Exhibit:

Issue(s) CCN for Ameren
Outlaw Project

Type of Exhibit: Written Rebuttal

Testimony

Witness: Dr. Janet Haslerig

Sponsoring Party: Missouri

Department of Conservation

File No.: EA-2019-0371

Date Testimony Prepared: December 12, 2019

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION FILE NO. EA-2019-0371

WRITTEN REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

DR. JANET HASLERIG

Missouri Department of Conservation

December 12, 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. MDC INTERESTS	4
III. BALD EAGLE OVERVIEW	6
IV. SOLAR GENERATION PROJECTS IMPACTS ON BALD EAGLES, OTHER RAPTORS AND SONGBIRDS	
V MDC RECOMMENDATIONS	10

1 I. INTRODUCTION

2 q; I leade duite your manne, title and dubineds addition	2 (Q. Please state:	our name, title	and business	address
--	-----	------------------	-----------------	--------------	---------

- 3 A. Janet Haslerig, Ph.D., Resource Scientist, Missouri Department
- 4 of Conservation, P.O. Box 180, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0180.
- 5 Q. What are your qualifications and experience?
- 6 A. I have a Ph.D. in Wildlife Ecology and over 15 years of
- 7 professional experience in wildlife conservation. I have served as the Bald
- 8 Eagle Recovery leader for the Missouri Department of Conservation ("MDC")
- 9 since October 2010 where I am responsible for the monitoring and recovery of
- 10 bald eagle populations in the state.
- 11 Q. Have you testified previously before the Missouri Public
- 12 Service Commission?
- 13 A. Yes. I have provided testimony in the following cases before the
- Public Service Commission ("Commission"): EA-2018-0202, EA-2019-0021,
- 15 EA-2019-0181, and EA-2018-0010. In those cases, Ameren Missouri
- 16 ("Ameren") and Empire District Electric sought approval of Certificates of
- 17 Convenience and Necessity for wind farms in Schuyler/Adair, Atchison, and
- 18 Lawrence/Jasper/Barton/Dade counties, respectively.
- 19 Q. Are you familiar with the application for Certificate of
- 20 Convenience and Necessity ("CCN") filed by Ameren Missouri to
- 21 construct three utility-scale solar generation facilities?

- 1 A. Yes. I am familiar with the proposal to construct three utility-
- 2 scale solar generation facilities ("Projects") in Green City, Richwoods and
- 3 Livingston, Missouri. I have reviewed the Direct Testimony filed by Ameren
- 4 and (the Critical Issues Analysis reports) and have compared that
- 5 information with data contained in the MDC's Natural Heritage Database,
- 6 which indicates current and past locations of threatened and endangered
- 7 species as well as species designated by MDC as Species of Conservation
- 8 Concern ("SOCC") as described below.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

II. MDC INTERESTS

Q. Why is MDC intervening in this case?

A. MDC has a constitutional mandate to conserve fish, forest, and wildlife in the state for Missourians to enjoy now and in the future. MDC was formed through an initiative petition approved by voters in 1936 to create a Conservation Commission. Sportsmen protested earlier that decade that fees from hunting permit sales were used for projects other than wildlife preservation/management, plus the statewide wildlife populations were low (deer population not more than 2,000 animals and perhaps 3,500 turkeys scattered across 45 counties). Voters passed another ballot initiative ("Design for Conservation") in 1976 to fund increased research into forestry and all species of wildlife, and to expand recreational opportunities for the future.

1 The proposed construction and operation of the three solar 2 commercially operated facilities is the first of its kind in Missouri. MDC is 3 interested in gaining an understanding of the wildlife impacts of renewable 4 energy projects. While renewable energy projects can be positive, the 5 Commission and the public need to understand and weigh all potential 6 consequences associated with such projects. It is MDC's position that 7 consideration of fish and wildlife resources during project planning, siting, 8 construction, and operation can produce a renewable energy project that is 9 even more environmentally beneficial. Unfortunately, because of a lack of 10 reported fatality monitoring, MDC is still learning about the impacts of solar projects on certain wildlife species. Fatality monitoring at renewable energy 12 projects is critical to understanding and protecting wildlife in the future. MDC has an interest in protecting the investment made by Missourians 13 14 (through the Conservation Sales Tax) in conserving species that are rare or 15 were once rare in our state. MDC also has interest in conserving other 16 species, so they do not decline to the point of becoming federally protected.

11

17

18

19

20

21

What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony? Q.

A. The purpose of my testimony is to respond to the Application for a CCN and Direct Testimony filed by Ameren. My testimony summarizes my concerns about the proposed Projects -- that the projects may pose risks to bald eagles, as well as other raptors and songbirds in and around the Project

- 1 areas. I also explain why the Commission should impose monitoring and
- 2 reporting requirements to assist MDC in evaluating the risks to the state's
- 3 conservation interests.

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

III. BALD EAGLE OVERVIEW

6 Q. Are bald eagles currently protected by federal or state

7 law?

Α. Yes, both. While bald eagles were removed from the federal Endangered Species Act list in June 2007, they remain federally protected by the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, 16 U.S.C. 668-668c, and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, 16 U.S.C. 703-712. These acts generally prohibit anyone, without a permit, from taking or disturbing bald eagles, including their parts, nests, or eggs. The bald eagle is also designated by MDC as a Species of Conservation Concern ("SOCC"). This state designated status and rank indicate the level of concern about the species and/or natural community continued existence throughout its range in Missouri. The bald eagle is currently listed as "S3" within the state – which means that it is vulnerable in the state due to a restricted range, relatively few populations or occurrences, recent and widespread declines, or other factors making it vulnerable to extirpation. As an SOCC, the bald eagle in Missouri warrants routine monitoring to assess the population status and to document the

- 1 continual recovery of the species as well as detect any eminent or pending
- 2 threats to its survival.
- Q. Describe MDC's efforts in restoring, managing and protecting bald eagles.
- 5 MDC has invested and will continue to invest considerable 6 resources in the restoration, management and protection of bald eagles. From 7 1981 to 1990, MDC, in cooperation with USFWS and the Dickerson Park Zoo 8 in Springfield, released 74 young bald eagles in Missouri to reestablish them 9 as nesters. The eaglets were obtained from captive breeding facilities or 10 healthy wild populations and released in good nesting habitat at Mingo 11 National Wildlife Refuge and Schell-Osage Conservation Area. Since 1990, 12 MDC has opportunistically monitored the population of nesting bald eagles in the state. After the USFWS delisted bald eagles, MDC has systematically 13 14 surveyed nesting bald eagles under the USFWS post-delisting monitoring 15 plan. This plan calls for states nationwide to monitor the status of bald eagles 16 for a 20-year period. In 2006 (prior to the official delisting of the bald eagle 17 under the ESA), MDC participated in the pilot study to test the effectiveness 18 of the post-delisting monitoring protocol. Since then, MDC conducted 19 statewide aerial and ground surveys in 2011, 2016, 2017 and 2018. The 20 yearly estimated monetary cost of conducting aerial surveys is approximately 21 \$10,189 (helicopter only), not including staff hours.

1	Initiated in the spring of 2018, the Missouri Eagle Watch Program
2	allows volunteers to contribute to science by collecting critical monitoring
3	information necessary for the conservation and protection of bald eagles in
4	the state. The Eagle Watch Program is a standardized and comprehensive
5	eagle nest monitoring program using citizen scientists to monitor bald eagle
6	populations and their productive status. To date, there are 75 volunteers
7	monitoring 202 nests throughout the state.

IV. SOLAR GENERATION PROJECTS IMPACT ON BALD EAGLES,

OTHER RAPTORS AND SONGBIRDS

- Q. Are you concerned about the impact of the Projects on bald eagles, other raptors and songbirds? Why or why not?
- A. Yes, I am concerned about the potential impact of the Projects on bald eagles, other raptors, and songbirds. My primary concern is that there are not documented studies that assess the impacts of large-scale solar developments upon wildlife in general, and eagles, raptors and songbirds in particular. There is limited scientific literature on this topic, however, the range of potential impacts from large-scale solar projects on birds and other wildlife include habitat loss and fragmentation, impact trauma, solar flux,

- 1 predation, adverse reactions to noise, and infrastructure collision. ¹². Based
- 2 upon my review of MDC's Natural Heritage Database, there is currently one
- 3 known active bald eagle nest within 2.8 miles of the Livingston Project area.
- 4 Despite this lack of understanding of their long-term impacts to
- 5 wildlife, solar power projects are being constructed on the landscape at a
- 6 rapid pace. The U.S. Department of Energy projections suggest that the
- 7 solar energy sector could meet 14% of electricity demands in the contiguous
- 8 U.S. by 2030 and 27% by 2050. 3,4 It is important that we begin to gather
- 9 data now to begin evaluating potential impacts to our bird populations before
- 10 irreversible damage is done.^{5,6}

¹ U.S. Department of Energy, Sunshot Initiative and Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy. 2015. A Review of Avian Monitoring and Mitigation Information at Existing Utility-Scale Solar Facilities. Washington, DC. USA.

² Smith, Jennifer A. and J.F. Dwyer. 2016. Avian Interactions with Renewable Energy Infrastructure: An update. The Condor: Ornithological Applications 118:411-423. DOI:10.1650/CONDOR-15-61.1

³See n. 2.

⁴ U.S. Department of Energy. 2012. Sunshot Vision Study. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy, Washington, DC, USA.

⁵ See. n.1.

⁶ See. n.2.

1	Q.	Generally, can you describe the economics associated	
2	with the	public's interest in the birds and raptors (including bald	
3	eagles)?		
4	A.	Hundreds of birds and raptors are of interest to wildlife watchers	
5	in our stat	e. There are 1.7 million Missourians and visitors who participate in	
6	wildlife vi	ewing on an annual basis. There is a \$1.7 billion economic impact	
7	of wildlife	viewing in Missouri, supporting 18,000 jobs, and generating \$153.7	
8	million in state and local taxes. 8		
9	Q.	What area uses are known from MDCs' lands proximate to	
10	the proje	ct?	
11	A.	There are no MDC owned or managed lands located or within	
12	three mile	s of the Project Areas.	
13			
14	V. MDC F	RECOMMENDATIONS	
15	Q.	What does MDC recommend with respect to bald eagles,	
16	other rap	otors and songbirds?	

⁷ U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau. 2011 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation.

⁸ ENVIRON International Corporation. 2014. The 2011 Economic Impacts of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife Viewing in Missouri. Environ International Corporation, Clackamas OR. 67 pp.

1	A.	MDC suggests that the following best management practices be
2	implement	ed to ensure that MDC can adequately protect, monitor and
3	determine	the impacts of the Projects on the area's bald eagles, other raptors
4	and songbi	rd population. The Commission should require Ameren to:
5		1. Conduct monthly avian carcass searches throughout the
6	year	for at least the first two years the Projects are in operation.
7		2. Use biodegradable wildlife friendly erosion control
8	mate	rials during construction (as opposed to erosion control mesh) for
9	highl	y erodible areas to reduce the bird fatality and entanglement.
10		3. Design overhead power lines, wires and supports to
11	mini	mize electrocution and collision risk.
12		4. Agree to not clear any occupied/active or inactive eagle
13	nest	trees to be cleared.
14		5. Report all current and future avian species of conservation
15	conce	ern (SOCC) carcasses observed within 48 hours on a form provided
16	by M	DC. Verify SOCC annually from the MDC checklist.
17		6. Report mortalities for all avian species by December 31,
18	annu	ally.
19		
20	Q.	Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?
21	A.	Yes.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of Union El Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri for Permis Approval and a Certificate of Convenience a Necessity Authorizing it to Construct Solar Facility(ies)	sion and) Case No. EA-2019-0371 nd)
AFFIDAVIT OF DR	2. JANET HASLERIG
	
STATE OF MISSOURI)) ss	· ·
COUNTY OF COLE)	
Dr. Janet Haslerig being first duly sworn	on her oath, states:
1. My name is Dr. Janet Haslerig. I	work in Jefferson City, Missouri, and am
employed at the Missouri Departme	ent of Conservation as a Resource Scientist.
2. Attached to this affidavit and made	a part hereof for all purposes is my Written
Rebuttal Testimony (testimony) of	on behalf of the Missouri Department of
Conservation. The testimony consideration	sts of <u>11</u> pages, which have been prepared
in the appropriate format to be intr	coduced into evidence in the case above.
3. I hereby swear and affirm that	my answers contained in the attached
testimony to the questions promula	gated therein are true and correct.
Dr. Janet Haslerig	
Sworn to and subscribed before me thi	s 12th day of December, 2019.
	Jama M. Stickaum
	Notary Public
My Commission Expires: November	24, 202 LAURA M. STICKANN

LAURA M. STICKANN Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri Commissioned for Cole County My Commission Expires: November 24, 2021 Commission Number: 13551367