

ALBERTA ENVIRONMENT AND PARKS (AEP) SOLAR ENERGY SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

The Alberta Utilities Commission (AUC) Rule 007 (<http://www.auc.ab.ca/acts-regulations-and-auc-rules/rules/Pages/Rule007.aspx>) outlines the operating conditions and application requirements for solar energy developments. As part of Rule 007 there is a requirement for the proponent to submit project information to AEP for review of the potential impacts to wildlife caused by the project. Project information required by AEP includes project siting, wildlife surveys to determine wildlife use in the area, construction/operation mitigation plan and post-construction monitoring/mitigation plan to minimize the effects on wildlife and wildlife habitat. In order to ensure alignment with AEP requirements, a Directive has been developed for proponents to use. It is the responsibility of the proponent to ensure that all necessary information is included and is in alignment with the Directive as part of the AEP submission. This checklist outlines the information necessary to ensure completeness relative to AEP requirements, however, does not preclude the opportunity for the proponent to contact the responsible AEP Wildlife Biologist.

AEP-Wildlife will not review a project submission unless all the documentation outlined in this checklist is provided. For more information on AEP expectations of industry, please refer to the *Wildlife Directive for Alberta Solar Energy Projects* (hereafter *Directive*).

OVERVIEW OF INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR AEP REVIEW:

- Description of project location and map including all project related infrastructure
- Comprehensive report detailing wildlife survey methods, results and interpretation of results
- Documentation of avoidance of areas of wildlife concern (as described in the *Directive*)
- Construction and Operation Mitigation Plan for the life of the project
- Post Construction Monitoring and Mitigation Plan

TYPES OF APPLICATION (NEW OR HISTORIC)

Yes	No	1. The project was previously issued a Renewable Energy Wildlife Referral Report.
Yes N/A	No	2. If the project was previously issued a Renewable Energy Wildlife Referral Report and construction did not begin within 5 years of report issuance, then all wildlife surveys outlined in Standard 100.2.1 have now been redone.

AEP SOLAR ENERGY SUBMISSION REQUIREMENT CHECKLIST

Completed		Checklist Requirement and Description
Yes	No	3. The solar project has been sited to avoid: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. native grassland/parkland b. old growth forest stands c. named waterbodies d. valley breaks (including coulees) e. valleys of large permanent water courses f. eastern slopes region
Yes	No	4. The solar project has been appropriately sited to avoid the following Wildlife Sensitivity Layers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Greater Sage Grouse Range b. Trumpeter Swan Waterbodies and Watercourses c. Caribou Zones d. Mountain Sheep and Goat Zones e. Piping Plover Waterbodies
Yes	No	5. The solar project has been sited to avoid: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Special Access Zones b. Key Wildlife and Biodiversity Zones c. Grizzly Bear Zone
Yes	No	6. If you answered “No” to one or more of the above three questions, which means that the project is sited within one or more of these zones, then the submission includes confirmation that all required standard mitigations outlined in the <i>Directive</i> have been or will be adhere to. If deviations are proposed, justification and alternative mitigation strategies, which align the project with the original intent of the Standard, are included. Alternative mitigations will be reviewed by the responsible AEP Wildlife Biologist.
Yes	No	7. All setbacks for the following features are adhered to: valley breaks, named lakes, wetlands, and watercourses. If deviations are proposed, justification and alternative mitigation strategies, which align the project with the original intent of the Standard, are included. Alternative mitigations will be reviewed by the responsible AEP Wildlife Biologist.

Yes	No	8. The following pre-construction wildlife surveys, as per Standard 100.2.1 of the <i>Directive</i> , have been completed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. spring bird migration surveys b. fall bird migration surveys c. raptor nest surveys d. breeding bird surveys e. field investigations to determine habitat types, including the presence and extent of native grasslands and other sensitive habitats (e.g., wetlands)
Yes	No	9. Site specific pre-construction wildlife surveys, as per Standard 100.2.1 of the <i>Directive</i> , have been completed in the applicable ranges/buffer/zones: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Burrowing Owl Range b. Eastern Short-horned Lizard Range c. Endangered and Threatened Plants Ranges d. Ord's Kangaroo Rat Range e. Sensitive Snake Species Range f. Sharp-tailed Grouse Range g. Swift Fox Range h. Colonial Nesting Birds Buffer(within 1000 m) i. Grizzly Bear Core and Support Zones
Yes	No	10. Surveys followed the survey protocols outlined by AEP and described in Standard 100.2.1 of the <i>Directive</i> . If deviations from these protocols were used, justification and alternative protocol details are included for review by the responsible AEP Wildlife Biologist.
Yes	No	11. Surveys included in this submission are considered current (i.e. within two years of the last survey date), as per Standard 100.2.2 of the <i>Directive</i> . If surveys are not current, justification is provided for review by the responsible AEP Wildlife Biologist.
Yes	No	12. Wildlife surveys will be kept current as per Standard 100.2.4 of the <i>Directive</i> .
Yes	No	13. Based on the results of pre-construction wildlife surveys (Standard 100.2.1), all mitigation identified in Stage 2 and Stage 3 of the <i>Directive</i> , which includes all setbacks and timing restrictions, has been described and will be implemented. If deviations are proposed, justification and alternative mitigation strategies, which align the project with the original intent of the Standard, are included. Alternative mitigations will be reviewed by the responsible AEP Wildlife Biologist.
Yes	No	14. The comprehensive wildlife report details: methods, results, interpretation of results and mitigations as per Stage 2 of the <i>Directive</i> . In addition, the data collected has been submitted in the appropriate format for FWMIS entry to the responsible AEP Wildlife Biologist.
Yes	No	15. Details regarding the project fencing, including but not limited to, type, shape, layout, and continuous length have been planned to avoid impeding normal wildlife movement and to reduce the chance of collision and wildlife entrapment as per Standard 100.2.7 of the <i>Directive</i> .
Yes	No	16. Construction and Operation Mitigation plans have been developed based on site specific wildlife concerns as per Stage 3 in the <i>Directive</i> and will be implemented. If deviations are proposed, justification and alternative mitigation plan(s), which align the project with the original intent of the mitigation, are included. Alternative mitigations will be reviewed by the responsible AEP Wildlife Biologist.

Yes	No	17. The Post-Construction Monitoring Plan has been developed and meets all Standards in Stage 4 of the <i>Directive and will be implemented</i> . If deviations are justification and alternative methods, which align the project with the original intent of the monitoring and adaptive management described in Stage 4 of the <i>Directive</i> , are included. Alternative monitoring and mitigation plans will be reviewed by the responsible AEP Wildlife Biologist.
Yes	No	18. The Post-Construction Mitigation Plan has been developed and outlines mitigation including, but not limited to, techniques outlined in Standard 100.4.9 that will be implemented if post-construction mortality results are determined to exceed acceptable levels. Proposed mitigation strategies will be reviewed by the responsible AEP Wildlife Biologist.
Yes	No	19. A map of the proposed project infrastructure is provided in the submission to the responsible AEP Wildlife Biologist. The map details all infrastructure related to the project including, but not limited to, the substation if one is to be built for the project, temporary work spaces, collection lines, fence lines, and access roads to be built or upgraded specifically for the project.

FINAL STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

Upon completion of the above checklist, the applicant must fill out the following statement of compliance and provide the signed checklist as part of their submission to the responsible AEP Wildlife Biologist.

Once all required documents are received, the submission will be reviewed by the responsible AEP Wildlife Biologist. A Renewable Energy Wildlife Referral Report will be completed and forwarded to the proponent for inclusion within the AUC application.

I, _____, as an
 authorized representative of the solar proponent,
 ensure that this
 submission meets the AEP requirements as detailed in
 the *Wildlife Directive for Alberta Solar Energy Projects*.
 Deviations from the *Directive* (if any) are outlined in the
 submission and include proposed mitigation and any formal
 discussions or agreements with AEP.

Signature

Date