

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION BY ENGIE NORTH AMERICA, INC. FOR
A PERMIT FOR A WIND ENERGY FACILITY IN HYDE AND HUGHES COUNTIES,
SOUTH DAKOTA, FOR NORTH BEND WIND FARM**

SD PUC DOCKET EL _____

PRE-FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF **MARTIN PIORKOWSKI**, BIOLOGICAL
RESOURCES, WESTERN ECOSYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY, INC., ON BEHALF OF ENGIE
NORTH AMERICAN, INC.

June 16, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Witness Introduction.....1

II. Purpose and Coverage of Testimony.....3-11

1 **Q. Please state your name, employer and business address for the record.**

2 A. Martin Piorkowski. Employed by Western EcoSystems Technology, Inc. or WEST. 415
3 West 17th Street, Cheyenne, Wyoming

4 **Q. Briefly describe your educational background.**

5 A. I have a Bachelor's degree from The Pennsylvania State University and a Master's
6 degree from Oklahoma State University.

7 **Q. Briefly describe your professional experience.**

8 A. I have been employed as a consultant with WEST for 5 years, and have been working on
9 many aspects of wind-wildlife related evaluation across the U.S. during this time. I have 19 years
10 of professional experience with various federal and state agencies in addition to academia with a
11 focus on wind energy development.

12 **Q. Have you attached a resume or CV.**

13 A. Yes, my resume is attached.

14 **Q. Have you previously submitted or prepared testimony in this proceeding in South
15 Dakota?**

16 A. No, I have not.

17 **Q. What is the purpose of your direct testimony?**

18 A. I will be addressing portions of Section 9 of the application, which discusses anticipated
19 impacts on Terrestrial Ecosystems. This section discusses the existing terrestrial ecosystem, the
20 Project's potential impacts to it and potential avoidance, minimization and mitigation techniques
21 to minimize impacts. Terrestrial ecosystem wildlife and vegetation data was identified and
22 gathered through literature searches, federal and state agency reports and consultations, natural
23 resource databases, and field studies. Biologists from WEST conducted field surveys on behalf

24 of ENGIE North America, Inc. (hereafter ENGIE or North Bend) within and surrounding the
25 North Bend Wind Project (Project Area) to provide site-specific information on terrestrial
26 resources. The results of these surveys are summarized in Section 9 of the application.

27 **Q. Did you categorize project lands by vegetation types?**

28 A. Yes. The Project Area is located within the Northwestern Glaciated Plains Level III
29 Ecoregion, an area characterized by significant surface irregularity and high concentrations of
30 seasonal and semi-permanent wetlands (prairie potholes). As provided in the application, North
31 Bend estimated 52.0 percent of the Project Area is mapped as grassland pasture or grassland
32 herbaceous and approximately 43.9 percent is mapped as cultivated crops. As shown in Table 9-
33 1 of the application, the remainder is developed land, wetlands, open water, barren land, and
34 shrub/scrub.

35 **Q. How will the project impact grasslands?**

36 A. Grasslands are important and valuable communities, providing habitat to a diverse range
37 of taxa, including highly specialized, habitat-specific birds, rare and economically-important
38 pollinators and a wide range of mammals. Once covering millions of acres across North
39 America, it is estimated by some that mixed grass prairies have declined by approximately 68
40 percent. Aside from direct impacts, another concern associated with turbine development in
41 grasslands, particularly native or unbroken grasslands, is habitat fragmentation created by the
42 development of access roads and displacement of some birds from around turbines once
43 operating. Fragmented habitat not only supports edge-generalist species such white-tailed deer
44 and American robins, but simultaneously deters many species that require large areas of
45 undisturbed land to breed. North Bend is working with SDGFP to explore ideas to support
46 ongoing conservation initiatives for grasslands given that the layout cannot completely avoid

47 grassland areas found within the Project Area. Best efforts were made to avoid grasslands and
48 utilize croplands and planted grasslands for turbine placement and use existing disturbed
49 corridors (e.g., roads, transmission lines, fence rows) to reduce habitat fragmentation and direct
50 impacts to grassland vegetation. Turbines placed within areas mapped by SDSU as potentially
51 undisturbed land will be inspected for signs indicative of past disturbance or tillage by a
52 qualified biologist prior to construction in order to confirm if these areas are undisturbed
53 grasslands. In areas where impacts to undisturbed grasslands cannot be avoided, North Bend will
54 employ BMPs such as revegetation with native grasslands and erosion control measures and will
55 restore areas of disturbed soils as soon as possible after construction activities have been
56 completed.

57 **Q. Have you considered noxious weeds relative to the project?**

58 A. Noxious and invasive weeds are regulated by state and federal rules and regulations
59 (SDCL 38-22 and 7 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 360, respectively) designed to stop the
60 spread of plants that are detrimental to the environment, crops, livestock, and/or public health.
61 According to the South Dakota Department of Agriculture (SDDOA), there are 9 listed species
62 of noxious weeds that have the potential to occur and are regulated within Hyde and Hughes
63 counties. In addition, there are seven statewide listed species with infestations listed for Hyde
64 and Hughes counties.

65 Noxious weeds have the potential to spread through a variety of mechanisms. They are
66 often carried on vehicles' undercarriage and tires and thrive in highly disturbed areas, rapidly
67 out-competing native vegetation – particularly when exposed soil conditions are present. It is
68 anticipated that pockets of noxious and invasive weed populations are currently present within
69 the Project Area. With construction activities potentially taking place nearby, the threat of these

70 species spreading via work crews, vehicles or other vessels exists. North Bend will develop and
71 implement a Noxious and Invasive Weed Management Plan that will identify and establish the
72 procedures to prevent the introduction and spread of noxious and invasive weeds during
73 construction and ongoing operations. This plan will be based on the construction schedule and
74 the potential for weeds to be spread during that timeframe. During restoration, North Bend will
75 utilize seed mixes free of noxious and invasive weeds. North Bend will coordinate with SDGFP,
76 USFWS, USDA NRCS and landowners on seed mixes to be used during restoration efforts.
77 Therefore, North Bend will work to have beneficial impact in the Project Area by reducing and
78 controlling the spread of noxious and invasive species that are already present and by restoring
79 disturbed areas with approved reseedings and controlling weeds in restored areas.

80 **Q. What impacts to tree cover are anticipated?**

81 A. Based on digitized data, the land cover Trees classification comprises less than 0.7
82 percent or 331.3 acres, of the Project Area. Typical trees include shelterbelts with a mixture of
83 evergreen and deciduous species located along field borders and near residences. As part of the
84 Northern Long-eared Bat (NLEB) Habitat Assessment (Appendix C of the application), WEST
85 conducted a desktop assessment of potential suitable habitat, which included deciduous forest,
86 evergreen forest, mixed forest and woody wetlands. Two forested areas greater than 10 acres in
87 size were mapped inside of the Project Area and eight additional forested patches (greater than
88 10 acres) were mapped within 2.5 miles of the Project Area. As demonstrated in Table 9-3 of the
89 application, North Bend has avoided nearly all permanent impacts to trees, including the areas
90 greater than 10 acres in size that occur adjacent to the Project Area identified as potential NLEB
91 habitat (as described in the NLEB Assessment, Appendix C of the application) by more than
92 1,000 feet. No major tree clearing activities are anticipated.

93 **Q. Have you quantified the acres impacted by the project?**

94 A. Yes, those are found in the application. Based on information from North Bend and the
95 Project layout, the Project will permanently impact approximately 99.42 acres and temporarily
96 impact approximately 595.2 acres. Table 9-3 of the application identifies North Bend's
97 calculated acreages of National Land Cover and WEST-digitized land cover classes that will be
98 directly affected by construction and operation of the Project. Permanent impact acreages
99 provided in Table 9-3 of the application identifies amounts of vegetation that will be
100 permanently removed and replaced by wind turbine foundations, MET towers, collector
101 substation, transmission poles, and permanent access roads.

102 **Q. What impacts have been analyzed to grassland vegetation in the project area?**

103 A. Based on the WEST-digitized land cover classification, Project construction activities
104 have the potential to impact various vegetation categorized as grassland/herbaceous and
105 grassland pasture. A subset of this category, areas of potentially undisturbed grassland as mapped
106 using data from SDSU, could result in approximately 51.67 acres being impacted.

107 **Q. Does the Project impact USFWS easements in the area?**

108 A. The Project has been designed to avoid impacts to USFWS grassland easements and the
109 identified protected features associated with the USFWS wetland easement program. North Bend
110 will continue to coordinate with USFWS to confirm that impacts to the identified protected
111 features within USFWS wetland easement programs are avoided.

112 **Q. How did you analyze the project area for effects on biological resources?**

113 A. In accordance with USFWS Wind Energy Guidelines (WEG or Guidelines) Tiers 1 and 2,
114 a landscape-level site analysis was conducted utilizing desktop resources to identify potential
115 sensitive species or habitats that could be located near the Project. Resources reviewed included

116 South Dakota Natural Heritage Program, SDGFP Wildlife Action Plan, USFWS Information,
117 Planning and Consultation (IPaC), NLCD mapping, aerial imagery, eBird, USGS Breeding Bird
118 Survey (BBS), NatureServe, and USGS Gap data, among other sources.

119 **Q. How did North Bend start to determine bird use of the area?**

120 A. In an effort to characterize potential use of the Project Area by breeding birds, the two
121 nearest USGS BBS routes, the Crow Creek BBS and Fort Thompson BBS, were analyzed. Each
122 route is approximately 24.5 miles (39.4 kilometer [km]) long, with survey points located every
123 half-mile. Standard survey protocol dictates that all birds seen or heard are tallied for a 3-minute
124 period at each point along the route. In 2011, 2,242 individual birds of 80 species were observed
125 along the two routes surveyed (1,146 individuals of 64 species in Crow Creek and 1,096 birds of
126 53 species in Fort Thompson). The most abundant species observed were the brown-headed
127 cowbird, western meadowlark, common grackle, dickcissel, red-winged blackbird, mourning
128 dove, and cliff swallow.

129 **Q. Were raptors analyzed differently?**

130 A. Following a desktop assessment of potential raptor roosting habitat, prey base and species
131 distributions, a total of 13 diurnal raptors (excluding bald and golden eagles), one vulture, and
132 six owls were determined to have the potential to occur within the Project Area. Of these species,
133 five species have the potential to nest near or within the Project Area (Table 9-4 of the
134 application). Surveys for raptor nests were conducted by WEST biologists in 2016, 2018, 2019,
135 and 2020 within the Project area and extending two miles beyond. Additionally, avian use
136 surveys were conducted by WEST biologists from 2016 to 2021 which included raptor use
137 within the Project area.

138 **Q. Are there potential effects on native gamebirds found in the area?**

139 A. The Project Area occurs within the occupied range of greater prairie-chicken and sharp-
140 tailed grouse, hereafter referred to as prairie grouse for both species combined. These two
141 species of gamebirds are native to the Great Plains of North America and thus prefer large
142 expanses of grasslands with tall residual grass or shrubs that can provide cover while nesting and
143 short or sparse grass on slightly elevated ground for leks (area where prairie grouse congregate
144 during spring for mating), which provides maximum visibility for female grouse while
145 simultaneously enabling a clear view of avian and mammalian predators.

146 WEST identified a total of 20 prairie grouse leks during aerial and ground lek surveys
147 within the Project Area and its 1-mile survey area during the 2016, 2018, 2019, and 2020
148 breeding season (Figure 6 in Appendix C of the application). Four lek locations were active in
149 2016, seven in 2018, three in 2019 surveys, and eight in 2020; of these identified and potential
150 leks, one was a sharp-tailed grouse lek and 19 were greater prairie-chicken leks. Siting of
151 turbines within agricultural fields and avoiding disturbance or fragmentation of large blocks of
152 grasslands may help reduce potential impacts to prairie grouse and their breeding habitat within
153 the Project area.

154 **Q. What about bats and bat mortality?**

155 A. Based on range maps, eight bat species are possible residents and/or migrants in the
156 Project Area (Table 9-5 of the application). Two of the eight species are included due to range,
157 but are unlikely to occur in the Project Area based on habitat restrictions: the Townsend's big-
158 eared bat and the western small-footed myotis. The six remaining species that have potential to
159 occur in the Project Area based on range maps (Table 9-5 of the application) and have been
160 documented as fatalities at wind energy facilities. These species include big brown bat, eastern
161 red bat, hoary bat, little brown bat, northern long-eared bat, and silver-haired bat.

162 **Q. Are there endangered species likely to occur in the Project area?**

163 A. Six wildlife species were listed as federally threatened or endangered under the
164 Endangered Species Act have been verified to occur or have the potential to occur in Hughes and
165 Hyde counties. This included four federally listed avian species (whooping crane, red knot,
166 piping plover, and least tern), one federally listed bat species (northern long-eared bat), and one
167 federally listed fish species (pallid sturgeon). As of January 2021, the least tern has been
168 removed from the list of species protected under the Endangered Species Act. The remaining
169 five species are described in Table 9-6 of the application.

170 **Q. Will the Project have a mitigation strategy?**

171 A. North Bend Wind has sited the layout to avoid or minimize impacts to federally and
172 state-protected species, avoid impacts to high quality prairie habitat, and to realign linear
173 corridors, such as the access roads, collector system, crane pathways, and transmission lines to
174 follow existing disturbed corridors (e.g., roads, fence rows) in an effort to reduce fragmentation.
175 Pending completion of pre-construction avian and bat studies and reporting, North Bend will
176 prepare a Bird and Bat Conservation Strategy (BBCS) that will be implemented during
177 construction and operation of the Project. The BBCS will consist of North Bend's corporate
178 standards for minimizing impacts to avian and bat species during construction and operation of
179 the wind energy project and will be developed in a manner that is consistent with the USFWS
180 Land-Based WEG. It will include North Bend's commitments to wind project siting,
181 construction practices and design standards, operation practices, permit compliance and
182 construction and operation worker training. These are all further discussed in greater detail in
183 Section 9.2.3 of the application.
184 Dated this 16th day of June, 2021.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Martin Piorkowski". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

185

186 Martin Piorkowski, Western EcoSystems Technology, Inc.