with estimations of take are likely to have tiers triggered late in the permit period. These late triggers will have limited mitigation options and may result in the selection of less desirable conservation actions. For example, habitat restoration may take over a decade to be realized. Tiers that are triggered within a decade of permit expiration are not likely to be able to use restoration as a mitigation tool.

While tiers may theoretically be an incentive for the adoption of more effective minimization and mitigation efforts, tiers can also be a disincentive. This is of particular concern if the total authorized take is not minimized to the maximum extent practicable. Incidental take licenses are intended to identify, and then authorize, the amount of take that an approved activity is likely to have after take has been minimized to the maximum extent practicable. The authorization of take levels that are either excessive or deflated is inappropriate. Underestimating a project’s take negatively impacts endangered species, while overestimating take reduces the flexibility of future projects and unnecessarily burdens the current HCP, unless tiers are used to reduce financial assurances or expenditures. In addition, if the requested level of take is higher than the take level that can be achieved by effective minimization the HCP may be inconsistent with statutory requirements to minimize to the maximum extent practicable. Authorized take that is higher than what can be achieved through minimization may also compromise regulatory provisions to ensure that the minimization measures are employed to the maximum extent practicable and that adaptive management is diligently applied to enhance the effectiveness of those measures.

For these reasons, the ESRC recommends that tiers are not used.

IV. Hawaiian Hoary Bat Take Avoidance and Minimization Measures

A. Overview

State law requires that any incidental take authorized as part of an approved HCP is minimized to the maximum extent practicable (§195D-4-(g)(1)), and that any approved HCP identifies the steps that will be taken to minimize take (§195D-21(b)(2)(C)). Pursuant to this section, HCPs submitted for consideration for approval are expected to contain a description of all measures

that will be employed to minimize take to the maximum extent practicable and an analysis to demonstrate how those measures constitute the maximum practicable extent of minimization. The data and information that justify the basis for the determination of the maximum practicable extent of the minimization should be provided, including, but not limited to, energetic and economic thresholds that may be impacted by the potential minimization measures, as may be appropriate.

The discussion below provides guidance for the inclusion of selected considerations, practices, or tools that may be employed to reduce take resulting from the operation of wind turbines. The basic principles to be considered for avoidance and minimization are as follows:

- Take should be minimized to the maximum extent practicable. A range of alternatives should be presented that evaluate projected take and are supported with detailed data and reasoning.
- Given the unknown effectiveness of compensatory mitigation measures to offset take, ceasing operations and feathering of rotors from one hour before sunset to one hour after sunrise should be considered to avoid take of Hawaiian Hoary Bats.
- Avoidance and minimization efforts should have a robust adaptive management strategy to ensure that changes and adjustments are employed to increase effectiveness when minimization targets are not being met or when new tools and methods become available.

B. Project Siting

An important consideration during the planning phase for a wind energy project is the siting of the facility. Records available for Hawaiian Hoary Bat strikes by wind turbines in Hawai'i suggest significant differences in collision rates among sites. However, the environmental correlates or causes of these differences are currently not well understood. Additional research is needed to understand why some sites are likely to result in higher take so that predictive models can be developed at landscape scales to guide siting decisions. Pending those improved decision tools, applicants for HCPs/ITLs should demonstrate that they have considered various locations and turbine layout configurations and evaluated in detail the advantages and disadvantages of each when considering the potential effect on the Hawaiian Hoary Bat. Some of the factors that should be considered when siting wind energy projects include the following:


- Wind characteristics including a determination of how much a facility can minimize Hawaiian Hoary Bat incidental take through curtailment.
- Proximity to habitat suitable for listed endangered species including Hawaiian Hoary Bats.
- Monitoring to assess Hawaiian Hoary Bats and other listed species presence, activity, and use of the potential project areas based on prior research and project-specific monitoring (minimum acoustic monitoring of one year in all months and supplemented with thermal imaging during high activity months).
- Topographic and habitat features that may be suitable for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat.
- Land use adjacent to the proposed project area, including proximity to federal, state, and private reserves and conservation areas.
- Restoration in the area which could attract bats.

- Vegetation types.
- Presence of water features.
- Climate records.

Other concerns are related to the foraging behavior of hoary bats. Cattle grazing and the resulting manure attracts dung beetles. A large portion of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat diet is comprised of beetles. There is anecdotal evidence that the presence of dung beetles in the vicinity of a wind facility may create an attractive nuisance and draw in foraging bats, putting them at risk of collision with turbine blades. A review of bat fatalities at the Auwahi wind farm on Maui did not find a relationship between fatalities and grazing (Auwahi Wind 2019). Researchers with USGS are currently investigating the possibility of a link between grazing and bat activity.

C. Turbine Specifications

Bat foraging behavior may be influenced by the turbines themselves because of 1) an attraction of bats to the turbine for various reasons, most unknown, 2) attraction of insects to the turbine, or 3) perceived insect source by the bat, regardless of insect availability. Turbine design may help reduce attractiveness.

Barclay et al. (2007) found that fatality rates of bats were relatively low at short turbines (less than 65 meters high), but bat fatalities increased exponentially with turbine height. The range of tower heights examined varied from 25 to 80 meters. The highest bat fatality rates occurred at turbines with towers 65 meters or taller, with the potential explanation being higher towers elevated turbines into altitudes with more migrating bats. It is not clear if Hawaiian Hoary Bats fly at high altitudes when they move from site to site and could be impacted similarly. 




Figure 3. Adapted from Figure 1 in Barclay et al. 2007 and modified to show tower heights for existing (Kahuku and Kawailoa) and under construction (Na Pua Makani) wind farms on O’ahu.

A more recent study (Zimmerling and Francis 2016) found no relationship between turbine height and bat fatalities for the very narrow range of turbine heights examined, which only varied by 37 meters (99 meters to 136 meters). Importantly, Zimmerling and Francis's (2016) definition of turbine height included the height of the blades, whereas Barclay et al. (2007) examined just tower height. On O’ahu, this narrow range would only capture the Kahuku wind farm turbines at 127 meters turbine height including the blades. The turbines at the Kawailoa wind farm and those approved for the Na Pua Makani wind farm are significantly above the range examined by Zimmerling and Francis (2016). Kawailoa's turbine height including blades is 150 meters and Na Pua Makani’s will be 200 meters.

The Barclay et al. (2007) study also looked at rotor size, but did not find a relationship between mortality and turbine rotor diameter. However, a series of studies at the Fowler Ridge wind farm (Good et al. 2011, 2012, 2018, and 2019) found higher bat mortality at Siemens and Clipper turbines than at GE and Vestas turbines which had smaller rotors. This pattern was thought to potentially be a function of increasing rotor swept area among the different turbines and/or variation in the spin-up and spin-down behavior of turbines from the different manufacturers. The follow-up studies in 2017 and 2018 (Good et al. 2018 and 2019) provided data that show a pattern of turbines with increased rotor size progressively killing more bats (Figure 4). It should be noted that the authors in these later studies did not identify a causal factor for these patterns. Additional studies are needed that include comparing the impacts of different rotor sizes from a single manufacturer and from sites that have a more random distribution of turbines across the

landscape. However, based on evaluation of these recent data (e.g., Good et al. 2018 and 2019), estimated take could be expected to be greater for turbines with larger rotors in Hawai'i.




Figure 4. Rotor size and associated bat fatalities. Fatalities over two years for four different rotor sizes (from four different manufacturers) employed at the same nacelle height and under the same experimental treatments. Data from Good et al. (2018 and 2019).

D. Turbine Operations

1. Curtailment

Operational adjustments that curtail the time that turbines are rotating may reduce the number of bats struck by those turbines. Timing of curtailment may be designed to take advantage of known factors that may influence the probability of bats striking particular turbines. Known factors may include time of night, weather, wind speed, location, or seasonality of bat activity. Hawaiian Hoary Bats are nocturnal so curtailment of turbines during night time hours is expected to reduce take. Additional factors to guide curtailment are discussed below.

2. Low Wind Speed Curtailment

Low wind speed curtailment (LWSC) is a twofold strategy of raising the wind speed at which the blades begin spinning and generating electricity, also known as the cut-in speed, and feathering turbine blades (i.e., positioning the blades parallel to the wind) to slow or stop rotation. Under LWSC, wind capable of producing energy is available, but is not being converted to electricity and supplied to the grid. Curtailment can be imposed on a wind energy facility by the receiving utility company if the grid has reached capacity, or can be implemented by the wind facility operator, for instance, to minimize risk of incidental take. For the purposes of this guidance document, we use the term LWSC to refer to facility operator-imposed curtailment of blade rotation. Although LWSC reduces energy output, there is strong scientific evidence that bat fatalities, especially fatalities of migratory bats, are reduced on the U.S. mainland when LWSC is implemented compared to bat fatalities at facilities with no LWSC. Curtailment is currently the primary minimization measure implemented by wind farms in the U.S., including those in Hawai'i.

Various studies in the U.S. and Canada have attempted to assess the relationship between wind turbine cut-in speeds and the number of bat fatalities. Results from studies conducted across numerous ecosystems and facilities have consistently shown a decrease in fatalities of over 50 percent once cut-in speeds are equal to or greater than 5.0 meters per second (m/s). Based on these and other published data, curtailment with feathering has been implemented at all wind facilities with federal and state incidental take permits in Hawai'i either from the outset of operation as a minimization measure, or as an adaptive management response to higher than expected levels of take. Below is a summary of mainland studies on LWSC, including some newer studies not considered in the previous version of this guidance.

Baerwald et al. (2009) conducted a study during the peak period of migration (August 1–September 7, 2007) for hoary bats (*Lasiurus cinereus*) and silver-haired bats (*Lasionycteris noctivagans*) at a wind energy installation in southwestern Alberta, Canada, where the two bat species accounted for the majority of turbine-related fatalities. They tested three treatment groups: control turbines, treatment turbines with an increased cut-in speed (5.5 m/s), and experimental idling turbines with the blades manipulated to be motionless during low wind speeds. When the group combined the two experimental treatment results and compared them to control turbines, they concluded that the experimental turbines had lower fatality rates for each species.

The Fowler Ridge wind facility in Indiana has conducted a large number of important studies on LWSC. These studies have reported statistically significant reductions in bat casualty rates (bats per turbine per season) for sets of turbines curtailed at 3.5 m/s, 5.0 m/s, and 6.5 m/s, respectively (Good et al. 2011) and at 3.5 m/s, 4.5 m/s, and 5.5 m/s (Good et al. 2012). These studies have shown the value of feathering turbines when they are not generating power (Good et al. 2012). The two other wind farms, Casselman and Pinnacle, that have compared LWSC at both 5.0 m/s and 6.5 m/s also generally found increasing benefit from curtailment at 6.5 m/s versus 5.0 m/s, but the differences were not statistically significant (Arnett et al. 2010 and Schirmacher et al. 2018). Hein et al. (2013 and 2014) proposed that a lack of wind speeds between the 5.0 m/s and 6.5 m/s treatments may have made it difficult for the Casselman and Pinnacle studies to differentiate between those treatments. In contrast, the Fowler Ridge study had a good set of wind speeds with which to differentiate treatments, with the 5.0 m/s treatment operating 21.6 percent less than the fully operational turbines and the 6.5 m/s treatment operating 42 percent less than fully operational turbines.

Young et al. (2011) found that feathering the blades to reduce the rotational speed of turbine blades at or under the manufacturer's cut-in speed of 4.0 m/s significantly reduced bat fatalities. Young et al. (2013) saw a 62% reduction in bat fatalities when feathering was implemented at 5.0 m/s and below, though the study was a comparison made across two years – 2011 (no feathering) and 2012 (with feathering) – and assumes that other factors that may influence bat fatalities were the same in years 2011 and 2012. In the feathering study at Fowler Ridge, Good et al. (2012) found that turbines that feathered at 3.5 m/s, 4.5 m/s, or 5.5 m/s had significantly fewer fatalities than turbines that were not feathered. Fatalities decreased with each feathering increment.


At Casselman Wind Project, Arnett et al. (2009, 2010, and 2011) showed an average reduction in bat fatalities of 72 to 82%, depending on year, with the implementation of curtailment and blade feathering when compared to no curtailment. Hein et al. (2014) reported a 54.4% and 76.1% reduction in bat fatalities from a base cut-in of 3.0 m/s for the 5.0 m/s and 6.5 m/s curtailment treatments, respectively, although the two treatments were not shown to be statistically different from each other.

Arnett et al. (2013a) synthesized the results of ten wind energy projects in North America and identified only one study in Sheffield, Vermont that found increasing cut-in speeds to 6.0 m/s resulted in a 60% reduction in bat fatalities relative to that observed at turbines with a cut-in speed of 4.0 m/s. A study conducted at Beech Ridge, West Virginia, found a bat fatality reduction of approximately 89% when all turbines were curtailed at 6.9 m/s for the study, but the reduction was based on a comparison with other facilities, Mount Storm and Mountaineer, that were not curtailing. The study was not a comparison with other turbines at the Beech Ridge site, nor were other cut-in speeds evaluated (Tidhar et al. 2013). Arnett et al. (2013b) also reported the results from a wind farm in USFWS Region 8. Compared to the bat fatalities at turbines set to a cut-in speed of 3.0 m/s, the following reductions in bat fatalities were obtained: 34.5% at 5.0 m/s, and 38.1% at 6.0 m/s during the first four hours after dark, neither of which were statistically significant.

Good and Adachi (2014) reported that the effectiveness of curtailment speeds can depend on the deceleration and acceleration profile of the specific turbine model.

Cryan et al. (2014) analyzed wind turbine activities at a facility in northwestern Indiana using thermal video-surveillance cameras, supplemented with near-infrared video, acoustic detectors, and radar. They found that wind speed and blade rotation speed influence the way that bats approached turbines. Bats approached turbines less frequently when their blades were spinning fast, and the prevalence of leeward versus windward approaches to the nacelle increased with wind speed at turbines with slow-moving or stationary blades. Leeward approaches declined when the blades were rotating. They also observed that tree bats show a tendency to closely investigate curtailed or feathered turbines and sometimes linger for minutes to hours. This observation suggests the possibility that bats are drawn toward turbines in low winds, but sometimes remain long enough to be put at risk when wind picks up and blades reach higher speeds. Therefore, the frequency of intermittent, blade-spinning wind gusts within such low-wind periods might be an important predictor of fatality risk; fatalities may occur more often when turbine blades are transitioning from potentially attractive (stationary or slow) to lethal (fast) speeds.

Curtailed wind turbines typically use a 10-minute rolling average to determine mean wind speed and trigger rotation, feathering, or curtailment. Schirmacher et al. (2016) evaluated increasing the length of time used for determining the average wind speed from 10 minutes to 20 minutes. The premise behind increasing the rolling average to a longer period of time was that it would decrease the number of turbine starts and stops and thereby decrease the number of bat fatalities associated with bats being in the presence of non-moving or slowing rotating feathered blades when they unfeather and begin to rotate rapidly in higher winds. Schirmacher et al. (2016) reported fewer bat fatalities were observed with a 20-minute rolling average based on wind speed at the meteorological tower anemometer though they were not able to separate

fatality risk due to low wind speeds (5.0 m/s) verse risk at start up. Their results also suggested that using average wind speeds from anemometers located at the meteorological towers rather than on turbine nacelles may reduce bat fatalities. Efforts to minimize bat fatalities at wind facilities might benefit by averaging wind speed curtailment thresholds over longer periods of time (e.g., less 10 minutes) to prevent gusts from intermittently pushing blades to lethal speed during low wind periods. 

Foo et al. (2017) provided evidence that some species of bats, including hoary bats, do forage at wind turbines. Insects often accumulate on the downwind sides of natural and artificial windbreaks, and tend to increase in number and density with wind speed (Lewis 1965 and 1969).

3. Summary of Curtailment of Wind Turbines

The effect of cut-in speeds higher than the 6.5 m/s are difficult to assess in Hawai'i because of the 1) large uncertainty associated with estimating fatalities for a rare event, 2) lack of surrogate species that can be used in Hawai'i for estimating take of the bat and demonstrating real treatment differences, 3) lack of statistical power because of small project size and high site variability, 4) unknowns surrounding Hawaiian Hoary Bat flight behavior, 5) existing power purchase agreements already in place, and 6) the impacts of an increased cut-in speed on reduction in renewable power production.

Although no studies on the effectiveness of curtailment have been conducted in Hawai'i, there is sufficient evidence from research conducted across multiple ecosystems in the continental U.S. that support its use as a minimization measure. An overall comparison of curtailment results shows that there is a general increase in benefit (i.e., a decrease in mortality) as curtailment wind speed increases (Figure 5). Paired results from mainland studies are summarized in Figure 6.




Figure 5. The relationship between curtailment wind speed and bat mortality. There is a general increase in mortality reduction as curtailment wind speed increases.




Figure 6. Project trends for eight mainland U.S. studies with incremental increases in LWSC. Seven of the eight studies showed increasing trends as LWSC increases. One study did not.

Based on these findings, LWSC should be a part of every wind facility’s minimization strategy to the maximum extent practicable. HCPs should describe in detail the considerations used to develop a cut-in speed for LWSC, including economic considerations. A cut-in speed of 6.5 m/s is suggested based on the mainland studies. With a minimum cut-in speed of 6.5 m/s, a reduced take request may be justified with a detailed rationale. In any case, given the status of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat in Hawai’i and the studies available, a minimum cut-in speed of 5.0 m/s should be implemented, with higher cut-in speeds up to or exceeding 6.5 m/s implemented when the cumulative take of Hawaiian Hoary Bats poses a risk to island populations. Higher curtailment speeds have already been implemented by several wind projects in Hawai’i as part of adaptive management actions aimed at reducing higher-than-anticipated rates of take. Such adaptive management responses should be continued.

If deterrence technology becomes more effective and available, the need for curtailment efforts may be reduced. The permittees should collect, analyze, and report data on the effectiveness of curtailment practices in their annual reports.

Curtailement protocols and triggers for increasing curtailment are included below in the adaptive management section of this guidance document and should be specified in detail in all HCPs.

Unlike the seasonal-related vulnerability associated with migratory bats on the U.S. mainland, Hawaiian Hoary Bats may transgress or be active around turbines at Hawaii-based wind farms year-round, thus curtailment should be deployed year-round at the permitted wind facilities in Hawai'i, unless it can be clearly shown that bats are less active at a particular site during certain months and no takes have previously occurred in those months. This creates a larger loss of renewable energy per turbine than wind farms operating on the U.S. mainland when considering the typical 20-year term of an ITL and/or ITP.

4. *Other Operational Factors*

Other important operational factors that may affect bat mortality and that should be described and analyzed in HCPs for proposed wind turbines:


- Turbine manufacturer.
- Turbine height.
- Rotor size and sweep area. Feathering of rotors when not generating power should be a standard minimization action for all wind projects.
- Turbine behavior prior to reaching cut-in speeds, including specific cut-in speeds, acceleration, deceleration, and free-wheeling rates. Nacelle wind meters should be calibrated to reflect actual wind speeds at the turbine site.
- Criteria used to determine that wind speed has reached cut-in speed to include wind speed measurement location and trigger (e.g. rolling average time used in calculation of wind speed).
- Daily times of cut-in/out and average daily time in feathering mode by season for turbines already in operation.
- Wind speeds and relationship to bat activity as measured by acoustic or thermal sensors.
- Siting considerations as specified above in Section III B.
- A discussion of minimization of Hawaiian Hoary Bat take through optimizing turbine manufacturer, rotor size, turbine power output, and number of turbines needed to reach the power production target.

For existing wind turbines with Hawaiian Hoary Bat take a thorough analysis of previous take is required to determine any patterns that might be affecting take and that could provide opportunities for minimization. These should include the following:


- Spatial considerations (specific locations/turbines where fatalities were found) and temporal considerations (patterns related to time of year).
- Weather (wind speeds and other weather prior to take) and lunar phases.
- Acoustic monitoring results prior to take.
- Operational characteristics of turbines in periods prior to take (number of turbine starts and stops and how the trigger is determined for starts and stops; whether blades are completely stopped during curtailment; specific start and stop times for curtailment and how related to measured bat acoustic activity and the area).


- Surrounding area practices that may influence bat activity (description and location of any grazing within, for instance, one mile of the turbines; location and description of any open water such as cattle troughs that may have been brought into the area; and any other recent activities and changes in the vicinity of the turbines).

E. Bat Deterrence Technology

Bat deterrence technology refers to any device, feature, or modification that uses visual or acoustic means to reduce the numbers of bats that are struck by wind turbine blades. Technologies currently in research and development that hold promise to serve as cost effective tools in reducing the numbers of bats killed by wind turbines include ultrasonic acoustic deterrents and ultra violet (UV) light deterrents. Deterrence provides an alternative approach to reduce take that may not require curtailment of operations and associated impacts to energy production. However, while a number of new technologies have emerged designed to deter bats from coming in close proximity to turbines, additional testing and development are needed to inform planning and deployment for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat. 

Acoustic deterrents have been in development and testing since 2006 and have shown generally positive results thus far. A description of bat acoustics and acoustic deterrent technology is summarized in a workshop document: Acoustic Deterrent Workshop National Wind Technology Center, Louisville, CO, August 26, 2013

https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2015/03/f20/Deterrent-Workshop-Proceedings_Final.pdf. The acoustic deterrents are devices that emit continuous high frequency sounds. The workshop document describes a fundamental impediment to acoustic deterrents which is the short distance that acoustic signals at the needed frequencies will travel. Attenuation due to higher humidity was also an issue noted. For Hawaiian Hoary Bats, Gorresen et al. (2017) recorded that the range of calls in their study was a mean of 29.3 kHz and the 95th percentile of peak frequency was at 38.1 kHz. Acoustic deterrent signals must be well above those frequencies to “jam” bat signals and deter bats, rather than attract them to the source to investigate. 

Arnett et al. (2013b) conducted two trials at a wind facility in Pennsylvania, with results the first year showing 21 to 51 percent fewer bat fatalities when deterrents were deployed, and results the second year showing 18 to 62 percent fewer fatalities. Weaver et al. (2019) found a 78  percent reduction in hoary bat mortality over two years for an acoustic deterrent system. This system was recently deployed at the Kawailoa wind farm on O’ahu, with deterrent units installed on all 30 turbines in 2019. Kawailoa is the first wind facility employing the use of commercial acoustic bat deterrents as a minimization strategy not only in Hawai’i, but in the U.S.

Additional current and ongoing deterrence research coordinated by the Bats and Wind Energy Cooperative and funded by various partners is summarized in presentations given in March 2018 and available at the following website: <https://www.nationalwind.org/status-findings-developing-technologies-bat-detection-deterrence-wind-facilities>. The studies included the following:

- Rotor-mounted, Ultrasonic Bat Impact Mitigation System study;
- Rotor-mounted Biomimetic Ultrasonic Whistle;

- Ultrasonic Acoustic Deterrent using a High Speed Jet Device;
- Testing and Comparability Studies at two facilities (Ohio and Texas) with various treatments; and
- Texturizing Wind Turbine Towers to Reduce Bat Mortality.

The only acoustic deterrent study conducted in Hawai'i was at a macadamia nut farm on Hawai'i Island by Hein and Schirmacher (2013). This study found a significant decrease in bat acoustic detections when the deterrents were operating (a reduction from 3,814 calls to 10), with activity levels returning to pre-treatment levels immediately following the removal of the deterrent devices. There was also no indication of habituation found in any of the studies.

Based on previous studies demonstrating that some species of bats can perceive bright UV light, two studies by Gorresen et al. (2015a and 2015b) were conducted in the western U.S. to determine if 1) dim UV light was perceptible to bats and 2) if bat flight behavior would be impacted by UV light. The first study demonstrated that multiple genera of bats can perceive dim UV light, at levels imperceptible to humans and many avian species. The second study was conducted at the same macadamia nut farm on Hawai'i Island where the aforementioned acoustic deterrent surveys took place. Although not all analysis results were statistically significant, bat calls, bat feeding buzzes, and visual observations of bats at treatment sites declined by 25 to 44 percent as compared to control sites, despite the fact that insect abundance increased. The researchers noted that bat activity was not highly associated with insect abundance, and bats did not appear to have been drawn in by the insects attracted by UV illumination. They hypothesized that the insects were dispersed within the treated airspace to a degree that may not draw the attention of foraging bats. These results indicate that the technology is promising and warrants further study.

Finally, physical modifications to the turbine towers and blades (modifying surface texture) has also been evaluated in a preliminary study as a technique to make turbine towers less attractive to bats based on unpublished research by researchers at Texas Christian University. The work to date has been inconclusive.

Given the relatively high levels of take projected for Hawaiian Hoary Bats in Hawai'i, and the uncertainties regarding the effectiveness of mitigation to compensate for that take, research, testing, and deployment of effective deterrents are a high priority. This should be accomplished by 1) including the use of deterrents as part of all HCPs, and 2) investing in deterrent research to support the development and improvement of effectiveness. Agencies should aggressively pursue funding opportunities to support development of deterrents, including application for state and federal grants, such as the HCP planning grants offered under the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund (<https://www.fws.gov/endangered/grants/index.html>).

V. Mitigation

A. Overview

HRS 195D requires that each HCP include mitigation measures that result in an overall net gain in the recovery of any species for which take cannot be avoided, the measures that will be implemented to achieve those benefits, and a justification for how the proposal will achieve net recovery benefits. In general, the net benefit requirement is best achieved through the implementation of conservation measures for which quantitative monitoring demonstrates that individuals of the covered species have been effectively added to the population, and that the number added exceeds the number taken. The conservation measures employed may target threats or limiting factors with the objective to increase survival or reproductive success above a known level that would be expected in the absence of mitigation.

Identification of mitigation actions to offset take as described above are challenging for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat because threats and factors that limit the bat population are unknown. Specifically, at the present time, there are no data to infer with statistical confidence an effect on Hawaiian Hoary Bat population dynamics resulting from implementation of conservation measures to address a threat or limiting factor. These challenges are compounded by the limitations inherent in the tools available for the detection of changes in population demographics. As a result, interim mitigation approaches must be identified that comply with applicable sections in HRS 195D.

The discussion below provides guidance for the development of mitigation plans for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat in light of the challenges and uncertainties described above. The overall approach integrates best available science and management practice to enhance efficacy, research to improve understanding of threats and limiting factors, biological monitoring to measure and track success, and adaptive management to improve effectiveness as new information becomes available.

B. Mitigation Planning Framework

The recommended framework for mitigation plans includes the following elements:

- Biological goals and objectives that establish specific, measurable outcomes that describe the targets that the mitigation is expected to achieve and serve as the measures of success.
- Implementation plans that specify how the work will be accomplished to reach the targets and include a schedule of activities.
- Monitoring plans that establish schedules of activities designed to assess progress toward goals and objectives, with time-specific targets that will provide a meaningful indication of whether the implementation is successfully on track to achieve success.
- Adaptive management approaches that are based on the results of monitoring and describe alternative actions that will be implemented if mitigation targets aren't being reached by the proposed implementation actions.

Additional guidance on compensatory mitigation is provided by the USFWS in their 2016 Endangered Species Act Compensatory Mitigation Policy (81 Federal Register 248, pp. 95316-95348).

C. Mitigation Recommendations

It is expected that Hawaiian Hoary Bats are adapted to habitats that support natural complements of species composition, richness, and diversity. There are also data to indicate that Hawaiian Hoary Bats may use habitats and species that are not indigenous to the Hawaiian Islands for foraging, roosting, and breeding. Based on these assumptions and observations, the following framework is recommended:

- Protection of currently suitable, predominantly native forest habitat that is threatened with loss or degradation;
- Restoration of degraded habitats to predominantly native forest habitat;
- Inclusion or incorporation of non-native species or habitat features only when they have been demonstrated to provide recovery benefits into a predominantly native forest restoration project;
- Monitoring of the response by the Hawaiian Hoary Bat population to the mitigation action using the best available methods for the detection of Hawaiian Hoary Bat occupancy, presence, distribution, or abundance; and
- An iterative and structured process for the identification of and support for scientific research to improve understanding of population dynamics, threats, and limiting factors to improve the effectiveness of mitigation efforts designed to provide recovery benefits.

Selection of mitigation projects may be informed by its timing in relation to take. Habitat restoration may require many years of effort before suitable habitat is achieved and therefore may not be appropriate for projects or take authorizations of shorter duration.

The recommendations provided here are interim guidance that will be reviewed and revised as new information becomes available to inform planning. Recommendations are expected to be updated as more research on Hawaiian Hoary Bats is completed and as more specific management actions for the species are identified. These recommendations and guidance will be revised a minimum of every five years.

1. Habitat Restoration

a) Biological Goals and Objectives

For many threatened or endangered species, habitat loss is one of the primary threats to their existence. For the Hawaiian Hoary Bat, we lack even basic information on the bat's limiting factors. The federal recovery plan for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat assumed that habitat was limiting. However, there are no studies documenting that habitat is indeed limiting.

The most prudent course of action is to first avoid and minimize take instead of seeking to mitigate or offset take through habitat restoration. Then, if some amount of take cannot be avoided or minimized, mitigation should focus on strategic island wide habitat protection and restoration efforts aimed at maintaining the viability of the native ecosystems that can provide needed resources for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat. Ideally, restoration efforts for HCPs would be

coordinated island wide and with other organizations in order to provide Hawaiian Hoary Bat habitat that is well distributed throughout the island, spans a range of elevations, and that complements the recovery of other Hawaiian species.

The goal of a habitat restoration project should be to restore habitat that is currently unsuitable for foraging, roosting, and breeding to conditions that improve suitability for those purposes. While much is unknown concerning the attributes that comprise suitable habitat for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat, native forests represent the natural habitats to which Hawaiian Hoary Bats are adapted and should make up the core of restoration goals, in the absence of compelling information otherwise. Habitat restoration should employ a landscape level strategy incorporating restoration of native forest habitat with natural assemblages of forest canopy, understory, and ground cover species that include natural levels of species richness and diversity, to the greatest degree practicable. Restoration efforts should include controlling the impacts of ungulates (e.g. fencing), removing key invasive species, and planting or enhancing native vegetation, if needed.

Several mitigation projects approved for take of Hawaiian Hoary Bats to date have implemented habitat restoration efforts on native forest and wetland habitats. Studies on Hawaiian Hoary Bat activity and presence have shown that forested areas are positively associated with bat occupancy, though native- versus alien-dominated areas has not yet been determined to be a significant factor tied to occupancy (Gorresen et al. 2013). Bat activity also appears to be high around open canopy areas interspersed with wetlands based on studies in the mainland U.S. (Grindal et al. 1999 and Brooks and Ford 2005). One study in Hawai'i conducted by SunEdison (SWCA 2011) suggested that ponds and wetlands could serve as important foraging grounds for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat. Observation of bats frequenting ponds has also been documented during studies at a restoration site on Maui, as reported in the Auwahi Wind Farm Fiscal Year 2018 Annual Report (Auwahi Wind 2018).

Concurrent with the habitat restoration mitigation projects in progress for bats, USGS researchers have increased the understanding of aspects of Hawaiian Hoary Bat distribution, habitat use, prey consumption, and occupancy (Bonaccorso et al. 2015, Bonaccorso et al. 2016, Gorresen et al. 2013, Gorresen et al. 2015a, 2015b, and 2015c, Pinzari et al. 2014, Todd 2012, and Todd et al. 2016). These and other research findings are used to inform habitat-based mitigation actions to further benefit the bats and aid in identifying appropriate mitigation sites to support foraging, pupping, and roosting needs. Surveys have been conducted in Kahikinui Forest Reserve and Nakula Natural Area Reserve on Maui (KFR-NNAR; Todd et al. 2016). The baseline information from those surveys indicated detection probabilities, mean pulses per night, percentage of nights with feeding activity, and acoustic detections are greater in recovering forest areas than in unrestored shrublands (Todd et al. 2016).

Gorresen et al. (2013) found a significant association between occupancy and the prevalence of mature forest cover, indicating this should be a consideration for habitat management. The Gorresen et al. (2013) study also reported the Koa (*Acacia koa*) tree, although abundant in habitats used by bats, was not significantly associated with bat occupancy in their models, and suggested that finding may be the due to Koa supporting little shade cover for day roosts, having limited influence on overall prey availability, and the availability of a wide variety of other food sources that are used opportunistically.

Bonaccorso et al. (2015) tracked 28 Hawaiian Hoary Bats on the windward side of the island of Hawai'i. The average size of an individual bat's foraging area was 230 hectares (568 acres) and its average core use area (CUA) – areas where an individual spends 50 percent of its time – was 25.5 hectares (63 acres). There were no significant differences in the size of foraging areas or core use areas based on sex or age. However, adult bats on average had core use areas of 19.64 hectares (48.5 acres), juvenile females had smaller CUAs at 12.2 hectares (30 acres), and juvenile males had larger CUAs of 56.7 hectares (140 acres). There was no overlap in CUAs among adult male bats and limited overlap (less than eight percent in total) among all bats. Unpublished studies by H.T. Harvey (2019) conducted on Maui found much larger CUAs, with bats regularly foraging areas in the order of 3,000 acres. It is currently unclear how to reconcile the vastly different CUA sizes found in the two studies.

In the past, federal and state agencies have used estimates of CUA sizes as surrogates for the habitat needs of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat. These habitat estimates were then used to determine mitigation for the take of Hawaiian Hoary Bats. The amount of habitat recommended to offset the take of one bat has ranged from 20 to 40 acres, depending on the rationale in place at the time.

There are multiple issues with the use of CUAs to determine the size of habitat mitigation areas for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat. The most significant issue is that, as mentioned above, it is not known if habitat is a limiting factor. If habitat is not a key limiting factor, then habitat restoration as an offset to take is not only a waste of resources, but it also generates a false assumption, or sense of security, that bat populations are benefitting from the mitigation. If habitat is limiting, then the restoration of habitat may be an important benefit to Hawaiian Hoary Bat populations. The issues of concern then become how much habitat is needed to increase a bat population and what are the characterizes quality habitat.

Until the H.T. Harvey (2019) study is better understood, the Bonaccorso et al. (2015) study provides the best information on habitat use by Hawaiian Hoary Bats.

Using Bonaccorso et al. (2015) as a starting point, it is recommended that habitat restoration focus on providing:

1. A mix of foraging and roosting/pupping habitat (such as forest and forest edge habitat);
2. Habitat that is predominantly native; and
3. An adequate amount of habitat for each bat being offset. The typical unit of Hawaiian Hoary Bat take is one adult bat, which had a mean CUA of 48.5 acres in the study by Bonaccorso et al. (2015). The CUA is presumably high quality habitat since 50 percent of a bat's time is spent there, with a high level of feeding activity. The restoration of this acreage would be expected to add enough habitat value to provide for half a bat. Doubling the acreage could provide the other half of a bat's habitat need, if it was of high quality. Compensatory mitigation is recommended to consist of 97 acres of high quality predominantly native habitat (i.e., CUA quality).




Figure 7. Bat core use area from 28 bats (both adults and subadults) on Hawai‘i Island (Bonaccorso et al. 2015).

b) Incorporation of Other Habitat Features

Wetlands also have been used as mitigation sites for many plant and animal species. On the continental U.S., restoration efforts at wetlands have demonstrated increased bat activity (Menzel et al. 2005). Only one state-approved HCP in Hawai‘i includes mitigation for Hawaiian Hoary Bats through wetland restoration. Data collected by SunEdison demonstrated that bat activity rates measured through acoustic detectors are seven times higher at small irrigation ponds near the Kawailoa Wind Farm than at other vegetated areas nearby (SWCA 2011). It is not clear if these water features are increasing the number of bats that can successfully occupy the area, or if they simply represent sites where bats that are foraging over this landscape are concentrated by the water feature and are thus easier to detect. Mitigation through restoration at the ‘Uko‘a wetland on O‘ahu is underway and is intended to provide increased bat foraging habitat. Monitoring efforts will help evaluate the efficacy of wetland management for Hawaiian Hoary Bat mitigation. Although not yet confirmed with data collected in Hawai‘i, wetland restoration projects could also provide important foraging habitat for Hawaiian Hoary Bats. Studies conducted by USGS at the Koloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park on the island of Hawai‘i suggest that wetland habitats provide suitable insect prey for the bat (Pinzari et al. 2014).

Research also indicates that Hawaiian Hoary Bats may use some non-native habitat features and that those features may contribute to suitable habitat. Restoration may incorporate habitat features other than those described above where justified by applicable scientific information and after analysis and assessment of any unintended impacts. Examples may include edges or

other approaches to create canopy openings, water features, and particular tree species with special attributes. These elements may be appropriate when incorporated into an overall restoration plan predominantly consistent with native habitat restoration. Incorporation of these elements should include a well-reasoned and detailed analysis of how the landscape would support the Hawaiian Hoary Bat and a likelihood of providing a net recovery benefit for the species given the level of take requested.

c) Siting and Legal Considerations

Mitigation should occur on the island where the impact is occurring. However, mitigation projects should also evaluate the proximity to the wind turbine impact area and how that could negatively affect take.

Habitat restoration projects to serve as mitigation should be conducted on lands for which those benefits will receive long term or perpetual protection and management. When private lands are used for restoration there should be a documented commitment, preferably a conservation easement that confers long term or perpetual protection. If a conservation easement is not feasible, a memorandum of agreement with the landowner is recommended. Projects for which there is no assurance for the long term protection of the restored habitat are not recommended.

Public lands should be used for restoration only when funding for restoration by an HCP will enhance and supplement public efforts, especially in the case of acquisition or management of large tracts of land. HCP mitigation funds should in no case replace or displace public funds available for the same work. If the restoration occurs on public lands, additional mitigation may be appropriate since no private land would need to be encumbered. Clear responsibilities of the parties should be specified and a memorandum of agreement with the public land manager should be in place prior to issuance of the ITL.

d) Measures of Success

Monitoring is expected to provide a quantitative assessment of whether the project is on track to meet its mitigation goals. Monitoring for habitat restoration may include assessment of relevant measures such as survival, canopy cover, species richness and diversity, prey abundance, and other features identified as goals and objectives. Monitoring Hawaiian Hoary Bats should employ best available methods, including acoustic monitors, thermal imaging, and methods to assess the abundance of preferred insect prey types. Monitoring should occur prior to restoration to establish a baseline and continue with frequency to ensure robust statistical inference. Surveys should be repeated at specified intervals throughout the life of the project to provide an index of change and to gather information on preferred bat habitat characteristics, limiting factors and threats, or if monitoring techniques are refined, to enable quantification of bat population and productivity.

Measures of success and a detailed schedule showing restoration actions and monitoring are key considerations for inclusion in the mitigation plan. A measure of success must be a metric (quantitative/qualitative or some observable phenomena) that is monitored, and connected back to the mitigation biological goals and objectives. Habitat improvement for bats should result in a statistically documented increase of bat habitat and/or quality of habitat as measured over an established baseline condition. Measures of success should also include data that

demonstrate an increase in measures of Hawaiian Hoary Bat use of the area, such as presence, occupancy, or activity. Methods used to detect Hawaiian Hoary Bat use should be designed to detect increased use with robust statistical inference and should include an analysis of statistical power to do so. While it is understood that it is not practicable at this time to estimate the net recovery benefit of habitat restoration as the increased absolute number of bats occupying a core use area, the measures of success should include a quantitative increase in one or more measures of Hawaiian Hoary Bat use of the area inferred with statistical confidence.

2. Land Acquisition

Land acquisition may be desirable as mitigation when the benefits of the acquisition to the bat population in the project area can be assessed with reasonable certainty. Circumstances that contribute to the assessment of benefits may include, but not be limited to, lands that presently support bats that are in some way threatened in a manner that would render the habitat no longer suitable for bats. This alternative provides benefits when the acquisition safeguards the land from future development, protects existing habitat, and/or provides a clearly documented opportunity for restoration/creation of habitat.

Proposals to acquire lands to serve as mitigation should include documentation that the habitat to be acquired currently supports bats, such as robust surveys that have documented presence or occupancy over the area for a specified time, presence of suitable habitat such as intact native forest or other habitats that are known to be used by Hawaiian Hoary Bats for foraging, roosting, or breeding, or other indicators of conservation value, such as size, location, proximity to protected public lands, or landscape setting. Larger parcels are typically preferable to smaller parcels; however, the location of a smaller parcel (e.g., adjacent to another larger area that supports bats or is being restored to support bats) could make it more attractive as a mitigation site.

The proposal should provide a documentation of the nature and urgency of threats to the lands and habitats to be acquired. The documentation should show that there is a reasonable expectation that the subject lands will be modified in the foreseeable future such that suitable habitat will be degraded or destroyed, resulting in the absence of Hawaiian Hoary Bats on those lands and the lands no longer providing habitat for Hawaiian Hoary Bats.

The acreage of the proposed acquisition should include an acreage of suitable Hawaiian Hoary Bat habitat (as determined by other considerations in this guidance) for each bat for which the acquisition is proposed to serve as mitigation. If partnering with other entities for a larger acquisition, the prorated share of funds provided for the mitigation should be used to calculate credit at a rate of 97 acres per bat for either existing CUA habitat quality or for proposed areas of restoration and acquisition, as discussed in the habitat restoration section.

Proposals to acquire lands to serve as mitigation should be accompanied by documentation to ensure that once acquired, the habitat will not degrade or lose its suitability as bat habitat into the future in perpetuity. Documentation may include transfer to conservation agencies, management plans, conservation easements, or other assurances. Any planned activities or uses of the lands should be consistent with, and not detrimental to (e.g. timber harvesting, fencing with barbed wire, etc.), protection of bats and suitable habitat.

3. *Research as Mitigation*

During the April 2015 ESRC Bat Workshop and subsequently, experts recognized that current mitigation guidance for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat was based on an incomplete understanding of the species biology and its recovery needs. Filling key information gaps was identified at that time as a priority need to inform better mitigation actions, thereby reducing uncertainty in mitigation effectiveness. After thorough consideration by the ESRC and agencies, research was accepted as a mitigation option for take of Hawaiian Hoary Bats in the near term. Research is not a preferred mitigation strategy for most species, but can be and has been used in instances when there is a paucity of information on the species and where research can enable better management of the species; such as is the case for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat.

Bat research is intended to result in a better understanding of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat and its recovery requirements but the benefits for bats are not readily assessed for any individual HCP and therefore the level of effort required cannot be determined without a monetary value assigned. The cost associated with research should be similar to a value associated with known habitat restoration costs so that research costs are roughly comparable to the cost of restoration mitigation. Given 97 acres per bat as a recommended restoration target, the cost for research is estimated based on cost estimates to maintain and/or restore native forested areas and wetland habitats by the state and other partner organizations. In Hawai'i, bat mitigation has varied extensively. DOFAW staff who developed the State of Hawaii Rain Follows the Forest Initiative estimated a range of costs to manage and restore key watershed areas (E. Yuen 2015 pers. comm.). The cost ranged from \$35,708 - \$68,415 per 40 acres depending on the condition of the forest and management needs, such as the amount of fencing and invasive species control needed. Costs associated with management actions in the State of Hawaii Forest Reserves, Natural Area Reserves, and wetlands range widely with an average cost for 40 acres of \$79,220.51 ± \$47,366.45. Based on the high standard deviation and wide range in costs of the different managed areas described above, the figure of \$50,000 to restore an area of 40 acres is currently considered to be a reasonable cost estimate. Therefore, an appropriate cost for research mitigation is \$125,000 per bat.

In order for research to be credited as mitigation, research projects should be designed to provide information applicable to improving mitigation and planning during the period of the HCP or should provide information on better management actions for Hawaiian Hoary Bats that will lead to promoting the recovery of the species. To determine which research questions and projects were recommended, the ESRC established a task force to conduct a thorough assessment of research and information needs, to identify and prioritize those needs, to issue a request for proposals from qualified entities to carry out research projects to address those needs, to review, evaluate, and rank all proposals received, and to recommend to the ESRC which of those research proposals should be supported.

In 2017, the Bat Task Force reported its findings to the ESRC, with a recommendation to support research projects at a total cost of \$4M. Those research projects subsequently became a part of the mitigation plans for several HCPs that were pending approval. The research projects were initiated in early 2018 and are expected to continue for 3-5 years. Upon review of the results of those research projects, the ESRC will conduct an assessment of future research needs and make its recommendations through its regular meetings pursuant to HRS Chapter 92. It is expected that further research will be recommended in order to obtain biological information essential to

meet statutory requirements of HCPs to provide net recovery benefits to Hawaiian Hoary Bats as part of their ITLs. A description of research priorities and research conducted is provided in Appendix 1.

4. *In-lieu Fee Approaches*

Given the significant challenges and uncertainties in regard to Hawaiian Hoary Bat mitigation, the agencies should consider development of an in-lieu fee framework for an interim period of time as another mitigation option. In an in-lieu fee system, applicants deposit funds into an agency account to serve as their mitigation, and the agencies develop and implement the recommended mitigation actions, as described above. This approach has a number of advantages for species for which the success of compensatory mitigation is highly uncertain, including simplifying the process for applicants, whose mitigation will be deemed successful upon the deposit of the funds, and enhancing the ability of the agencies to direct the funds to specific needs, such as research and habitat management. HCPs may allow direct payments in this manner under State of Hawaii law pursuant to §195D-21(b)(1), if and when at such time the mechanism exists.

VI. **Adaptive Management**

Adaptive management is a framework to address uncertainty in the conservation of a species covered by an HCP and is a required component of HCPs. USFWS in its HCP Handbook (USFWS and NOAA 2016) outlines an adaptive management program for an HCP as follows:

- Define goals.
- Develop conceptual models to serve as hypotheses for how the system works and to identify key uncertainties.
- Evaluate management options.
- Develop a monitoring and evaluation program that can answer questions to reduce uncertainty.
- Implement management actions and monitoring.
- Evaluate information and incorporate it into decisions to improve system models, if needed.
- Use updated system models for directing future management and monitoring decisions.

An adaptive management framework is built on biological goals and objectives, monitoring, success criteria, and adaptive management triggers and strategy pathways. It allows for flexibility over time during the implementation of the HCP as new information is gained relative to calculated take and mitigation options, and uses monitoring and evaluation to adjust management strategies. An adaptive management strategy is essential in HCPs for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat due to significant data and information gaps that result in uncertainties and/or risk to Hawaiian Hoary Bats under an approved HCP. The HCP should have a trigger for specific actions that must be taken. Each HCP should adhere to the following principles for adaptive management:

- Adaptive management triggers and responses are needed, as a minimum, for the overall rate of take, the rate of take within a tier, CARE/SEEF monitoring, mitigation targets, and the implementation rates (e.g., percentage of time deterrence equipment is operational).
- Triggers for action should be clearly defined. The initial or default responses planned for exceedance of each trigger point should be clearly defined; in some cases, a decision tree may be appropriate.
- An HCP should provide a clear description of the range of adjustments to the management actions that will be required as a result of any adaptive management provisions and those that may be implemented so that all parties understand what can be considered under adaptive management.
- Additional curtailment and bat deterrence technology should be strongly considered as responses to adaptive management trigger(s) for rate of take.

To develop a metric for rate of take to evaluate under adaptive management, methodology using EoA modeling can be used. Dalthorp and Huso (2015) describe a method that calculates a moving-average take rate that is tracked through the years. When the average take rate is determined to be clearly above the permitted level, a short-term trigger is activated that can be used as a check against excessive take over the span of a few years, signaling that the long-term take limit is likely to be exceeded unless conditions change.

If the short-term trigger threshold is exceeded, responses may include 1) curtailment with higher cut-in speed or other operating adjustments for wind turbines if studies available at the time show those measures are likely to reduce take, 2) some form of deterrence if technologically feasible, or 3) some other specific means of minimizing take.

HCPs submitted for consideration are expected to include explicit and clear criteria for levels or rates of take that will trigger a response that is likely to be effective to reduce the rate of take in the foreseeable future. Those responses may include curtailment or other measures. Since bats are nearly exclusively nocturnal, HCPs should consider trigger scenarios for which the response is to curtail during all night time hours.

Adaptive management should include the provision that if authorized take is exceeded, turbines will not operate during times when bat take is possible.

All adaptive management decisions should be documented in each HCP annual report and tracked to allow a thorough review of the full effect of all adaptive management decisions for an HCP. This should include results of monitoring, adherence to the schedule, and overall success, and should be reviewed annually with respect to established success criteria. Annual reporting should follow the recommended HCP annual report template provided by the agencies (Appendix 2).

VII. References

- Arnett, E.B. 2005. Relationships between bats and wind turbines in Pennsylvania and West Virginia: an assessment of bat fatality search protocols, patterns of fatality, and behavioral interactions with wind turbines. A final report submitted to the Bats and Wind Energy Cooperative. Bat Conservation International, Austin, Texas, USA.
- Arnett, E.B., W.K. Brown, W.P. Erickson, J.K. Fielder, B.L. Hamilton, T.H. Henry, A. Jain, G.D. Johnson, J. Kerns, R.R. Koford, C.P. Nicholson, T.J. O'Connell, M.D. Piorkowski, and R.D. Tankersley, Jr. 2008. Patterns of Bat Fatalities at Wind Energy Facilities in North America. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* 72(1):61-78.
- Arnett, E.B., M. Schirmacher, M.M.P. Huso, and J.P. Hayes. 2009. Effectiveness of Changing Wind Turbine Cut-in Speed to Reduce Bat Fatalities at Wind Facilities. 2008 Annual Report. Prepared for the Bats and Wind Energy Cooperative and the Pennsylvania Game Commission. Bat Conservation International. Austin, TX, USA.
- Arnett, E.B., M.M.P. Huso, M. R. Schirmacher, and J.P. Hayes. 2011. Changing wind turbine cut-in speed reduces bat fatalities at wind facilities. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 9(4): 209-214; doi:10.1890/100103 (published online 1 November 2010).
- Arnett, E.B., M.R. Schirmacher, M.M.P. Huso, and J. P. Hayes. 2010. Effectiveness of changing wind turbine cut-in speed to reduce bat fatalities at wind facilities, final report. A final report submitted to the Bats and Wind Energy Cooperative. Bat Conservation International. Austin, Texas, USA.
- Arnett E.B., G.D. Johnson, W.P Erickson, and C.D. Hein. 2013a. A synthesis of operational mitigation studies to reduce bat fatalities at wind energy facilities in North America. A report submitted to the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Bat Conservation International. Austin, Texas, USA.
- Arnett, E.B., C.D. Hein, M.R. Schirmacher, M.M.P. Huso, and J.M. Szewczak. 2013b. Evaluating the effectiveness of an ultrasonic acoustic deterrent for reducing bat fatalities at wind turbines. *PLoS ONE* 8(6):e65794.
- Arnett, E.B. and E.F. Baerwald. 2013. Impacts of Wind Energy Development on Bats: Implications for Conservation. *Bat Evolution, Ecology, and Conservation* 2013, pp 435-456.
- Auwahi Wind. 2018. Auwahi Wind Farm Habitat Conservation Plan FY 2018 Annual Report.
- Auwahi Wind. 2019. Auwahi Wind Farm Habitat Conservation Plan Final Amendment. Prepared by TetraTech. <https://dlnr.hawaii.gov/wildlife/hcp/approved-hcps/>
- Baerwald, E.F. and R.M.F. Barclay. 2011. Patterns of Activity and Fatality of Migratory Bats at a Wind Energy Facility in Alberta, Canada. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* 75(5):1103-1114.
- Baerwald, E.F., J. Edworthy, M. Holder, and R.M.R. Barclay. 2009. A Large-Scale Mitigation Experiment to Reduce Bat Fatalities at Wind Energy Facilities. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* 73(7): 1077-1081.
- Baird, A.B., Braun, J.K., Mares, M.A., Morales, J.C., Patton, J.C., Tran, C.Q. 2015. Molecular systematic revision of tree bats (Lasiurini): doubling the native mammals of the Hawaiian Islands. *Journal of Mammology* 96(5):1-20.
- Baird A.B., J.K. Braun, M.D. Engstrom, A.C. Holbert, M.G. Huerta, B.K. Lim, et al. 2017. Nuclear and mtDNA phylogenetic analyses clarify the evolutionary history of two species of native Hawaiian bats and the taxonomy of Lasiurini (Mammalia: Chiroptera). *PLoS ONE* 12(10): e0186085.

- Barclay, R.M.R., E.F. Baerwald, and J.C. Gruver. 2007. Variation in bat and bird fatalities at wind facilities: assessing the effects of rotor size and tower height. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 85: 381-387.
- Bonaccorso, F.J., C.M. Todd, A.C. Miles, and P.M. Gorresen. 2015. Foraging Range Movements of the Endangered Hawaiian Hoary Bat, *Lasiurus cinereus semotus*. *Journal of Mammalogy* 96(1):64-71.
- Bonaccorso, F.J., K. Montoya-Aiona, C.A. Pinzari, and C. Todd. 2016. Winter Distribution and Use of High Elevation Caves as Foraging Sites by the Endangered Hawaiian Hoary Bat, *Lasiurus cinereus semotus*. Technical Report HCSU-068.
- Brooks, R.T. and W.M. Ford. 2005. Bat activity in a forest landscape of central Massachusetts. *Northeastern Naturalist* 12(4): 447-462.
- Cryan, P.M. 2011. Wind Turbines as Landscape Impediments to the Migratory Connectivity of Bats. *Environmental Law* 41:355.
- Cryan, P.M., P.M. Gorresen, C.D. Hein, M.R. Schirmacher, R. Diehl, M. Huso, D.T.S. Hayman, P. Fricker, F. Bonaccorso, D.H. Johnson, K. Heist, and D. Dalton. 2014. Behavior of bats at wind turbines. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111:15126-15131.
- Dalthorp, D., M. Huso, D. Dail, and J. Kenyon. 2014. Evidence of Absence Users Guide: U.S. Geological Survey Data Series 881, 34 p., <http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/ds881>.
- Dalthorp, D., and M. Huso. 2015. A framework for decision points to trigger adaptive management actions in long-term incidental take permits: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2015-1227, 88 p., <http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/ofr20151227>.
- Foo, C.F., V.J. Bennett, A.M. Hale, J.M. Korstian, A.J. Schildt, and D.A. Williams. 2017. Increasing evidence that bats actively forage at wind turbines. *PeerJ* 5:e3985; DOI 10.7717/peerj.3985.
- Frick, W.F., E.F. Baerwald, J.F. Pollock, R.M.R. Barclay, J.A. Szymanski, T.J. Weller, A.L. Russell, S.C. Loeb, R.A. Medellin, and L.P. McGuire. 2017. Fatalities at wind turbines may threaten population viability of a migratory bat. *Biological Conservation* 209:172-177.
- Good, R.E. and K. Adachi. 2014. Fowler Ridge Research Summary. WEST, Inc. Bloomington, IN and Cheyenne, WY, USA.
- Good, R.E., W. Erickson, A. Merrill, S. Simon, K. Murray, K. Bay, and C. Fritchman. 2011. Bat Monitoring Studies at the Fowler Ridge Wind Energy Facility Benton County, Indiana, April 13-October 15, 2010. Prepared for: Fowler Ridge Wind Farm. Prepared by Western EcoSystems Technology (WEST). Inc., Cheyenne, WY, USA.
- Good, R.E., A. Merrill, S. Simon, K. Murray, and K. Bay. 2012. Bat monitoring studies at the Fowler Ridge Wind Farm, Benton County, Indiana. An unpublished report submitted to the Fowler Ridge Wind Farm by WEST, Inc., Cheyenne, WY, USA.
- Good, R.E., G. Iskali, K. Nasman, and A. Ciecka. 2018. Bat Evaluation Monitoring Studies at the Fowler Ridge Wind Farm, Benton County, Indiana. August 1-October 15, 2017. Prepared for: Fowler Ridge Wind Farm. WEST, Inc. Bloomington, IN, USA.
- Gorresen, M.P., A.C. Miles, C.M. Todd, F.J. Bonaccorso, and T.J. Weller. 2008. Assessing Bat Detectability and Occupancy with Multiple Automated Echolocation Detectors. *Journal of Mammalogy* 89(1): 11-17.
- Gorresen, M.P., F.J. Bonaccorso, C.A. Pinzari, C.M. Todd, K. Montoya-Aiona, and K. Brinck. 2013. A Five-Year Study of Hawaiian Hoary Bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) Occupancy on the Island of Hawai'i. Technical Report HCSU-041.
- Gorresen P.M., P.M. Cryan, D. Dalton, S. Wolf, F.J. Bonaccorso. 2015a. Ultraviolet vision may be widespread in bats. *Acta Chiropt* 17: 193-198.

- Gorresen, P.M., P.M. Cryan, D.C. Dalton, S. Wolf, J.A. Johnson, C.M. Todd, and F.J. Bonaccorso. 2015b. Dim ultraviolet light as a means of deterring activity by the Hawaiian hoary bat *Lasiurus cinereus semotus*. *Endang. Species Res.* 28: 249–257.
- Gorresen, P.M., P.M. Cryan, M.M. Huso, C.D. Hein, M.R. Schirmacher, J.A. Johnson, K.M. Montoya-Aiona, K.W. Brinck, and F.J. Bonaccorso. 2015c. Behavior of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) at Wind Turbines and its Distribution Across the North Ko’olau Mountains, O’ahu. Technical Report HCSU-064.
- Gorresen P.M., P.M. Cryan, K. Montoya-Aiona, F.J. Bonaccorso. 2017. Do you hear what I see? Vocalization relative to visual detection rates of Hawaiian hoary bats (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*). *Ecol. Evol.* 2017;7:6669–6679.
- Grindal, S.D., J.L. Morissette, and R.M. Brigham. 1999. Concentration of bat activity in riparian habitats over an elevational gradient. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 77:972-977.
- Hawaiian Electric. Filed August 22, 2019. Hawaiian Electric Companies’ Final Stage 2 Renewable and Grid Services RFPs. https://www.hawaiianelectric.com/documents/clean_energy_hawaii/selling_power_to_the_utility/competitive_bidding/20190822_final_stage_2_rfp_book_1.pdf.
- Hein, C.D. July 18, 2017. Bats and Wind Energy Development. NWCC Webinar. <https://www.nationalwind.org/summary-synthesis-latest-knowledge-wind-energy-wildlife/>
- Hein, C.D., and M.R. Schirmacher. 2013. Preliminary field test of an ultrasonic acoustic deterrent device with the potential of reducing Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) fatality at wind energy facilities. Unpublished report submitted to First Wind, Portland, ME by Bat Conservation International, Austin, TX.
- Hein, C.D., A. Prichard, T. Mabee, and M.R. Schirmacher. 2013. Effectiveness of an Operational Mitigation Experiment to Reduce Bat Fatalities at the Pinnacle Wind Farm, Mineral County, West Virginia, 2012. An annual report submitted to Edison Mission Energy and the Bats and Wind Energy Cooperative. Bat Conservation International, Austin, TX, USA.
- Hein, C.D., A. Prichard, T. Mabee, and M.R. Schirmacher. 2014. Efficacy of an operational minimization experiment to reduce bat fatalities at the Pinnacle Wind Farm, Mineral County, West Virginia, 2013. An annual report submitted to Edison Mission Energy and the Bats and Wind Energy Cooperative. Bat Conservation International. Austin, Texas, USA.
- Horn, J.W., E.B. Arnett, M. Jensen, and T.H. Kunz. 2008. Testing the Effectiveness of an Experimental Acoustic Bat Deterrent at the Maple Ridge Wind Farm. A report submitted to the Bats and Wind Energy Cooperative and Bat Conservation International. Bat Conservation International. Austin, Texas, USA.
- H.T. Harvey and Associates. 2014. Best Management Practices and Flow Charts to Avoid Take of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat during non-native Commercial Timber Harvest Operations. Final Report 19 September 2014.
- H.T. Harvey and Associates. January 24, 2019. Ecological Studies of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat on Maui: An Update. Presentation to the ESRC. <https://dlnr.hawaii.gov/wildlife/files/2019/01/ESRC-HTHarvey-24-Jan-2019.pdf>
- Hull, C.L. and S. Muir. 2010. Search areas for monitoring bird and bat carcasses at wind farms using a Monte-Carlo model. *Australasian Journal of Environmental Management*, 17, 77-87.
- Jacobs, D.S. 1994. Distribution and Abundance of the Endangered Hawaiian Hoary Bat, *Lasiurus cinereus semotus*, on the Island of Hawai’i. *Pacific Science* 48(2):193-200.
- Jacobs, D.S. 1999. The diet of the insectivorous Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*). *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 77:1603-1607.

- Johnson, G.D. and M.D. Strickland. 2003. Biological Assessment for the federally Endangered Indiana Bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and Virginia Big-eared Bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii virginianus*). Prepared for NedPower Mount Storm LLC.
- Johnson, J.B., W.M. Ford, J.L. Rodrigue, and J.W. Edwards. 2012. Effects of Acoustic Deterrents on Foraging Bats. Res. Note NRS-129. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 5p.
- Kunz, T.H., E.B. Arnett, W.P. Erickson, A.R. Hoar, G.D. Johnson, R.P. Larkin, M.D. Strickland, R.W. Thresher, and M.D. Tuttle. 2007. Ecological Impacts of Wind Energy Development on Bats: Questions, Research Needs, and Hypotheses. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 5(6):315-324.
- Lewis, T. 1965. The effects of an artificial windbreak on the aerial distribution of flying insects. *Annals of Applied Biology*, 55(3):503-512.
- Lewis, T. 1969. The distribution of flying insects near a low hedgerow. *Journal of Applied Biology*, 6(3):443-452.
- Maui Electric. Filed August 6, 2019. Draft Request for Proposals for Variable Renewable Dispatchable Generation Paired with Energy Storage, Island of Moloka'i. https://www.hawaiielectric.com/documents/clean_energy_hawaii/selling_power_to_the_utility/competitive_bidding/20190806_exhibit_1_exhibit_2_molokai_book_1.pdf
- McAlexander, A. 2013. Evidence that Bats Perceive Wind Turbine Surfaces to be Water. M.S. thesis, Texas Christian University.
- Menard, T. 2001. Activity Patterns of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) in Relation to Reproductive Time Periods. M.S. thesis, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu.
- Menzel, J.M., M.A. Menzel, J.C. Kilgo, W.M. Ford, and J.W. Edwards. 2005. Bat response to Carolina bays and wetland restoration in the southeastern U.S. coastal plain. *Wetlands* 25(3): 542-550.
- Mitchell, C., C. Ogura, D.W. Meadows, A. Kane, L. Strommer, S. Fretz, D. Leonard, and A. McClung. October 2005. Hawaii's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. Department of Land and Natural Resources. Honolulu, Hawai'i. 722 pp.
- Patriquin, K.J. and R.M. Barclay. 2003. Foraging by Bats in Cleared, Thinned, and Unharvested Boreal Forest. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 40:646-657.
- Pinzari, C., F. Bonaccorso, and K. Montoya-Aiona. 2014. Hawaiian Hoary Bat Occupancy at Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park. Technical Report HCSU-051.
- Russell, A.L., Pinzari, C.A., Vonhof, M.J., Olival, K.J., Bonaccorso, F.J. 2015. Two Tickets to Paradise: Multiple Dispersal Events in the Founding of the Hoary Bat Populations in Hawaii. *PLoS ONE* 10(6).
- Schirmacher, M., A. Prichard, T. Mabee, and C. Hein. 2016. Multi-year Operational Minimization Study in WV: Potential Novel Strategy to Reducing Bat Fatalities at Wind Turbines. Presentation to NWCC Wind Wildlife Research Meeting XI. Bat Conservation International, Austin, TX, and ABR, Inc., Fairbanks, AK, USA.
- Schirmacher, M.R., A. Prichard, T. Mabee, and C. Hein. 2018. Evaluating a Novel Approach to Optimize Operational Minimization to Reduce Bat Fatalities at the Pinnacle Wind Farm, Mineral County, West Virginia, 2015. An annual report submitted to NRG Energy and the Bats and Wind Energy Cooperative. Bat Conservation International, Austin, TX, USA.
- Spanjer, G.R. 2006. Responses of the big brown bat, *Eptesicus fuscus*, to a proposed acoustic deterrent device in a lab setting. A report submitted to the Bats and Wind Energy Cooperative

- and the Maryland Department of Natural Resources. Bat Conservation International. Austin, Texas, USA.
- SunEdison. 2014. Kawaiiloa Habitat Conservation Plan FY 2014 Annual Report Year 2. <https://dlnr.hawaii.gov/wildlife/files/2013/10/Kawaiiloa-Wind-Power-Year-2-FY-2014-Report.pdf>
- SunEdison. 2015. Kaheawa I Habitat Conservation Plan Annual Report: FY 2015. https://dlnr.hawaii.gov/wildlife/files/2013/10/KWPI-HCP-Year-9-Annual-Report_9-1-15_Redacted.pdf
- SWCA. 2011. Kawaiiloa Wind Power Final Habitat Conservation Plan. Prepared for Kawaiiloa Wind Power, LLC. by SWCA Environmental Consultants. October 2011.
- Szewczak, J.M. and E.B. Arnett. 2007. Field Test Results of a Potential Acoustic Deterrent to Reduce Bat Mortality from Wind Turbines. Unpublished report. Bat Conservation International. Austin, Texas, USA.
- Tidhar, D., M. Sonnenberg, and D. Young. 2013. DRAFT 2012 Post-construction Fatality Monitoring Study for the Beech Ridge Wind Farm, Greenbrier County, West Virginia. Final Report: April 1 - October 28, 2012. Prepared for Beech Ridge Wind Farm, Beech Ridge Energy, LLC, Chicago, Illinois. Prepared by Western EcoSystems Technology, Inc., NE/Mid-Atlantic Branch, Waterbury, Vermont.
- Todd, C.M. 2012. Effects of prey abundance on seasonal movements of the Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*). M.S. thesis, University of Hawai'i at Hilo.
- Todd, C.M., C.A. Pinzari, and F.J. Bonaccorso. 2016. Acoustic Surveys of Hawaiian Hoary Bats in Kahikinui Forest Reserve and Nakula Natural Area Reserve on the Island of Maui. Hawaii Cooperative Studies Unit. Technical Report HCSU-078.
- USFWS (U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service). 1998. Recovery Plan for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Portland, OR. 50pp.
- USFWS and NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration). 2016. Habitat Conservation Planning and Incidental Take Permit Processing Handbook. December. https://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/HCP_Handbook.pdf
- Weaver, S., I. Castro-Arellano, T. Simpson, and C. Hein. 2019. Testing ultrasonic acoustic deterrents for reducing bat fatalities at wind turbines in south Texas. In "Proceedings of the Wind-Wildlife Research Meeting XII." St. Paul, MN November 28-30, 2018. Prepared for the Wildlife Workgroup of the National Wind Coordinating Collaborative by the American Wind Wildlife Institute, Washington, DC, Susan Savitt Schwartz, ed. 148pp. pp.101-103.
- Young, D.P., Jr., K. Bay, S. Nomani, and W.L. Tidhar. 2011. Nedpower Mount Storm Wind Energy Facility Post-Construction Avian and Bat Monitoring: July-October 2010. Prepared for NedPower Mount Storm, LLC, Houston, Texas. Prepared by Western EcoSystems Technology (WEST), Inc., Cheyenne, Wyoming.
- Young, D.P., Jr., C. Nations, M. Lout and K. Bay. 2013. 2012 post-construction monitoring study, Criterion Wind Project, Garrett County, Maryland: April-November 2012. Prepared for Criterion Power Partners, LLC. Prepared by Western EcoSystems Technology (WEST), Inc., Cheyenne, Wyoming.
- Zimmerling, J.R. and C.M. Francis. 2016. Bat Mortality Due to Wind Turbines in Canada. The Journal of Wildlife Management 80(8):1360-1369.
- Zimpfer, J. and F. Bonaccorso. 2010. Barbed Wire Fences and Hawaiian Hoary Bats: What We Know. 2010 Hawaii Conservation Conference abstract. Hawaii Convention Center, Honolulu.

Appendix 1. Hawaiian Hoary Bat Research

Research Priorities Identified in 2016

The list of priority research questions from the Hawaiian Hoary Bat workshop was further outlined and then refined by a subcommittee of the ESRC that was established in 2016, the Bat Task Force, to develop a request for proposal (RFP) for research projects based on these research priorities and that could be recommended to HCP applicants. The result was included in the RFP and is reproduced below.

Goal 1: Basic research

Conduct basic research to obtain information that will guide and assist conservation efforts.

Objectives include:

- a. **Document distribution.** Conduct island-wide surveys on Maui and O'ahu using replicable methods to document distribution. Document seasonal changes in spatial occupancy. This information may inform efforts to evaluate risk associated with proposed actions and inform management decisions for conservation benefit and provide baseline information needed to understand the potential role of habitat suitability in limiting populations of the bat. (1)
- b. **Document demographic information.** Conduct research to determine basic demography, such as annual survival, reproductive success, maximum lifespan, age of 1st breeding, % of breeding females, number of broods per year, mating system, etc. (1)
- c. **Document home range and movements.** Conduct radio-telemetry experiments to better elucidate how nightly movements and home range may differ on different islands, in different habitats, or seasonally. (1)
- d. **Document genetic variability.** Collect genetic data to document variability, population structure, estimate effective population size, and provide information about population dynamics. (1)
- e. **Conduct population modeling.** Obtain and use demographic information to develop population models, including population viability analyses. (2)

Goal 2: Identify limiting factors.

Understanding the factors that limit the survival and reproductive success of individuals, and therefore determine the distribution, abundance, and growth of populations, is essential for planning conservation actions designed to increase bat population sizes and create net recovery benefits. Potential factors that may limit bat populations include:

- a. **Suitable habitat.** Bats require suitable habitat for foraging, roosting, and breeding. Studies indicate that bats use a wide range of habitats for foraging, but that mature trees may be important for breeding and roosting. Recent studies have documented aspects of habitat use for breeding and roosting, including tree species and architecture. The following research is needed to improve our understanding of suitable habitat. This information will shed light on the question of whether or not bats are habitat limited. Findings that suitable habitat remains unoccupied would suggest that bats are not habitat limited, that habitat management and restoration would not necessarily result in net recovery benefits, and that other factors may be limiting bat populations. Objectives include, but may not be limited to:

- i. **Define suitable habitat.** Document aspects of habitat used for foraging, breeding, and roosting, including vegetation community structure, physical attributes, vegetation species used, and tree architecture. (1)
- ii. **Determine relationship of distribution to suitable habitat.** Document bat distribution and presence or absence in suitable habitat to determine whether suitable habitat is unoccupied. (1)
- iii. **Determine relationship of abundance to suitable habitat.** Determine whether aspects of suitable habitat are associated with demography and home range such that bat population densities or growth rates are associated with habitat features. (1)
- iv. **Conduct experimental treatments.** Conduct long term experimental studies (e.g. up to 20 years) in which bat occupancy or abundance is measured in treatment plots designed to increase suitable habitat. Research designed to employ this approach would be expected to require a study of considerable duration, given the long time frames inherent in habitat management and restoration efforts. Several habitat management projects are currently underway, in some cases in which Hawaiian Hoary Bat occupancy was assessed prior to the initiation of management efforts, that may provide opportunities for research consistent with the goals and objectives sought here. Applicants are encouraged to coordinate with current and potential licensees that may have opportunities for such long term research as part of their current mitigation requirements. (1)

b. Food availability

Populations may be limited if food resources are variable, scarce, or widely dispersed. Food limitation may impact survival and reproductive success to the degree that populations remain stable or decrease despite the availability of suitable habitat and lack of other threats. The following research objectives may contribute to a better understanding of food limitation.

- i. **Identify diet.** Understand food habits by analyzing fecal samples to provide information on foraging ecology, nutritional needs, and population ecology. (1)
- ii. **Document prey selection.** Determine which prey taxa are selected or preferred by comparison of diet to food availability. (1)
- iii. **Determine relationship of home range to food availability.** Conduct studies in which food availability is measured within the home ranges of bats and determine whether a correlation exists. (2)
- iv. **Document relationship of food availability to survival and reproductive success.** Conduct studies in which food availability is monitored within and among years to determine whether survival and reproductive success are correlated with food availability. (2)
- v. **Conduct experimental treatments.** Conduct experimental studies in which bat demography, occupancy, or abundance is estimated in treatment plots designed to increase food availability. As with objective 2.a.iv. above, this research may require a study of considerable duration, and may be carried out as a part of a study pursuant to that objective, in order to explore the potential relationship between habitat suitability, food availability, and bat population dynamics. (2)

- c. **Pesticides** Pesticide use in agricultural or other areas may place bats at risk to exposure, with resulting impacts on impact growth, survival, or reproductive success.
 - i. **Survey and analyze contaminate loads in bats.** (1)
 - ii. **Conduct surveys for chemical residues on bat prey.** (2)
 - iii. **Determine whether demographic variables are correlated with pesticide loads.** (2)
 - iv. **Determine whether high pesticide use areas are associated with low bat occupancy.** (2)

d. Predators

Predation may limit populations if bat pups or adults are subject to frequent predation events and high predator populations. Predator impacts on Hawaiian Hoary Bats are largely unknown. The following research may contribute to a better understanding of predatory relationships to bat populations.

- i. **Bat breeding roost monitoring.** Conduct intensive monitoring at roost sites to observe the outcome of pups during the period they are non-volant. (2)
- ii. **Investigation of potential predator's food preferences (e.g. barn owl).** Analyze potential predators' consumed prey items through analyzing pellets, stomach contents, etc. (2)

Goal 3: Research and development

- a. **Develop methods for assessing long term population trends.** Statistically robust methods for the detection of long term population trends are currently thought to be cost-prohibitive at relevant spatial scales. Efforts are needed to develop more cost effective methods to carry out state-wide long term population monitoring. (1)
- b. **Develop methods for the estimation of abundance.** Methods for the estimation of bat population levels are currently not available. Efforts are needed to develop and implement such methods in order to inform population models that can be used to understand population status, risk, and sensitivity to incidental take and other threats. (2)

Research Initiated Subsequent to the 2015 Guidance Document

Five research projects were selected as meeting identified research needs as well as other scientific criteria and were recommended for consideration for funding to HCP (new or amended) applicants. All five projects are now underway. Goals and objectives for each are described below and summarized in Table 2.

Hawaiian Hoary Bat conservation genetics

Research components related to Objectives for Goal 1, Basic Research:

- Quantify levels of genetic variation and population structure throughout Hawai'i
- Determine if distinct population boundaries exist among islands
- Estimate effective population size(s)
- Determine sex of bats collected and carcasses

Modeling foraging habitat suitability of the Hawaiian Hoary Bat

Research components related to Objectives for Goal 1, Basic Research:

- Echolocation, videography, and insect trapping

- Power analysis to estimate sampling effort for future studies of response to habitat restoration

Research components related to Objectives for Goal 2, Limiting Factors:

- Develop and test a technique that combines multiple sampling methods to specifically assess foraging habitat suitability
- Echolocation, videography, and insect trapping
- Power analysis to estimate sampling effort for future studies of response to habitat restoration

Hawaiian Hoary Bat conservation biology: movements, roosting behavior, and diet

Research components related to Objectives for Goal 1, Basic Research:

- Home range size- seasonality; three annual cycles
- Habitat use- foraging, roosting, and breeding
- Roost fidelity and roost tree characteristics
- Mother-pup behavior at roosts
- Movement patterns and food availability
- Tissue and fecal collection bank- genetic, diet and pesticide studies

Research components related to Objectives for Goal 2, Limiting Factors:

- Habitat use- foraging, roosting, and breeding
- Roost fidelity and roost tree characteristics
- Movement patterns and food availability
- Insect prey-host plant associations
- Diet analysis- insect prey selection and availability using molecular bar-coding techniques
- Tissue and fecal collection bank- genetic, diet, and pesticide studies

Hawaiian Hoary Bat home ranges, seasonal movements, habitat utilization, diet, and prey availability (Maui)

Research components related to Objectives for Goal 1, Basic Research:

- Determine home range and nightly and seasonal movements
- Evaluate foraging and roosting behavior
- Document the seasonal movements of bats

Research components related to Objectives for Goal 2, Limiting Factors:

- Define suitable habitat with acoustic sampling and radio-telemetry
- Assess risk of predation at maternity roosts through monitoring

Analysis of Hawaiian Hoary Bat occupancy, distribution, and habitat use (O'ahu)

Research components related to Objectives for Goal 1, Basic Research:

- Document distribution
- Estimate occupancy rates, detection probabilities, and covariate relationships
- Estimate seasonal changes in occupancy

Research components related to Objectives for Goal 2, Limiting Factors:

- Determine habitat suitability and characteristics to include vegetation community data, physical attributes, tree architecture, temperature, distance from water and forest, and other relevant variables
- Resource selection modeling

DRAFT

Table 2. Summary of Research in Progress and Associated Goals and Objectives

Note: X indicates primary contributor, x indicates indirect contributor

Goals and Objectives	Research Studies in Progress						Completed Studies
	Conservation genetics (USGS)	Modeling foraging habitat suitability (USGS)	Movement, roosting behavior, diet (USGS)	Home range, movement, habitat util., diet, prey avail. (HT Harvey)	Occupancy, distribution habitat use (West)	Non-RFP research projects in HI (ongoing)	Various
Goal 1 Basic Research							
a. Distribution					X		
b. Demography	x		x				
c. Home range and movements			X	X		x	X
d. Genetic variability	X		x	x		x	
e. Population modeling	x		x	x	x		X
Goal 2 Identify Limiting Factors							
<i>a. Suitable habitat</i>							
a.i. Define suitable habitat		X	X	X	X	X	X
a.ii. Relationship to distribution		X	X	X	X	X	X
a.iii. Relationship to abundance		x	x	x	x	x	x
a.iv. Experimental treatments							
<i>b. Food availability</i>							
b.i. Diet	x		X	X		X	X
b.ii. Prey selection		X	X	X			X
b.iii. Relationship to home range			x	x			x
b.iv. Relationship to success			x				
b.v. Experimental treatments							
b.vi. Food availability habitat type							
<i>c. Pesticides</i>							
c.i. Contaminant loads							
c.ii. Contaminants in prey							
c.iii. Correlation of loads-demography							
c.iv. Correlation of loads-occupancy							
<i>d. Predators</i>							
d.i. Bat reproductive success		x	x	x			x
d.ii. Bat predator food preference (cats, barn owls scat study)							
Goal 3 Research and Development							
a. Population trend methods							
b. Estimate of abundance methods							
c. Deterrent research							

Appendix 2. Habitat Conservation Plan Annual Report Template

DRAFT

Project Name
Annual Report
For the Period _____

Prepared for

Prepared by

Month, Year

This page intentionally left blank

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Include:

- basic project specifications and schedule
- any changes in management, operations, or ownership
- covered species
- covered activities
- monitoring information summary
- avoidance and minimization measures
- take summary including total take, fiscal year take, permitted take, and evaluation of take rate
- mitigation summary for covered species
- summary of any amendments including approvals
- summary of adaptive management including approvals
- plans for the future

Total observed fatalities and calculated total take since ITL issuance

Species Name	FY ____ Reporting Period	Total Permit Period from ____ through June 30, 20__				Permit/License Take
	Observed Take	Observed Take	Estimated Unobserved Take	Indirect Take using HCP multipliers	Estimated Take	

This page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Executive Summary.....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
LIST OF FIGURES.....	iv
Attachments.....	iv
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
2.0 PROJECT MONITORING PROGRAM	2-1
2.1 ACOUSTIC MONITORING	2-1
2.2 TAKE MONITORING.....	2-1
2.3 WILDLIFE EDUCATION AND INCIDENTAL REPORTING PROGRAM.....	2-1
2.4 SEEF.....	2-1
2.5 CARE AND SCAVENGER TRAPPING	2-1
2.6 ECOSYSTEM OR VEGETATION MONITORING.....	2-1
3.0 MBTA SPECIES TAKES.....	3-1
4.0 COVERED SPECIES TAKE, AVOIDANCE/MINIMIZATION AND MITIGATION.....	4-1
4.1 TAKE SUMMARY FOR ALL COVERED SPECIES	4-1
4.2 SPECIES 1	4-1
4.2.1 Avoidance and Minimization Measures	4-1
4.2.2 Direct Take	4-1
4.2.3 Indirect Take.....	4-2
4.2.4 Species 1 Take Summary.....	4-2
4.2.5 Lost Productivity	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3 SPECIES 2	4-3
5.0 MITIGATION.....	5-1
5.1 MITIGATION SUMMARY FOR ALL COVERED SPECIES.....	5-1
5.2 SPECIES 1	5-1
5.3 SPECIES 2	5-1
6.0 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT AND AMENDMENTS	6-1
6.1 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT	6-1
6.2 AMENDMENTS.....	6-1
7.0 FUNDING.....	7-1
7.1 EXPENDITURES	7-1
7.2 FUNDING ASSURANCE	7-1

8.0 OTHER TOPICS.....8-1
 8.1 PLANS AND MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES FOR THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR..... 8-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4-1. Covered Species Take Summary4-1
Table 4-2. Species 1 Direct Takes Attributable to the Project Since Permit Issue.....4-1
Table 4-3. Species 1 Direct Takes Not Attributable to the Project Since Permit Issue.....4-2
Table 4-4. Species 1 Take Summary.....4-2

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1. Project Vicinity Map 1-1
Figure 5-1. Location of mitigation projects 5-1

ATTACHMENTS

Possible Attachments: 

- Details for fatality monitoring, SEEF and CARE
- Fatality/Injury summary for species not covered in HCP and not MBTA
- Raw data for fatality estimator
- Fatality estimation input parameters and outputs
- Details for various take estimates and calculations
- Lost productivity calculations (when required)
- Mitigation reports
- Photographs
- Downed Wildlife Reports

OTHER ENCLOSURES PROVIDED ELECTRONICALLY - SEEF and CARE data files formatted for use in Evidence of Absence

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Include:

- Incidental Take License and Permit numbers
- citation of reporting requirements in HCP and HRS 195D-21(f)
- basic project specifications and schedule
- changes in management, operations, or ownership
- covered species
- covered activities
- list dates and purpose of meetings with regulatory agencies in the FY

Figure 1-1. Project Vicinity Map

2.0 PROJECT MONITORING PROGRAM

2.1 PRESENCE/ABSENCE/ABUNDANCE MONITORING

Acoustic, thermal, other monitoring.

2.2 TAKE MONITORING

2.3 WILDLIFE EDUCATION AND INCIDENTAL REPORTING PROGRAM

2.4 SEARCHER EFFICIENCY (SEEF)

Include type and number of carcasses placed, dates, number found, number removed before first search, whether repeated search was used, interval between searches (if applicable), and efficiency. Provide rationale for timing of SEEF and procedure for placement of carcass. Include vegetation class and map with GPS coordinates. Identify searchers and proctors. Please note—names can be redacted if a public request for the report is made. Include spread sheet with this data formatted for use in Evidence of Absence as an electronic file.

2.5 CARCASS RETENTION (CARE) AND SCAVENGER TRAPPING

Include number and type of carcasses placed, date of placement, method of monitoring (camera or human), scavenger results, and type of scavenger, if known. Include scavenger control measures, procedure, timing, bait, and outcomes. Include spread sheet with this data formatted for use in Evidence of Absence as an electronic file.

2.6 ECOSYSTEM OR VEGETATION MONITORING

Explain any monitoring results that are required in the HCP.

3.0 MBTA SPECIES FATALITIES OR INJURIES

Include fatalities or injuries occurring during the annual reporting period and since issue of permit.

List and summarize the details for each fatality or injury that occurred during the reporting period. Categorize as to covered species, MBTA, or none.

For injuries specify who handled the animal, where it was triaged and rehabbed, and the eventual outcome and all related dates.

Summarize pertinent information from USFWS permit report.

Table 3.1. MBTA species Take Summary

Species Name	Date Observed	Condition (dead, injured, etc.)	Actions taken	Disposition of animal or carcass

4.0 COVERED SPECIES TAKE, AVOIDANCE/MINIMIZATION AND MITIGATION

4.1 TAKE SUMMARY FOR ALL COVERED SPECIES

For injuries specify who handled the animal (e.g. was it DOFAW or if not then the reason and who did handle it), where it was triaged and rehabbed, and the eventual outcome.

Table 4-1. All Covered Species Take Summary

Species Name	FY ____ Reporting Period	Total Permit Period from ____ through June 30, 20__				Permit/License Authorized Take
	Observed Take During this FY	Observed Take	Estimated Unobserved Take	Calculated Indirect Take	Total Estimated Take	

4.2 SPECIES 1 (BATS)

4.2.1 Avoidance and Minimization Measures

Explain how project is meeting avoidance and minimization to the “maximum extent practicable”.

Explain any changes to these measures within the past year and what effect they have had.

For bats include an analysis of factors preceding bat takes that may have influenced takes including acoustic detector results (including temporal aspects and call types), weather (wind speed and direction, precipitation, storms) at or prior to takes, turbine operational details, moon phase, and information related to surrounding land practices such as grazing and cropping that might influence bat presence. All relevant factors that may explain takes should be evaluated and especially preceding periods of multiple HHB takes that occur within a short span of time, or other unusual timing or circumstances.

Summarize curtailment history and dates/hours and evaluation of effectiveness.

4.2.2 Direct Take

Summarize and explain data in tables below.


Table 4-2. Species 1 Direct Takes Attributable to the Project Since Permit/License Issue

Discovery Date	State FY	Fatal (yes/no)	Cause	Turbine # and curtail speed (m/s)	Distance from turbine (m)	Explain if not used in unobserved modeling
				only for wind HCPs	only for wind HCPs	only for wind HCPs

Table 4-3. Species 1 Observed Fatalities or Injuries Not Attributable to the Project Since Permit/License Issue

Discovery date	State FY	Fatal (yes/no)	Cause	Reason not attributed to project

Provide outputs from the EoA and include a graphical representation like the one below.



4.2.3 Indirect Take

Cite and use USFWS PIFWO guidance document for bats. to calculate indirect take on observed and unobserved. Please show all calculations including date of observed take, sex, and the number of observed and unobserved take based on the 80% credibility level. Assume a 1:1 female:male ratio for all take observed during the breeding season that were not definitively identified as to gender.

4.2.4 Species 1 Take Summary

Provide text summary and graphical representation showing take rate and include projection graph from EoA model for bats.

Table 4-4. Species 1 Take Summary

FY ____ Reporting Period	Total Permit Period through June 30, 20__				Permit/License Take
Observed Take	Observed Take	Calculated Unobserved Take	Indirect Take	Calculated Take	

4.3 SPECIES 2 [REPEAT SECTIONS .1 - .5 ABOVE FOR EACH SUBSEQUENT SPECIES]

5.0 MITIGATION

5.1 MITIGATION SUMMARY FOR ALL COVERED SPECIES

Include summary of status of meeting goals and objectives and success criteria.

Explain status of achieving net environmental and recovery benefit.

Figure 5-1. Location of mitigation projects

5.2 SPECIES 1 (BATS)

-overall schedule and progress of mitigation

-specific mitigation project(s) with status of meeting success criteria (cite attachments for details)

-progress in net gain of recovery of species

-progress in attainment of net environmental benefit

-reference to attachments if applicable

5.3 SPECIES 2

6.0 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT AND AMENDMENTS

6.1 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Describe problems or issues that required adaptive management.

Describe the evaluation of adaptive management decisions and comparison to triggers.

Evaluate triggers for take rate and mitigation progress and success

Explain what actions were taken if triggers are exceeded and a schedule for implementation

Explain the decision process and interaction/decisions with agencies

6.2 AMENDMENTS

Define minor and major amendments based on the HCP.

Summarize any action taken on major amendments and how documented.

7.0 FUNDING

7.1 EXPENDITURES

Status of funding per HRS 195D-21(f).

Summarize expenditures this fiscal year and project to date

7.2 FUNDING ASSURANCE

List all funding assurances in place and schedules.

Provide justification that the amount of funding assurance is adequate.

8.0 OTHER TOPICS

8.1 PLANS AND MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES FOR THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR

As required under 195D-21(f). Include “areas needing technical advice”.

Attachments

Appendix 3. HCP Requirements per HRS 195D

HCP Checklist for Key Components

Project Description and Covered Activities

- Project description
- Purpose and need: clear and detailed
- Specific discussion of power purchase agreements (PPAs) and implications for turbine operation details for wind energy
- Geographic plan area (includes mitigation areas)/Permit area (covered activities)
 - Description and maps of both plan area to include mitigation program areas, and area covered by Incidental Take License/Incidental Take Permit. Include Tax Map Keys (TMKs).
 - Permits/approvals required
- Description of covered activities that may result in take
- Alternative actions to the taking, as applicable (not an HRS 195D requirement but needed for an EA/EIS and Federal regulations)

Environmental Setting and Biological Resources

- Existing land use
- Ecosystem and vegetation for permit and plan areas
- Fauna for permit and plan areas

Covered Species

- Status and distribution of endangered, threatened, proposed, and candidate species (collectively covered species) with supporting studies
- Species description including life history
- Habitats/ecosystems used by the covered species
- Species use of the area
- Species in plan area that don't need coverage and why

Potential Biological Impacts and Take Assessment

- Anticipated take of each covered species
 - Direct take; lifecycle considerations; breeding, feeding, shelter
 - Specific causes or components of covered activities associated with take and duration of the take
 - Evidence of Absence (EoA) and 80% credibility used for unobserved direct take
 - Type of take (e.g., injury, mortality, harm, harassment)
 - Indirect take (use USFWS guidance for Hawaiian Hoary Bats)
 - Tiers if any and rationale
 - Lost productivity
- Anticipated impacts of the take/effect analysis
 - Resources required by species to fulfill lifecycle needs that may be affected by stressor
 - Identify the resource need affected (breeding, feeding, shelter) by stressor
 - Identify behavioral or physical response associated with each stressor (e.g., stress, displacement, lack of foraging ability, mortality)
- Cumulative effects: demographic consequence at population and species levels, both island-specific and Hawai'i-wide
 - Identify all other authorized take for each species, both on the project island and Hawai'i-wide
 - Demographic consequence at population and species levels, both island-specific and Hawai'i-wide
- Anticipated impacts of take on Critical Habitat

Conservation Program: Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation

- Biological goals
- Biological objectives
 - SMART: ○ Specific ○ Measurable ○ Achievable ○ Result-oriented ○ Time-fixed
 - Temporal and geographic scope of affected area (e.g., permit area, plan area)
 - Uncertainties
- Conservation measures to avoid and minimize take
 - Curtailment cut-in speed and justification
 - Curtailment seasonal and daily timing and justification
 - Details of turbine rotor speeds below manufacturer cut-in speed for the specific turbine models used
 - Details of operation for the specific curtailment cut-in speed proposed: rotor speeds, rolling average times, and wind speed measurement location to stop feathering
 - Deterrence research status and plans for the HCP
 - Description of potential avoidance and minimization that will be employed under adaptive management
- Measures to mitigate unavoidable take
 - Specific mitigation proposed including separate implementation plans
 - Ensure HCP minimizes and mitigates impacts to the maximum extent practicable and provides reasoning for the determination
 - Detailed, measurable mitigation success criteria during the permit term
 - Net environmental benefit and recovery analysis
 - Description of potential mitigation that might be employed under adaptive management
- A schedule for implementation of the proposed measures and actions

Monitoring and Reporting

- Avoidance, minimization, and observation training program for construction and operation staff
- Fatality monitoring
 - SEEF and CARE trial specifics and justifications
 - Bats to be sent to USGS for sex determination
 - Third party monitoring and proctoring
 - Notification requirements for downed wildlife and reference to state protocol
- Mitigation monitoring including analysis of success criteria and net benefit
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) monitoring and reporting
- Ecosystem, community, and habitat monitoring per requirement of 195D-21
- Reporting and meetings
 - Annual report contents: all monitoring results, direct and indirect take for fiscal year, take since permit start, mitigation progress, adaptive management, minor amendments, expenditures
 - Frequency of interim reports depending on complexity of the project and mitigation, e.g. quarterly
 - Annual and interim reports to include an estimate of total direct and indirect fatalities
 - Wind energy sites use 80% credibility limit to identify tier triggers (if any), and assess compliance with tier limits (if any) and the authorized take limit
 - Annual reports include calculation of lost productivity
 - Annual report recommendations
 - Frequency of update meetings depending on complexity of the project and mitigation

Adaptive Management

- Adaptive management strategy
 - Specific actions that may require adaptive management, e.g. take rate; new research or other information that shows that take minimization is available and practicable; mitigation success

- Triggers set for each action
- Specific analysis of defined objectives and success criteria, and process and timelines if triggers exceeded

Funding

- Budget includes monitoring, minimization, mitigation, contingency, funds for state compliance monitoring
- Description specifies that if a tier limit is reached mitigation for that tier must be fully funded and the next tier will not be authorized until mitigation is underway for that tier
- Funding assurance includes mitigation, contingency (or termed as adaptive management), and cost for state to take over management of mitigation if needed
- Inflation adjustments

Changed and Unforeseen Circumstances

- Changed circumstances
 - Identify all changed circumstances (per USFWS regulations)
 - Research or other information that shows an avoidance or minimization measure is likely to reduce take and is practicable
 - Develop thresholds for clearly identifying when circumstances are changed versus unforeseen
 - Develop responses for each circumstance: what will be the response to ensure goals and objectives are met if circumstance X happens to Y degree?
- No surprises description

Amendments

- In the event of a need for a formal amendment the applicant will work with the agencies to follow the most current agency regulations and policies
- Amendments
 - Minor Amendment
 - Circumstances requiring a minor amendment, e.g. reduce take, increase mitigation
 - Procedures for a minor amendment
 - Major Amendment
 - Circumstances requiring a major amendment
 - Specific trigger for when an amendment is needed when permitted take could be exceeded
 - Timelines for development of a major amendment
- Permit transfer (state ITL runs with the land)

Appendix 4. Evidence of Absence Indirect Take USFWS Guidance

Wildlife Agency Guidance for Calculation of Hawaiian Hoary Bat Indirect Take

In June 2016, the wildlife agencies discussed the possibility for standardizing the incidental take calculations for Hawaiian hoary bat for projects that have incidental take permits or incidental take licenses. As a result of that discussion we are recommending that proponents and their consultants consider using the following time periods and biological factors in their calculation of indirect take for observed Hawaiian hoary bat fatalities and for indirect take of unobserved Hawaiian hoary bats. Most of you will see very little change in the estimated take for your projects simply because the methods being used by everyone were somewhat similar. The only changes are really in the way the indirect is calculated and by the time the juveniles are converted to adults, there is only minor changes in total take estimation.

Calculation of Observed and Unobserved take will continue to be conducted with the Evidence of Absence software (Dalthorp et al. 2014 and Dalthorp and Huso 2015). The 80% credibility output will be used as a *general* guide for what the agencies are 80% confident has not been exceeded. This output plus the indirect take converted to adult bats will represent total take that we are 80% confident has not been exceeded. This total take at the 80% confidence level will also be used as the value to guide the triggering of the next tier level. The next tier level is currently triggered when 75% of the estimated take of the existing tier is reached or exceeded based on the output at the 80% credibility level plus indirect take.

Female Hawaiian hoary bats may be pregnant or supporting dependent young from April 1 through September 15 (Tomich 1986ab; Menard 2001; Uyehara and Wiles 2009; C. Pinzari, pers. comm. 2015). This is based on best science for the Hawaiian hoary bats or North American hoary bat surrogates and information in our files. The wildlife agencies understand that exceptions to this range can occur. However, the need to be conservative on the side of the species is primary. Second, the use of lactation to determine whether or not a female had dependent pups has been challenging, given the condition of the carcasses that are found. Thus, for these reasons, the Service recommends using April 1 through September 15 as a period in which a female bat taken may have been pregnant or lactating and will result in indirect take assessment on the direct take during this time period. This range would apply to all female observed carcasses. The determination of the sex of all carcasses found will be conducted through genetic testing by USGS.

The average number of pups attributed to a female that survive to weaning is unchanged and is assumed to be 1.8 which is based on Bogan, 1972 and Koehler & Barclay, 2000.

The sex ratio of bats taken through unobserved direct take will be assumed to be 50% female, unless there is substantial evidence to indicate a different sex ratio. Substantial evidence would need to be based on at least 10 or more bats.

The assessment of indirect take to a modeled unobserved direct bat take accounts for the fact that we do not know when the unobserved fatality may have occurred. The period of time from pregnancy to end of pup dependency for any individual bat is estimated to be 3 months. Thus the probability of taking a female bat that is pregnant or has dependent young is 25%, or 0.25.

The conversion of juveniles to adults has generally been 1 juvenile to 0.3 adults, though it has varied slightly from project to project. This was loosely based on the estimated survival of the little brown bat (*Myotis lucifugus*) which ranges from 20-48% (Humphrey & Cope 1976). The Service recognizes that this is a less than ideal surrogate for estimating Hawaiian hoary bat survival of a weaned pup to adult, but we have little other scientific evidence to base survival on, until it is established for the Hawaiian hoary bat. Thus, indirect take will be converted from juvenile to adult equivalency using the 0.3 conversion.

Based on the rationale presented above, the wildlife agencies recommend estimated total take be calculated as such:

Observed and Unobserved direct take calculated with Evidence of Absence and the output at 80% credibility used for calculating indirect take.

Indirect take assessed for females taken between April 1 and September 15:

The number of observed female bats taken between April 1 and September 15 x the average number of pups estimated at 1.8

Indirect take assessed for observed males taken at any time or females taken from September 16 through March 31 would be 0.

Indirect take assessed for unobserved take would be:

The estimated number of unobserved bats taken x the proportion of unobserved take that is female, which is assumed to be 0.50 x the proportion of the calendar year in which a female may be pregnant or have dependent young which is 0.25 x the average number of pups estimated at 1.8

Then to convert the indirect (juvenile) take to adults:

(Total indirect take based on observed take + Total indirect take based on unobserved take) x the conversion of juveniles to adults, 0.30.

Example using the above equations:

Observed take 5 bats. Assume Evidence of Absence output at 80% for the 5 observed bats is 13. This means 8 unobserved bats.

	<u>Indirect take</u>
2 of the observed bats were females taken between April 1 and September 15:	$2 \times 1.8 = 3.6$
1 of the observed bats was a female taken between September 16 and March 31:	0
2 of the observed bats were males:	0

We assume 4 of the 8 unobserved bats taken were female: $4 \times 0.25 \times 1.8 = 1.8$

Total indirect take of juveniles $3.6 + 0 + 0 + 1.8 = 5.4$

Conversion of juveniles to adults $5.4 \times 0.3 = 1.62$

Total take based on 80% credibility basis: $13 + 1.6 = 14.6$ rounded up to 15 bats.

Literature Cited

- Bogan, B.A. 1972. Observations on parturition and development in the hoary bat, *Lasiurus cinereus*. *Journal of Mammalogy* 53:611-614.
- Dalthorp, D. and Huso, M. 2015. A framework for decision points to trigger adaptive management actions in long-term incidental take permits. U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2015-1227:88.
- Dalthorp, D., Huso, M., Dail, D., and Kenyon, J. 2014. Evidence of absence software user guide: U.S. Geological Survey Data Series 881, 34 pp. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/ds881>.
- Humphrey, S. R. and Cope, J.B. 1976. Population ecology of the little brown bat, *Myotis lucifugus*, in Indiana and North-central Kentucky. Special Publication No. 4 of the American Society of Mammalogists. i-vii, 1-81.
- Huso, M.S.P., Dalthorp, D. Dail, D. and Madsen, L. 2015. Estimating wind-turbine-caused bird and bat fatality when zero carcasses are observed. *Ecological Applications* 25:1213-1225.
- Koehler, C.E. and Barclay, R.M.R. 2000. Post-natal growth and breeding biology of the hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus*). *Journal of Mammalogy* 81:234-244.
- Menard, T. 2001. Activity patterns of the Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*) in relation to reproductive time periods. M.S. Thesis, Ecology, Evolution, and Conservation Biology Program, University of Hawaii, Manoa. 149 pp.
- Pinzari, C. 2015. Observation of dependent Hawaiian hoary bat pup September 2-3, 2015 on the island of Hawaii. Email to Dawn Bruns, et al., USFWS and DOFAW personnel, September 3, 2015.
- Tomich, P. Q. 1986. Endangered species information system species workbook. Part I - Species distribution. Unpublished U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Report. Available at U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services, Honolulu. 20 pp.
- Tomich, P.Q. 1986. Endangered species information system species workbook. Part II - Species biology, Unpublished U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Report. Available at U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services, Honolulu. 38 pp.
- Uyehara, K. and Wiles, G. 2009. Bats of the U.S. Pacific Islands. U.S.D.A. National Resources Conservation Service. Biology Technical Note 20. 34 pp.

Appendix 5. Downed Wildlife Protocol 2019

Contact the agencies for the most current version of the Downed Wildlife Protocol.

DRAFT

DOWNED WILDLIFE PROTOCOL

STANDARD PROTOCOL FOR HOLDERS of a State of Hawai`i
INCIDENTAL TAKE LICENSE and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
INCIDENTAL TAKE PERMIT
RESPONDING TO
DEAD OR INJURED BIRDS AND BATS THAT ARE
THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES OR MBTA SPECIES

[For species not listed as endangered or threatened or MBTA use the
downed wildlife form at the end of this document]

Do not move wildlife unless in imminent danger.
Call DOFAW immediately for your island using the phone numbers in
Attachment 1

Fill out information on the downed wildlife form using the version with the
same date as this protocol and send as directed later in this protocol

OVERVIEW

The islands of Hawai`i contain numerous native and endemic species of wildlife that are protected by strict state and federal laws. This protocol is geared towards downed (injured or deceased) wildlife and focused on the endangered Hawaiian hoary bat and avian species protected by the Endangered Species and Migratory Bird Treaty Acts. The likelihood of encountering injured or dead wildlife that are protected by state and federal endangered species laws should be considered equal to encountering non-listed species. Therefore, all downed wildlife should be treated with the same safeguards and care to ensure adequate response and documentation according to the following set of guidelines.

Always be prepared for discovery of downed birds and bats. Please ensure that all staff and personnel are trained in this protocol, and that contact information, written protocols, and supplies are ready for response.

The first response for downed birds and bats is to call the local Hawai`i Division of Forestry and Wildlife (DOFAW) Office. The DOFAW staff is generally able to respond by sending someone to the scene to retrieve the injured or deceased wildlife. If DOFAW staff cannot be reached, you must leave a message and call-back number. In the event that DOFAW personnel are reached but not able to respond right away, they may instruct those reporting the incident to provide necessary response. Follow their directions carefully.

If DOFAW staff cannot be contacted, especially if the downed animal is in imminent danger, you should be prepared to handle the animal yourself, following the protocol, and transport them to DOFAW or a permitted wildlife rehabilitator. Again, you should only handle injured wildlife if DOFAW staff cannot be contacted or if the animal is in imminent danger.

DOWNED WILDLIFE PROTOCOL

PREPARING TO RESPOND FOR DOWNED OR INJURED BIRDS AND BATS

In all cases, ensure that all field staff are trained in the response protocol for injured birds and bats. Ensure they have read and understand the protocol, and have the protocol posted (including highlighted contact information) in a prominent location. Make sure that all staff know who to contact, and where supplies for handling injured wildlife are located. Staff should be regularly briefed on protocols, especially at the beginning of each distinct season that might correspond with a heightened likelihood of encountering downed wildlife.

Non-governmental parties should make prior arrangements, including procedures and payments with the rehabilitation or veterinary care facilities that will be used to treat injured animals.

At a minimum, for vehicles or foot patrols where maintaining a wildlife response kit (carrier) may be impractical, keep a copy of the protocol handy and accessible along with a large clean towel, soft cloth such as a t-shirt or flannel, several flags or tent stakes, and a pair of gloves, all of which are to be specifically designated for use in injured wildlife response.

For facilities and dedicated vehicles, please prepare and maintain one or more carriers designated for handling and transporting injured wildlife. This response kit should contain: a large clean towel; soft cloth such as a t-shirt or flannel; several flags or tent stakes; several pairs of gloves (plastic/latex disposable gloves and also heavy duty gloves such as leather or heavy rubber that can be sanitized); eye protection; a ventilated cardboard box, pet carrier, or other non-airtight container; and a copy of the protocol. For larger facilities (managed areas such as wildlife refuges, preserves, wetlands, or conservation areas), or areas where downed birds and bats are likely, please maintain several containers of various sizes. The container must provide enough room for the animal to comfortably move around, but also be sturdy enough to hold active birds or bats.

For small birds or bats, cardboard pet carriers or 'living world' plastic carriers work well as they have many ventilation holes and handles for easy carrying. Waxed pet carriers are preferred because they are sturdier, hold up longer, and can be thoroughly cleaned between uses. Sturdy cardboard boxes with holes punched in them to allow cross ventilation are also good. For birds, holes no wider than one inch in diameter should be punched on all four sides of the box. For bats, holes must be no larger than one-half inch diameter. A minimum of eight holes per side is sufficient. The carrier should be padded inside, well-ventilated and covered (to provide a sense of security).

Plastic dog kennels are recommended for handling larger birds, such as petrels, shearwaters, owls, hawks, ducks, stilts, and geese. All cages must have towels or rags placed in the bottom to help prevent slipping and protect bird feet and keels. The towel or other cushioning material should be sufficient to cover the bottom of the container effectively.

Cardboard boxes that are used for transporting injured wildlife should only be used once then discarded to avoid cross-contamination and/or disease or pathogen transfer. If plastic kennels or waxed pet carriers are used, be sure that they are adequately cleaned or sterilized between uses. Never put two animals in the same container.

Always wear personal protective equipment when handling downed wildlife. Disease and contamination exposure can work in both directions (bird or bat to person, and vice versa); always use protection against direct contact. If it becomes necessary to handle a bird, always wear disposable gloves. If multiple animals are being handled ensure that a new pair of gloves is used between each bird or bat.

Never put birds or bats near your face. When handing a bird or bat to someone else, make sure that the head, neck, and wings are secure and in control first to avoid serious injury to handlers and to minimize

DOWNED WILDLIFE PROTOCOL

injury to the animal. Never allow an alert bird with injuries to move its head freely while being handled – many birds will target eyes and can cause serious injury if not handled properly. Communicate with the person you are working with.

Never feed an injured bird or bat. The dietary needs of most species are more delicately balanced than many people realize. Most injured animals are suffering from dehydration, and attempting to feed or water the animal may kill it, as it is probably not yet able to digest solid food or even plain water. Often, when an injured animal arrives at a veterinary or rehabilitation facility, it is given a special fluid therapy for several days before attempts to feed the animal begin.

Handle wild birds and bats only if it is absolutely necessary. The less contact you have with the animal, the more likely it will survive.

NOTE: For remote sites with spotty coverage, ground staff may need to have a planned communication system with radios, or a cell carrier known to provide adequate coverage, that will allow communication with a designated contact able to relay information to DOFAW island biologist at the appropriate numbers listed in Attachment 1.

IF YOU FIND A LISTED OR MBTA BIRD OR BAT WHICH IS INJURED AND IN IMMINENT DANGER:

1. Do not put yourself in danger. Always wear personal protective equipment and clothing, including gloves and eye protection, to protect yourself when handling injured wildlife.
2. Mark the location with a flag or tent stake. **Record the time and location of the observation including the animal species and its condition, and call the DOFAW island biologist immediately at the number in Attachment 1.** Contact information is in prioritized order; if you don't reach the first person on the list, you must call the next. If possible, have someone stay with the animal while someone else calls. If there is no response from either party the animal may be picked up and transported to a qualified care facility after documenting key information and taking photos. If the animal is in imminent danger and you are able to protect it from further harm, mark the location where it was found with a flag or tent stake.
3. Pick up the bird or bat as safely as possible. Always bear in mind your safety first, and then the injured animal. If picking up a bird, approach and pick up the bird from behind as soon as possible, using a towel, t-shirt, or cloth by gently wrapping it around its back and wings. Gently covering the head (like a tent) and keeping voices down will help the animal remain calm and greatly reduce stress. If picking up a bat, use only a soft light-weight cloth such as a t-shirt or towel (toes can get caught in towel terry loops). Place the cloth completely over the bat and gather up the bat in both hands. You can also use a kitty litter scooper (never used in a litter box before) to gently "scoop" up the bat into a container.
4. Record the date, time, location, condition of the animal, and circumstances concerning the incident as precisely as possible. Place the bird or bat in a ventilated box (as described above) for transport. Never put two animals in the same container. Provide the animal with a calm, quiet environment, but do not keep the animal any longer than is necessary. It is critical to safely transport it to a wildlife official or veterinary professional trained to treat wildlife as soon as possible. While coordinating transport to a facility, keep the injured animal secure in the rescue container in a warm, dark, quiet place. Darkness has a calming effect on birds, and low noise levels are particularly important to help the animal remain calm. Extra care should be taken to keep wildlife away from children and pets.

DOWNED WILDLIFE PROTOCOL

5. Transportation of the animal to DOFAW per coordination with DOFAW staff may be required as soon as possible.
6. Notify HCP staff of DOFAW at the Honolulu office and USFWS within 24 hours via email.
7. Fill out a Downed Wildlife Form (use the version with the same date as this protocol) and report to the appropriate official(s) including DOFAW and USFWS HCP staff within 3 days.
 - a. For DOFAW send to the following email addresses: dofaw.hcp@hawaii.gov; lauren.taylor@hawaii.gov
 - b. For USFWS send to the following email addresses: lasha-lynn_salbosa@fws.gov, and cc: rebecca_frager@fws.gov, jenny_hoskins@fws.gov, and jennifer_roth@fws.gov
8. If you must keep the bird or bat overnight, keep it in a ventilated box with a secure lid. Please keep the animal in a quiet, dark area and do not attempt to feed, handle, or release it. Continue to try to contact DOFAW staff and veterinary care facilities.

IF YOU FIND A LISTED OR MBTA BIRD OR BAT WHICH IS INJURED BUT NOT IN IMMEDIATE DANGER:

9. Do not put yourself in danger. Always wear personal protective equipment and clothing, including gloves and eye protection, to protect yourself when handling injured wildlife.
10. Mark the location with a flag or tent stake. **Record the time and location of the observation including the animal species and its condition, and call the DOFAW island biologist immediately at the number in Attachment 1.** Contact information is in prioritized order; if you don't reach the first person on the list, you must call the next. If possible, have someone stay with the animal while someone else calls. If there is no response from either party the animal may be picked up and transported to a qualified care facility after thoroughly documenting the situation in the downed wildlife form and taking appropriate photos.
11. Usually DOFAW staff will have you leave the animal in place while they come and get the animal, but dependent on the situation they may provide other instructions. Please follow their directions.
12. While waiting for DOFAW staff to arrive, minimize noise and movement in the area around the wildlife. Watch the animal so that its location is not lost if it moves away. If possible, keep sources of additional harassment or harm, such as pets, vehicles, and loud noises, away from the animal. Note any changes in the condition of the animal.
13. Notify HCP staff of DOFAW at the Honolulu office and USFWS within 24 hours of discovery via email.
14. Fill out a Downed Wildlife Form (use the version with the same date as this protocol) and report to the appropriate official(s) including DOFAW and USFWS HCP staff within 3 days.
 - a. For DOFAW send to the following email addresses: dofaw.hcp@hawaii.gov; lauren.taylor@hawaii.gov
 - b. For USFWS send to the following email addresses: lasha-lynn_salbosa@fws.gov, and cc: rebecca_frager@fws.gov, jenny_hoskins@fws.gov, and jennifer_roth@fws.gov

DOWNED WILDLIFE PROTOCOL

Do not attempt to release the bird or bat yourself. Do not move injured wildlife unless explicitly instructed by DOFAW. DOFAW will need to document circumstances associated with the incident. The animal may also have internal injuries or be too tired or weak to survive. Never throw the bird or bat into the air as this could cause more injury or result in death. Let trained staff or veterinary personnel familiar with wildlife rehabilitation and care examine the animal and decide when, where, and how to proceed.

IF YOU FIND A LISTED OR MBTA **DECEASED** BIRD OR BAT:

All listed (MBTA and T&E species) wildlife found deceased must be reported ASAP upon detection to DOFAW and USFWS.

1. Mark the location with a flag or tent stake. **Record the time and location of the observation including the animal species and its condition, include photo documentation.**
2. **Call the DOFAW island biologist immediately at the number in Attachment 1.** Contact information is in prioritized order; if you don't reach the first person on the list, you must call the next. **Do not** move or collect the wildlife unless directed to do so by DOFAW. If necessary place a cover over the wildlife carcass or pieces of carcass *in-situ* (a box or other protecting item) to prevent wind or scavenger access from affecting its (their) position(s). Usually DOFAW staff will have you leave the animal in place while they come and get the animal, but dependent on the situation they may provide other instructions. Please follow their directions carefully.
3. If the DOFAW island biologist primary and secondary contacts (at the numbers in Attachment 1) cannot be reached within 1 hour, the carcass should be double bagged and placed in the refrigerator, not the freezer, until appropriate disposition is determined by the wildlife agencies. However, if the carcass is clearly from a wind energy turbine collision it can be placed directly in the freezer. The island biologist must still be contacted and when reached their instructions followed.
4. Also notify HCP staff of DOFAW at the Honolulu office and USFWS within 24 hours of discovery via email.
5. DOFAW island biologists will determine if the carcass should be submitted to the National Wildlife Health Center Honolulu Field Station (Dr. Thierry Work) for necropsy. The general considerations are as follows: if the fatality appears atypical for the species and situation the carcass may be a candidate for necropsy. If cause of fatality is questionable DOFAW or USFWS HCP biologists should provide instructions on how to proceed.
6. Fill out a Downed Wildlife Form (use the version with the same date as this protocol) and send to the appropriate official(s) including DOFAW and USFWS HCP staff within 3 days.
 - a. For DOFAW send to the following email addresses: dofaw.hcp@hawaii.gov; lauren.taylor@hawaii.gov
 - b. For USFWS send to the following email addresses: lasha-lynn_salbosa@fws.gov, and cc: rebecca_framer@fws.gov, jenny_hoskins@fws.gov, and jennifer_roth@fws.gov

Attachment 1. Contact List for Downed Wildlife Protocol for DOFAW Island Biologists

Island	Primary Contact	After business hours/weekends
Maui	(808) 984-8100 (First Primary Contact) [Secondary: (808) 268-5087, (808) 870-6344, (808) 280-4114 (seabirds)]	(808) 870-6344, (808) 268-5087, (808) 280-4114 (seabirds)
Moloka`i	(808) 553-1745, (808) 870-7598	(808) 870-7598
Lana`i	(808) 565-7916, (808) 357-5090	(808) 357-5090
East Hawai`i	(808) 974-4221	(808) 640-3829
West Hawai`i	(808) 887-6063	(808) 339-0983
O`ahu	(808) 973-9786, (808) 295-5896	(808) 295-5896, (808) 226-6050
Kaua`i	(808) 274-3433 (808) 632-0610, (808) 635-5117 [Secondary: (808) 212-5551 for Kaua`i Seabirds HCP and KIUC Short-term HCP]	(808) 645-1576, (808) 635-5117

Downed Wildlife Forms on the following pages:

Downed Wildlife Incident Documentation and Reporting Form for LISTED and MBTA SPECIES
Downed Wildlife Form for Species NOT LISTED or MBTA

Downed Wildlife Incident Documentation and Reporting Form

LISTED and MBTA SPECIES

Facility Name:**Species Common Name:****Species Scientific Name:****Four Letter Code:** [common name, e.g. HOBA for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat; contact DOFAW unsure]:**File Name:** [naming convention: SPECIESCODE_YEAR_MM-DD_FACILITY ABBREVIATION]

Observer Name:	
Report Prepared by:	
Date of Incident:	
Date of report:	
Fatality or Injury:	
Age (Adult/Juvenile), if known:	
Sex (if known):	
Incidental or Routine Search:	
Date Last Surveyed:	
Official Search Dist. and Whether In or Out	
Time Observed (HST):	
Time Initially Reported to DOFAW (HST):	
Time Picked Up and By Who:	
Deceased Animal Sent for Necropsy (Y/N)	
General Location:	
GPS Coordinates units and datum; prefer: GCS WGS84 or NAD83 UTM Zone 4N (specify):	
Closest Turbine #, distance from and bearing:	
Closest structure and distance (non-turbine):	
Ground Cover Type and Height (cm):	
Cloud Cover (%):	
Cloud Deck (m above ground level):	
Precipitation:	
Temperature (°F)	
Wind Direction&Speed for Wind Projects (m/s):	

Details:

Condition of Specimen [include a description of the animal's general condition, as well as any visible injuries, be specific (*e.g.*, large cut on right wing tip)]:

Probable Cause of Injuries and Supportive Evidence [be descriptive, *e.g.*, 'teeth marks visible on upper back', or 'found adjacent to tire marks in mud']:

Action Taken [include names, dates, and times, whether sent for necropsy]:

Additional Comments:

Include the following:

- photos up close and photo with nearest structures or turbines in the background; include a ruler or measuring device to provide scale
- map showing aerial imagery with location of found animal, search area polygon, turbine numbers, and nearby features, roads, and structures labeled where applicable

Additional Information Required for Covered Species at HCP Wind Energy Sites

- For the turbine associated with the fatality, include a figure showing rotor speed, wind-speed, and all weather variables for the time period spanning the last two search periods up to the time the fatality or injury was found.
- Moon phase
- Presence and description of grazing cattle within 1 mile of the turbines (bats only)
- Presence of any standing or flowing water within 1 mile of the turbines (including watering troughs)(bats only)

Downed Wildlife Incident Documentation and Reporting Form

SPECIES NOT LISTED OR MBTA

Facility Name:

Species Common Name:

Species Scientific Name:

Four Letter Code: [common name, e.g. HOBA for the Hawaiian Hoary Bat; contact DOFAW unsure]:

File Name: [naming convention: SPECIESCODE_YEAR_MM-DD_FACILITY ABBREVIATION]

Observer Name:	
Date of Incident:	
Species (common name):	
Age (Adult/Juvenile), if known:	
Sex (if known):	
Incidental or Routine Search:	
Time Observed (HST):	
General Location:	
GPS Coordinates; GCS WGS84 or NAD83 UTM Zone 4N) (specify):	
Closest Turbine #, distance from and bearing:	
Closest structure (e.g., Turbine # or Bldg):	
Distance to Base of closest structure:	
Bearing from Base of closest structure:	
Condition of specimen:	
Action Taken:	
Temperature:	
Precipitation within the past 24 hours	
Wind Direction&Speed for Wind Projects (m/s):	

Probable Cause of Injuries and Supportive Evidence:

Additional Information:

[Photos]

Appendix 6. Hawaiian Hoary Bat Vortex Population Exercise

DRAFT

Kristin Jonasson – Comments on 2020 Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance Document

II. Background

“The Hawaiian Hoary Bat, also known as the ‘ōpe‘ape‘a, is an endemic subspecies of the North American Hoary Bat (*L. c. cinereus*)”

- Hawaiian hoary bats are recognized at the species level (*Lasiurus semotus*) (<https://batnames.org/>). I have personally confirmed this with Dr. Nancy Simmons, the curator-in-charge of the Department of Mammalogy at the American Museum of Natural History.

“...they may use several distinct core use areas, each with a mean size of about 63 acres (25.5 hectares) with little to no overlap (Bonaccorso et al. 2015).”

- This statement requires more context. That study looked at bats in one circumstance (season and location) and are not representative of the bat’s year-round requirements”. The paper repeatedly cautions extrapolation of behavior during the monitoring period to other locations and times of year.

“We emphasize that given current technology the window of time for documenting the movements of small bats (< 25 g body mass) barring recapture is limited to approximately 3 weeks (the life of a single transmitter battery) and thus any descriptions of FR are by necessity relatively brief snapshots in time.”

“Although population estimates are not currently available, studies suggest that the Hawaiian Hoary Bat population on Hawai‘i Island may be stable and potentially increasing (Gorresen et al. 2013).”

- It is important to caution that this trend may not be applicable to other islands which have different levels of development and human impact currently and historically.

“Bat collisions and mortality at wind facilities are well-documented throughout the U.S., mostly involving migratory tree-roosting bat species such as silver-haired, hoary, and eastern red bats ...”

- A more recent book chapter (Arnett et al. 2016), shows that the most common feature shared by susceptible species is the use of open habitats. "An emerging hypothesis is that bats that regularly move and feed in less cluttered and more open air-space are most vulnerable to collisions with wind turbines, regardless of continent, habitat, migratory patterns, and roost preferences."

III. Assessment of Take and Impacts for HCPs

D. Bat activity Monitoring

“§195D-4(g)(3) provides that the applicant shall cover all costs to monitor the species.”

Is this just referencing fatality surveys, or does it also include other monitoring? Consider clarifying in the document.

E. Impacts of Take

4. That applicants and agencies should assume, until such time as the best available science informs otherwise, that the Hawaiian Hoary Bat populations on O‘ahu, Maui, and Hawai‘i are not more than 1,000, 1,500, and 5,000 bats, respectively.

- It is good that consistent population numbers are used for all HCPs on the same island. These numbers appear to come from Appendix 6, but the logic of how they were selected is not provided.

IV. Hawaiian Hoary Bat Take Avoidance and Minimization Measures

B. Project Siting

“Wind characteristics including a determination of how much a facility can minimize Hawaiian Hoary Bat incidental take through curtailment.”

- This is an excellent recommendation.

“Restoration in the area which could attract bats. “

- Given the ability of bats to easily travel several km in a night, what qualifies as “in the area” this is vague enough that it could be easily misinterpreted.

“Researchers with USGS are currently investigating the possibility of a link between grazing and bat activity.”

- Great! This is worthy of investigation.
- Recommended landscape features to avoid are not listed. Forested ridge tops are where the conflict between bats and wind-energy first became apparent (*see* Arnett et al. 2008). Additionally, the 2019 HT Harvey study showed that gulches are a frequently used habitat. Kawaihoa is the wind energy facility with the highest level of take and is also situated on forested ridges. The increased risks of building new facilities on forested ridgetops deserves discussion, as well as other habitat features that could increase fatality risk. Moreover, improving our understanding of siting risk is and avoiding high risk areas is likely the most cost-effective way to reduce fatality.

C. Turbine Specifications

“Bat foraging behavior may be influenced by the turbines themselves because of 1) an attraction of bats to the turbine for various reasons, most unknown.”

- The attraction hypothesis deserves merit and there are several papers which support this. This is also something for developers to be aware of and consider when they are conducting pre-construction surveys.

E. Bat Deterrence Technology

“ultra violet (UV) light deterrents”

- I haven’t seen any studies on this, but UV lights insect nocturnal attractants, especially moths. There would be a risk that these UV lights could accumulate prey and attract bats.

V. Mitigation

C. Mitigation Recommendations

“Coordinated island wide and with other organizations in order to provide Hawaiian Hoary Bat habitat that is well distributed throughout the island, spans a range of elevations, and that complements the recovery of other Hawaiian species.”

- Excellent that this plan is looking at island-scale management and complementing the recovery of other Hawaiian species.

“There are also data to indicate that Hawaiian Hoary Bats may use habitats and species that are not indigenous to the Hawaiian Islands for foraging, roosting, and breeding “

- The use of “may” in this sentence does not accurately represent the best available science. Recent publications show extensive use of non-native insect prey, habitats and roosts.

“Monitoring of the response by the Hawaiian Hoary Bat population to the mitigation action using the best available methods for the detection of Hawaiian Hoary Bat occupancy, presence, distribution, or abundance; ...”

- Discussion of what these metrics mean in laypeople’s terms would be useful. This would be useful so that all parties understand the strengths and limitations of what can be inferred from these numbers.
- For example: Occupancy analysis has been suggested as a means of monitoring the population. An area is occupied if a bat is detected once during a single survey. In a draft for an HCP (Auwahi Draft Final HCP, July15, 2019 page 3-8) occupancy was multiplied by expected core use area to estimate the number of bats present on the island. However, a single echolocation call in a week is hardly the level of activity expected for where a bat spends half of its foraging time. Another caution with occupancy analysis is that it cannot account for changes in home range size – if bats have to range farther in degraded habitat to acquire the food they need, then the same land area will be covered by fewer bats, masking a potential decline.

“... native forests represent the natural habitats to which Hawaiian Hoary Bats are adapted and should make up the core of restoration goals, in the absence of compelling information otherwise.”

- Continuing to think of Hawaiian hoary bats as native forest specialists is limiting. Recent studies have demonstrated that Hawaiian Hoary bats are generalists that forage extensively in open areas (HT Harvey 2019, Pinzari et al. 2019) and eat native and non-native insects (HT Harvey 2019, Pinzari et al. 2019). Non-native trees were used exclusively as when roost trees could be identified (HT Harvey 2019), likely in part because large native roost trees are less common. It is possible when bats roosted in inaccessible parts of forested landscape, they did use native trees.

“The above physiognomies occur in habitats that include undisturbed native forest, mature eucalyptus plantations having mixed understory trees and shrubs, lowland forest dominated by introduced trees, suburban and urban areas richly planted with ornamental trees, grassland/pasture, river gorges, arboretums, macademia nut orchards, and coastal embayments (Tomich 1986; Jacobs 1993; Barclay et al. 1999; Gorresen et al. 2013).” [BONACORRSCO ET AL. 2015]

Perhaps the most obvious indicator that Hawaiian hoary bats aren’t forest specialists is that they are killed at wind turbines at all. Native Hawaiian honeycreepers are not killed at wind turbines because they don’t interact with them. Affected Hawaiian birds (i.e. ‘ua’u and nēnē) fly quickly and at higher altitudes than forest birds. Open air foraging appears to be a trait shared by bat species susceptible to wind-turbine mortality (Arnette et al. 2016).

These studies provide compelling evidence that Hawaiian hoary bats are not native forest specialists. This finding is exciting because it means that there are more diverse solutions for their recovery. In addition, roosting is only one factor to consider when mitigating impact.

Bats forage using an entirely different sensory modality (echolocation) on prey we rarely observe (nocturnal moths). Because of this, researchers need to be aware of our biases to ensure that restoration efforts don’t just look good to us, but also function as intended.

1. While Hawaiian hoary bats adapted to the original Hawaiian landscape, we should ensure that native habitats still contain sufficient insects to provide appropriate prey. Hawaii has suffered devastating losses to its invertebrates (Asquith 1995, Dunn 2005). It is very possible some insect

species that bats relied on, have gone extinct or will not readily return once native trees are planted. As insectivores, bats are at least one step removed from a mitigation action, we cannot directly plant their food (i.e. the way 'ōhi'a is planted for native forest birds). Recent genetic barcoding of bat fecal pellets has identified their insect prey to the genus and species level. *I recommend that HCPs state the specific insect prey species they are attempting to restore and link the ability of the plants selected for restoration to act as hosts for these insects.*

2. Additional native habitats can provide suitable foraging habitat for Hawaiian hoary bats. Native shrubland at elevation filled with māmane has been used for foraging and can provide abundant insect moth prey (HT HARVEY 2019, Fig 18.), and is used by foraging bats (HT HARVEY 2019, Appx. D, Bat 7 and Bat 20). The introduced moth tropical grass webworm (*Herpetogramma licarsisalis*) was found in 6 of 11 bat fecal samples. Endemic moths (*Omiodes continuatalis*) that feed on non-native grasses were also a prey item. *I recommend shrublands be considered for restoration of foraging habitat.*
3. Given that Hawaiian hoary bats feed on native and non-native moths that frequently forage on grasses we must ensure that shrublands and pasture are not de-facto considered degraded habitat for this species. If non-native food resources are replaced by native plants that provide a lower biomass of insect prey, then restoration efforts could backfire and decrease foraging habitat quality. Non-native pine/eucalyptus forest is likely a more suitable target for restoration than pasture as these forests appear to have lower levels of insect prey. *I recommend that prospective restoration sites be surveyed for the abundance of suitable insect prey prior to being considered. Quantification of suitable insect abundance before and after restoration is essential for determining if restoration goals have been met.*
4. It is clear that mitigation plans should restore native habitat whenever possible to share the benefits of habitat restoration with other native Hawaiian species and maximize the use of conservation dollars. However, it should not be assumed that all such interventions will be beneficial to Hawaiian hoary bats (as generalists) and brings into question if those measures are appropriate use of mitigation funds.

The recommendations: "Restoration efforts should include controlling the impacts of ungulates (e.g. fencing), removing key invasive species" (page 31) do not have this link.

i. How will fencing / ungulate exclusion benefit bats?

ii. Which invasive species are known to negatively impact bat foraging or roosting habitat quality and how?

To prevent this confusion, HCPs should answer the question: "What is the mechanism by which the interventions will improve a metric habitat quality (foraging/roosting)?"

5. Place emphasis on quality of foraging habitat at critical times of year. For example, energy demands during lactation are 30% greater than during pregnancy (Kurta et al. 1989).
6. Recommend use of herbicides that have minimal impacts on insects.
7. An emphasis is needed on interventions that could improve insect biomass and density. Insects have gone through massive population declines across the world (Sánchez-Bayo and Wyckhuys

2019) (sometimes termed the insect apocalypse:
<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/27/magazine/insect-apocalypse.html>)

NEW REFERENCES

Arnett EB, Baerwald EF, Mathews F, et al (2016) Impacts of wind energy development on bats: A global perspective. In: Voigt CC, Kingston T (eds) *Bats in the anthropocene: conservation of bats in a changing world*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp 295–323

Asquith A (1995) Alien Species and the Extinction Crisis of Hawaii's Invertebrates. 8

Barclay, R. M. R. (1989). The effect of reproductive condition on the foraging behavior of female hoary bats, *Lasiurus cinereus*. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 24(1), 31–37. doi: 10.1007/BF00300115

Dunn RR (2005) Modern Insect Extinctions, the Neglected Majority: *Modern Insect Extinctions*. *Conservation Biology* 19:1030–1036. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2005.00078.x>

Hayward B, Davis R (1964) Flight speeds in western bats. *J Mammal* 45:236–242.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1376986>

Sánchez-Bayo F, Wyckhuys KAG (2019) Worldwide decline of the entomofauna: A review of its drivers. *Biological Conservation* 232:8–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.01.020>

Salcedo H, Fenton M, Hickey M, Blake R (1995) Energetic consequences of flight speeds of foraging red and hoary bats (*Lasiurus borealis* and *Lasiurus cinereus*; Chiroptera: Vespertilionidae). *J Exp Biol* 198:2245

Kawailoa Wind

February 21, 2020

Lauren Taylor
Protected Species Habitat Conservation Planning Coordinator
Department of Land and Natural Resources Division of Forestry and Wildlife
1151 Punchbowl Street, Room 325
Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: Comments on Draft Updated Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance (January 2020 Version)


Dear Ms. Taylor:

Kawailoa Wind, LLC (Kawailoa Wind) reviewed the “Draft Hawaiian Hoary Bat Guidance for Renewable Wind Energy Proponents—Updated January 2020,” (Draft Guidance) and is responding to Endangered Species Recovery Committee (ESRC) and Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources (BLNR), Division of Forestry and Wildlife (DOFAW) request for comments.

Kawailoa Wind supports ESRC and DOFAW efforts to provide advice and assistance to the BLNR and applicants for Incidental Take Licenses for Hawaiian Hoary Bats. We respectfully submit the following comments:

- Purpose of the Guidance: Since the original (2015) ESRC bat guidance was issued, the ESRC and DOFAW have used that ESRC bat guidance document as de facto rules by which to evaluate their approval of wind energy project Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) and HCP Amendments. The Draft Guidance are not rules associated with HRS 195D but rather meant to provide guidance and recommendations for consideration. As defined by HRS 195D-(25), the ESRC is an administrative consultant to the BLNR, not a law-making body. The Guidance should clearly state that the document is not a rule or law.
- Best Available Science: The Draft Guidance does not utilize the most recent science on Hawaiian Hoary Bats or the interaction between wind energy and bats. The document must be revised to include current best available science including the science that will be presented at the March 2020 Hawaiian Hoary Bat workshop.
- Need for Public Comment: Prior to the ESRC considering the Draft Guidance for approval, an updated version of the document should be published for public comment to allow for input from developers, stakeholders, and other interested parties.

Thank you for considering these comments.



Chris Clevenger
Authorized Signatory
Kawailoa Wind, LLC

SWCA Bat Paper Comments

Section	Page	Comment
III.B. Take Calculualtions	11	Regarding item 3, is ESRC taking the stance that credit can be gained through implementation of curtailment?
III.D. Bat Activity Monitoring	14	The stated objectives for acoustic monitoring must be more focused to attain statistical significance. The ESRC is asking for a very robust level of statistical power that would be difficult to achieve using acoustic monitoring for even a very specific objective (e.g., change in August activity rate between Year 1 and Year 2 at nacelle level at Turbine B) because of typical variability in nightly activity rates. This level of statistical power is nearly impossible to achieve if the project proponent were to distribute their acoustic detectors to monitor bat activity at different heights, habitats, deterrent device installations, at the facility and in the vicinity to the facility, time scales, etc. mentioned in this section. This is troubling since it is implied that the results of monitoring could have fairly high stakes: project proponents are asked to potentially reduce impacts by adjusting curtailment protocols based on acoustic monitoring results.
III.D. Bat Activity Monitoring	13-14	The purpose of the acoustic monitoring as it ties into the requirements of the HCP needs to be defined. Does the acoustic monitoring data inform any adaptive management triggers or decisions for this facility? Can a change in activity rate result in imposed curtailment in the absence of a documented fatality? This section describes various analyses that could be informed by this type of monitoring data, but doesn't provide a study design to answer specific questions that are relevant to the HCP. It does not specify exactly what is required of project proponents or why.
III.D. Bat Activity Monitoring	13-14	This guidance would be improved if the authors were to do the following. 1) Specify how these metrics will inform decision-making within the regulatory framework defined by the HCP. 2) Recommend specific metrics of bat activity to reduce noise and increase statistical power. 3) Better define what "in the vicinity of wind facilities" means and how these data are to be used—for example, are these data to provide a control for trends in activity at the wind facility or are they trying to detect impacts to the population in the areas surrounding the facility? This strongly affects site placement. 4) Recommend a subset of turbines to monitor and the criteria for selecting these turbines. For example, we suggest monitoring the turbines with the highest activity or highest mortality rates long term. These rates may not be representative of activity throughout the facility but will produce the most statistical power to detect change and trends in activity rate, providing the highest return on investment. 5)

SWCA Bat Paper Comments

		Provide more specific guidance on the specific metrics of activity to track (e.g., number of hours with bat activity at nacelle height on-facility in August) and standardized statistical approaches to evaluating these data, particularly the incorporation of all the recommended covariates. 6) Specify how the infrared imaging should be used to enhance interpretation of the required acoustic monitoring. Additionally, provide guidance on how many acoustic monitoring locations should be imaged, reasonable sample sizes, and methods for image evaluation.
IV.D.3. Summary of Curtailment of Wind Turbines	25	Does ESRC support reducing the take request based on the committed curtailment regime? For example, based on Figure 6, committing to a 6.5 m/s curtailment regime should reduce take by 75%, and so if 6.5 m/s is applied, the take request should be able to be reduced by 75%.
V.C.1.a. Biological Goals and Objectives	32	Regarding item 3, the previous 40-acre per bat guideline was based on the same Bonaccorso et al. 2015 study. Please provide more justification on how you can support a 142% increase in the recommended acreage with no new data (excepting HT Harvey's study, which you state above is not well understood).