Predicting Environmental Mitigation Requirements for Hydropower Projects through the Integration of Biophysical and Socio-Political Geographies

Christopher R. DeRolph^{*a}, Michael P. Schramm^a, and Mark S. Bevelhimer^a

^a Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Environmental Sciences Division, PO Box 2008, 1 Bethel Valley Road, Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6038

*corresponding author: derolphcr@ornl.gov

This manuscript has been authored by UT-Battelle, LLC under Contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725 with the U.S. Department of Energy. The United States Government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the United States Government retains a non-exclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, world-wide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this manuscript, or allow others to do so, for United States Government purposes. The Department of Energy will provide public access to these results of federally sponsored research in accordance with the DOE Public Access Plan(<http://energy.gov/downloads/doe-public-access-plan>).

ABSTRACT

Uncertainty about environmental mitigation needs at existing and proposed hydropower projects makes it difficult for stakeholders to minimize environmental impacts. Hydropower developers and operators desire tools to better anticipate mitigation requirements, while natural resource managers and regulators need tools to evaluate different mitigation scenarios and order effective mitigation. Here we sought to examine the feasibility of using a suite of multi-faceted explanatory variables within a spatially explicit modeling framework to fit predictive models for future environmental mitigation requirements at hydropower projects across the conterminous U.S. Using a database comprised of mitigation requirements from more than 300 hydropower project licenses, we were able to successfully fit models for nearly 50 types of environmental mitigation and to apply the predictive models to a set of more than 500 non-powered dams identified as having hydropower potential. The results demonstrate that mitigation requirements are functions of a range of factors, from biophysical to socio-political. Project developers can use these models to inform cost projections and design considerations, while regulators can use the models to more quickly identify likely environmental issues and potential solutions, hopefully resulting in more timely and more effective decisions on environmental mitigation.

Keywords hydropower, mitigation, modeling, prediction, environmental, sociopolitical

1. INTRODUCTION

Hydroelectric power is currently the largest of the renewable energy resources worldwide, contributing to electricity generation in 160 countries (Manzano-Agugliaro et al., 2013). The environmental impacts of hydropower are well established (Liermann et al., 2012; Nilsson et al., 2005; Poff et al., 1997; Poff et al., 2007), and are mitigated with mixed success (Trussart et al., 2002). In the United States (U.S.), the authority to issue 30-50 year licenses for the operation of non-federal hydropower facilities belongs to the U.S. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). The passage of the Electric Consumers Protection Act of 1986 (ECPA) substantially changed FERC's consideration of environmental impacts with the requirement that equal consideration be given to the protection and enhancement of, and mitigation of damage to, wildlife, environmental quality, and recreational opportunity. Furthermore, a string of court rulings eroded FERC's singular authority to prescribe environmental mitigation by requiring FERC to include fishway prescriptions from the National Marine Fisheries Service or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as minimum streamflow requirements included as part of state water quality certificates (Blumm and Nadol, 2001; Tarlock, 2012). The result was a significant increase in the number of mitigation requirements included in FERC licenses and a growing role of other federal and state agencies in the licensing process (Blumm and Nadol, 2001; Deshazo and Freeman, 2005; Kosnik, 2010).

FERC and the hydropower industry have suggested that this instable policy context and increased regulatory plurality have resulted in increased licensing time and increased uncertainty in mitigation requirements (FERC, 2001; U.S.-Congress, 2012). Original licenses for new projects and relicensing of existing projects provide a once in every 30 to 50 year opportunity to address environmental concerns at hydropower projects. FERC addresses potential environmental impacts by incorporating license conditions (mitigation requirements) where evidence shows project operations will impact environmental or recreational resources. With over 300 relicense applications anticipated between 2016 and 2026 (FERC, 2015), there is new urgency to integrate sustainability practices into future hydropower

development by evaluating and balancing the environmental and social costs of hydropower projects with the variety of potential benefits hydropower projects provide.

Hydropower developers and owners desire some certainty and ability to better anticipate mitigation requirements. Similarly, resource managers and regulators must be able to evaluate likely mitigation scenarios and determine the relative effectiveness of mitigation implemented at similar projects. While each hydropower project is unique, Yu and Xu (2016) recommend development of common approaches and principles for designing ecological and social compensation mechanisms for hydropower development. The authors of this manuscript recently developed a database of environmental mitigation requirements in FERC licenses (Schramm et al., 2016) that presents new opportunities for analyzing past environmental mitigation requirements and predicting future mitigation requirements.

In this study we sought to examine the feasibility of using a suite of multidisciplinary explanatory variables to fit predictive models for environmental mitigation requirements at hydropower projects across the conterminous U.S. We developed a spatially explicit framework (applying niche modeling concepts common in landscape ecology) to predict nearly 50 types of environmental mitigation requirements using biological, facility, human, hydrologic, landscape, locational, and stream network characteristics. Our primary goal was to build statistical models to predict future mitigation requirements at hydropower project sites, while the secondary goal was to gain some understanding into potential key environmental and social drivers of these requirements that may warrant additional future research. As an example of how the models can be applied, we made predictions to a set of non-powered dams (NPDs) across the U.S. that were previously identified as having considerable energy potential.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The conterminous United States (Fig. 1) is environmentally and culturally heterogeneous (Fig. 2), containing diverse physiographic regions ranging from mountains to inland and coastal plains, and

encompassing examples of nearly every global climate. There is also considerable geographic variation in socio-political, economic, and cultural characteristics.

Fig. 1. Study area showing location of 463 hydropower plants licensed from 1998 through September 2015. Color of plant locations indicates number of mitigation requirements for mitigation categories selected for statistical modeling.

Fig. 2. a. Average percent democratic votes cast in U.S. presidential elections from 1996 to 2012. b. Percent unemployment from 2010 U.S. census, aggregated to physiographic region. c. Number of freshwater fish species per HUC8 watershed. d. Average annual runoff per HUC8 watershed. e. Dam locations symbolized by height. f. 2011 land cover.

2.1. Mitigation database and response variables

A database of environmental mitigation requirements was compiled for FERC licenses issued from 1998 through September 2015 (Schramm et al., 2016). Since our goal is prediction of future mitigation requirements, the manual review of licenses was limited to those issued from 1998 through 2015 with an assumption that more recently issued licenses would better reflect future mitigation requirements. The database includes Bernoulli distributed presence-absence mitigation data at 463 hydropower plants in the

study area from 316 licenses. Six broad categories (Tier 1) of mitigation (biodiversity, fish passage, habitat, hydrology, recreation, and water quality) and 20 subcategories (Tier 2) were used to classify specific mitigation types in the hierarchical database. A full list of each of the mitigation types catalogued in the database and the percent of times each was required, including each of the 132 Tier 3 categories, is presented in Appendix A. Descriptions of each of the Tier 3 categories is provided in Appendix A of Schramm et al. (2016). Predictive models were built only if a mitigation type was required for at least 5% (Rickbeil et al., 2014) of the plants in the mitigation database. Models were not built for the very broad Tier 1 categories.

2.2. Explanatory variables

Given that hydropower project licensing is influenced by a suite of biophysical and socio-economic factors, the candidate predictor variables (Table 1) employed here were selected based on expert opinion and on previous research by Kosnik (2010) and Trussart (2002) as broad-scale measures of biological, facility, human, hydrologic, landscape, locational, and stream network characteristics thought to have some bearing on mitigation requirements. The models that each candidate predictor was included in are indicated in Table 1. We used expert opinion to identify candidate predictors for each of the six Tier 1 categories, and these six predictor sets were then used to build models for each Tier 2 and Tier 3 model nested within the Tier I categories. Given that our goal was prediction and not explanation, we did not delve into the exact causal role of each potential predictor. Instead, we selected predictors based on hypothesized quality of association between the predictor and the response, data quality, and data availability (Shmueli, 2010).

2.2.1. Biological

The presence or absence of important fish species can influence not only fish passage mitigation requirements but also other measures related to biological conservation (Cada, 1998; Fraley et al., 1989; Renofalt et al., 2010). We used conservation status in concert with expert opinion to compile a list of

high profile migratory fish species supported by policy protections (McManamay et al., 2015). We then mapped distributions of each of these species using the NatureServe (2010) database of current

Table 1. Summary and description of input variables for the boosted regression tree models. Variables or units in bold and underlined indicate remaining predictor variables after collinearity analysis.

Variable	Description	Units	Spatial scale	Source	Models
Biological					
bigPlvrSum	Major migratory fish species	Count	HUC8 watershed	NatureServe fish distributions, expert opinion	P, H, B, A, R
Facility					
Height	Dam height	Feet	Hydropower dam	ORNL NHAAP database	P, H, W, B, A, R
HY_MW	Generation capacity	Megawatts	Hydropower dam	ORNL NHAAP database	--
HY_MWh	Generation	Megawatt-hours	Hydropower plant	ORNL NHAAP database	--
Length	Dam length	Feet	Hydropower dam	ORNL NHAAP database	P, H, W, B, A, R
Mode	Dam mode-of-operation	Categorical	Hydropower dam	ORNL NHAAP database	P, H, W, B, A, R
owner	Ownership type	Categorical	Hydropower dam	ORNL NHAAP database	P, H, W, B, A, R
PrmyPurps	Dam primary purpose	Categorical	Hydropower dam	ORNL NHAAP database	P, H, W, B, A, R
Human					
birdG_xx	National Audubon Society chapters	Count, PA, PC	State	National Audubon Society	--
damR_xx	Dam removals	Count, PA, PC	State	American Rivers	P, H, W, B, A, R
education	Education attainment - percent bachelor's degree or higher	Percent	USEPA Level 3 Ecoregion	US Census	P, H, W, B, A, R
FishG_xx	TU and CCA chapters	Count, PA, PC	State	TU, CCA	P, H, B, A, R
hshldincm	Mean household income	US dollars	USEPA Level 3 Ecoregion	US Census	--
IssueYear	FERC hydropower project license issue year	Year	Hydropower plant	ORNL NHAAP database	P, H, W, B, A, R
LandG_xx	Land trusts	Count, PA, PC	State	Land Trust Alliance	--
politics	see note*	Difference	State	US Federal Election Commission	P, H, W, B, A, R
xx_POPDENS	2000 population density	Individuals/km2 (L and N)	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	National Fish Habitat Partnership	H, W, B, A, R
q12_avg	Survey response on environmental impact of dams	Rank	Geographic region	MIT Energy Survey, 2008	P, H, W, B, A, R
q16_avg	Survey response on increasing or decreasing hydro power	Rank	Geographic region	MIT Energy Survey, 2008	P, H, W, B, A, R
SierG_xx	Sierra Club chapters	Count, PA, PC	State	Sierra Club	P, H, W, B, A, R
unemplmnt	Unemployment	Percent	USEPA Level 3 Ecoregion	US Census	P, H, W, B, A, R
usHouse	LCV US House of Rep. mean scorecard for 1998 to 2013	Percent	State	League of Conservation Voters	--
usSenate	LCV US Senate mean scorecard for 1998 to 2013	Percent	State	League of Conservation Voters	--
wshed_xx	Local watershed associations	Count, PA, PC	State	USEPA	P, H, W, B, A, R
Hydrology					
ADRAIN	Total artificial drainage area	Square meters	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USGS	H, W, A
BFI_MEAN	Mean base-flow index for GW discharge into streams	Percent	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USGS	H, W, A
CNTC_MEAN	Baseflow residence time in the subsurface	Days	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USGS	H, W, A
DITCHES	Estimated area subject to the practice of ditches	Square meters	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USGS	--
FlowYr	Average annual flow	Cubic feet per second	NHD Plus V1 Flowline	NHD Plus V1	P, H, W, B, A, R
IRRIG	Estimated area subject to the practice of irrigation	Square meters	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USGS	--
KFACT	Soil erodibility factor	Dimensionless	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USGS	H, W, A
MAVELU	Mean Annual Velocity (fps) at bottom of flowline	Cubic feet per second	NHD Plus V1 Flowline	NHD Plus V1	P, H, W, B, A, R
MEAN_IEOF	Mean value for infiltration-excess overland flow	Percent	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USGS	H, W, A
MEAN_RCHRG	Mean annual natural groundwater recharge	Millimeters	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USGS	--
midStorSum	Accumulated upstream storage	Acre-feet	Hydropower dam	National Anthropogenic Barriers Dataset	H, W, A
ResDay	Reservoir residence time	Days	Hydropower dam	ORNL NHAAP database	P, H, W, B, A, R
SATOF_MEAN	Average value of saturation overland flow	Percent	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USGS	H, W, A
SfArea	Reservoir surface area	Acres	Hydropower dam	National Inventory of Dams	P, H, W, B, A, R
Stor	Reservoir storage	Acre-feet	Hydropower dam	National Inventory of Dams	--
TILES	Estimated area of tile drains	Square meters	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USGS	--
Landscape					
xx_CROPS	Land cover classified as cultivated crops	Percent (L and N)	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	National Fish Habitat Partnership	H, W, B, A
xx_NPDES	Number of NPDES sites	Count (L and N)	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	National Fish Habitat Partnership	H, W
xx_PASTURE	Land cover classified as pasture/hay	Percent (L and N)	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	National Fish Habitat Partnership	H, W, B, A
xx_ROADCRC	Road-stream crossings	Count (L and N)	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USGS, National Fish Habitat Partnership	--
xx_URBANHC	Land cover classified as high intensity urban	Percent (L and N)	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	National Fish Habitat Partnership	--
xx_URBANL	Land cover classified as low intensity urban	Percent (L and N)	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	National Fish Habitat Partnership	H, W, B, A
xx_URBANM	Land cover classified as medium intensity urban	Percent (L and N)	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	National Fish Habitat Partnership	H, W, B, A
CNPY_MEAN	Mean canopy cover	Percent	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USGS	H, W, B, A
CROP_AREA	Total crop area for fertilizer/manure derived from land use	Square meters	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USGS	H, W, B, A
d303_count	Impaired or threatened waters	Count	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USEPA 303(d) list	H, W, B, A
IMPV_MEAN	Mean impervious surface	Percent	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USGS	--
L_MINES	Number of mines or mineral processing plants	Count	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	National Fish Habitat Partnership	W
L_ROADLEN	Length of roads	Meters	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	National Fish Habitat Partnership	P, H, W, B, A
MAXELEVSMO	Maximum elevation	Meters	NHD Plus V1 Flowline	NHD Plus V1	P, H, W, B, A, R
PPT30MEAN	30-year (1971-2000) average annual precipitation	Millimeters	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USGS	P, H, W, B, A, R
SLOPE	Slope of stream reach	Unitless	NHD Plus V1 Flowline	NHD Plus V1	P, H, W, B, A, R
SLP_PERC	Landscape slope	Percent	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USGS	P, H, W, B, A, R
TMAX30_MEAN	30-year (1971-2000) average annual maximum temperature	Celsius	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	USGS	--
Location					
POINT_X	Longitude	Decimal degrees	Hydropower dam	National Anthropogenic Barriers Dataset	P, H, W, B, A, R
POINT_Y	Latitude	Decimal degrees	Hydropower dam	National Anthropogenic Barriers Dataset	P, H, W, B, A, R
Stream network					
dist2Mouth	Stream network distance to network mouth	Meters	Entire downstream flow path	Calculated from NHD Plus V1 flowlines	P, H, W, B, A, R
DrArea	Drainage area upstream of dam	Square miles	Hydropower dam	National Inventory of Dams	--
dsDams	Downstream dams on flow path to network mouth	Count	Entire downstream flow path	Calculated from NHD Plus V1 and NABD	P, H, W, B, A, R
N_DAMSC	Number of dams within network catchment	Count	NHD Plus V1 Catchment	National Fish Habitat Partnership	P, H, W, B, A, R
SO	Strahler stream order	Strahler number	NHD Plus V1 Flowline	NHD Plus V1	P, H, W, B, A, R

PA = per area; PC = per capita; L = local catchment; N = entire network catchment; xx indicates variable derived for multiple units; P = fish passage; H = hydrology; W = water quality; B = biodiversity; A = habitat; R = recreation; *politics is the difference between mean percent democrat and republican from 1996 to 2012 presidential elections; LCV = League of Conservation Voters; TU = Trout Unlimited; CCA = Coastal Conservation Association.

distributions of freshwater fishes of the U.S. at the 8-digit hydrologic unit code (HUC8) scale to allow for analysis of interactions between these high profile species and hydropower project locations. The biological explanatory variable is a count of the number of key fish species per HUC8 (McManamay et al., 2015).

2.2.2. Facility characteristics

The Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) National Hydropower Asset Assessment Program (NHAAP) is an integrated energy, water, and ecosystem research effort for sustainable hydroelectricity generation and water management. The ORNL NHAAP database (<http://nhaap.ornl.gov/>) integrates data from multiple data sources and provides the most current, detailed, and spatially comprehensive information for analyzing and visualizing existing U.S. hydropower assets. We included hydropower facility characteristics from the NHAAP database thought to be important drivers of prescribed mitigation such as dam height, generation capacity, dam mode-of-operation, and geographic location (Kosnik, 2010).

2.2.3. Human dimensions

The convergence of different anthropogenic characteristics such as presence of environmental interest groups, political climate, population demographics, and regulatory tendencies can be impactful on mitigation requirements (Kosnik, 2010). Consistent with the interest group theory of regulation (Peltzman, 1976), Knittel (2006) concluded that electricity industry regulators respond to lobbying from interest groups. In research focused on explaining drivers of environmental mitigation requirements at hydropower projects, Kosnik (2010) found the largest influences on FERC's regulatory decisions to be congressional politics and regulatory tendencies. In an attempt to capture the socio-political and regulatory landscape, we included numerous anthropogenic predictors that serve as direct measures or proxies for local, state, or regional political tendencies, environmental awareness, regulatory trends, and public attitudes toward dams. Candidate predictors aimed at capturing political tendencies include presidential election voting averaged over time and congressional politics. Different aspects of environmental awareness were estimated at a state-scale using prevalence of non-profit organizations,

including protection of birds and their habitats (using National Audubon Society chapters), fish and their habitats (using Trout Unlimited chapters for freshwater and Coastal Conservation Association chapters for marine), land conservation (using land trusts), water quality conservation (using local watershed associations), and general environmental awareness (using Sierra Club chapters). Regulatory trends were estimated using the issue year of the license. Prevalence of dam removals and citizen survey responses on energy and environmental impacts from dams were used as estimates of public attitudes toward dams.

2.2.4. Hydrology

Operation of a hydropower facility typically involves modifications to hydrologic regimes both upstream and downstream of dams, reservoirs, or river diversions (Fraley et al., 1989; Ligon et al., 1995; Poff et al., 1997). The magnitude of these flow disturbances can be minimized by discharge management, and there is increasing pressure from regulatory agencies to incorporate ecological flow requirements in licenses and operational plans for hydropower projects (Bunn and Arthington, 2002; Renofalt et al., 2010; Trussart et al., 2002). We included a suite of explanatory variables derived at the stream reach and watershed scale that describe different aspects of the hydrologic regime of a given area, including surface water, groundwater, and reservoir storage characteristics.

2.2.5. Landscape

Broad-scale landscape descriptors such as land cover, terrain, and climate can influence prescribed mitigation in all six of the Tier 1 mitigation categories, either directly or indirectly. Thus we included numerous land cover metrics derived at multiple scales (Tong and Chen, 2002; Wang et al., 2001), topographic variables such as slope and elevation (Moore et al., 1991), and the core climatic variables of average annual precipitation and air temperature (Grimm et al., 2008).

2.2.6. Location

In the U.S., there are tangible trends and patterns in environmental, economic, cultural, and social conditions from east to west and north to south. We included latitude and longitude to account for spatial

effects and capture spatial patterns across the large study area that may be insufficiently represented in the other predictors (Fink et al., 2010; Oppel et al., 2012).

2.2.7. Stream network

Stream network position and the prevalence of upstream and downstream dams are important descriptors of network fragmentation/connectivity (Kuby et al., 2005). Where a hydropower project falls on the stream network in relation to other barriers and the network mouth can have a strong influence on the nature and magnitude of ordered mitigation (Fraley et al., 1989; Kosnik, 2010).

2.3. Statistical analyses

Model development was carried out in R version 3.2.2 (R-Core-Team). Boosted regression trees (a machine-learning technique) were used to develop the predictive models, as this method has been demonstrated to have high predictive performance with presence-absence response variables, allows for complex regression analyses of complex responses, and can handle continuous and categorical explanatory variables (Abram et al., 2015; Arganaraz et al., 2015; Elith et al., 2006; Elith et al., 2008). Before running the models, all predictor variables were assessed for collinearity using Pearson's correlation coefficients (r). When r values exceeded 0.7 (Dormann et al., 2013), the variable deemed more functionally applicable to hydropower mitigation (Arganaraz et al., 2015; Rickbeil et al., 2014) or that was derived at a higher spatial resolution was retained (Table 1). The data were split into training (80%) and validation (20%) data using the caret package in R, which creates random splits within each class so that the overall class distribution is preserved as well as possible (Kuhn, 2008).

Given the novelty of the mitigation database, we were unable to obtain an independent validation dataset as recommended by Araujo and Guisan (2006). The optimal number of trees was determined using 10-fold cross validation (CV), with the bag fraction set to 0.5 and the learning rate set to 0.001 to ensure that each model had at least 1,000 trees (Elith et al., 2008). The area under the receiver-operating characteristic curve (ROC) calculated on the validation dataset was used to assess predictive performance. We implemented the ROC interpretation presented by Hosmer et al. (2013) where an ROC value of 0.7-

0.8 is considered an acceptable prediction, 0.8-0.9 is excellent, and >0.9 is outstanding. For a model to be deemed acceptable, both the internal CV ROC and the validation ROC had to be ≥ 0.7 . We generated partial dependence plots to examine the nature of the models and to interpret the effect of a variable on the response after accounting for the average effects of all other variables in the model (Elith et al., 2008). Spatial autocorrelation of model residuals was evaluated using Moran's *I* statistics (Dormann et al., 2007) calculated with the Spatial Autocorrelation tool in ArcGIS version 10.2.2 (ESRI).

2.4. Example model application at non-powered dams

While approximately 2,500 dams in the U.S. provide 78 gigawatts (GW) of conventional and 22 GW of pumped-storage hydropower, there are hundreds of NPDs originally built for other purposes that may be retrofitted for hydropower to produce an additional 12 GW of estimated renewable energy for the U.S (Hadjerioua et al., 2012). While many of the monetary costs and environmental impacts have already been incurred at these sites, our models can be used as a tool to assess potential environmental mitigation requirements that may arise during the hydropower licensing process. As an example of how the modeling can be applied, we made predictions for each of the acceptable models to 568 NPDs estimated by Hadjerioua et al. (2012) to have >1 megawatt (MW) in potential capacity. We used the optimal threshold function in the R package SDMtools (VanDerWal et al., 2012) to identify the value on the ROC curve that is closest to a perfect model fit, and then we applied that value as the predicted present/absent threshold when making predictions to the NPDs.

3. RESULTS

3.1. BRT models

Predictive models were built only if a mitigation type was required for at least 5% (Rickbeil et al., 2014) of the plants in the mitigation database, resulting in 57 Tier 3 mitigation types being modelled and all 20 of the Tier 2 mitigations being modelled (see Table 2 for modeling results). Eight of the 57 Tier 3 models were rejected due to either a CV ROC or validation ROC <0.7 , leaving 49 Tier 3 models with at

least an acceptable fit. All 20 of the Tier 2 models had an $\text{ROC} \geq 0.7$. Significant spatial autocorrelation of model residuals was detected in 4 of 20 Tier 2 models and 11 of 49 Tier 3 models.

Table 2. Model results summary.

Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	ModelID	Trees	CV ROC	V ROC	OT	MI	Influential Variable 1	Influential Variable 2	Influential Variable 3
Fish Passage	DS	NA (see Tier 2 category)	F101	5550	0.867	0.916	0.36	-0.165	POINT_Y (13)	dist2Mouth (10.7)	FlowYr (8)
	Fish Passage	DS Passage Plan Study Design	F101010	5300	0.892	0.829	0.30	-0.309	POINT_Y (11.1)	dist2Mouth (9.9)	MAXELEVSMO (9.1)
	US	NA (see Tier 2 category)	F102	5250	0.899	0.896	0.29	-0.436	MAXELEVSMO (14.5)	POINT_Y (13)	bigPhyrSum (8.3)
	Fish Passage	Eelway	F102017	4350	0.956	0.966	0.33	-1.178	MAXELEVSMO (36.5)	POINT_X (11.9)	bigPhyrSum (7.7)
		US passage study plan or design	F102023	5000	0.909	0.854	0.29	-0.703	MAXELEVSMO (12.3)	POINT_X (10.5)	POINT_Y (9.7)
	Passage	NA (see Tier 2 category)	F103	2850	0.780	0.856	0.27	-0.467	POINT_Y (9.3)	dsDams (8.1)	MAXELEVSMO (7.5)
	Planning	DS fish passage mon. sampling	F103029	3200	0.888	0.924	0.22	-0.908	MAXELEVSMO (18.2)	Height (10)	POINT_X (8.9)
		Fish passage & operations plan	F103031	1050	0.739	0.749	0.08	-0.246	wshed_PC (11.8)	L_ROADLEN (10.5)	dsDams (9.9)
		Fish stranding plan mon. evaluation	F103033	1100	0.712	0.605	--	--	--	--	--
		US fish passage mon. sampling	F103036	3050	0.891	0.865	0.18	-0.504	MAXELEVSMO (16.2)	Height (11.9)	POINT_Y (8.7)
	Entrainment	NA (see Tier 2 category)	F104	3450	0.849	0.756	0.29	-0.222	ResDay (9.8)	SierG_PC (7.8)	politics (7)
		Trash or bar rack	F104043	3700	0.917	0.833	0.22	0.147	POINT_X (10.4)	SierG_PC (9.6)	fishGroups (8.8)
	Hydrology	Flow	F205	4700	0.785	0.787	0.56	-1.413	PrmryPurps (7.7)	N_URBANLC (5.3)	Height (5.1)
	Mitigation	Tailrace flow mon. plan	F205045	5850	0.822	0.920	0.39	-0.076	POINT_X (8.5)	IssueYear (4.8)	politics (4.7)
		Tailrace flow or stage mon. equipment	F205048	2650	0.784	0.867	0.17	-0.191	N_CROPS (9)	Length (7.3)	dist2Mouth (4.7)
Hydrology		Tailrace ramping rate restriction	F205050	2400	0.790	0.834	0.19	-0.333	SfArea (8.3)	CNPY_MEAN (5.9)	midStorSum (5.8)
		Bypass flow mon. plan	F205052	2900	0.802	0.853	0.20	-0.522	politics (6.9)	Length (6.7)	SfArea (5.6)
		Bypass flushing or flood flow	F205054	3750	0.890	0.951	0.15	0.187	POINT_X (24.6)	N_PASTUREC (6.8)	PPT30MEAN (6.2)
		Bypass flow or stage mon. equipment	F205055	1500	0.735	0.779	0.13	-0.679	SLP_PERC (18)	POINT_X (7)	bigPhyrSum (5.2)
		Bypass ramping rate restriction	F205057	2900	0.878	0.802	0.16	0.170	POINT_X (28.6)	BFI_MEAN (6.7)	CNTC_MEAN (6.5)
	Tailrace	NA (see Tier 2 category)	F206	3800	0.863	0.845	0.63	-0.198	POINT_X (10.4)	Mode (10.3)	SLP_PERC (7.2)
	Minimum	Run-of-river Tailrace	F206058	3700	0.904	0.911	0.37	-0.349	Mode (39.2)	Height (7.8)	POINT_X (4.8)
	Flow	Seasonal Tailrace	F206059	2700	0.850	0.846	0.20	0.087	Mode (24.6)	POINT_Y (9.2)	N_PASTUREC (5.7)
		Year-round Tailrace	F206061	1500	0.787	0.899	0.19	-0.312	Mode (22.7)	owner (9.2)	Length (4.3)
	Bypass	NA (see Tier 2 category)	F207	3250	0.808	0.771	0.46	-0.676	SfArea (16.3)	MAXELEVSMO (6.6)	MAVELU (4.7)
	Minimum	Seasonal Bypass	F207063	1450	0.678	0.668	--	--	--	--	--
	Flow	Year-round Bypass	F207065	1200	0.720	0.805	0.23	-0.339	SfArea (15.6)	Height (10.2)	Length (6.9)
	Sediment	NA (see Tier 2 category)	F208	4850	0.767	0.851	0.49	-0.364	IssueYear (6.1)	CNPY_MEAN (5.3)	unemplmnt (4.6)
		Sediment & erosion control plan or mon.	F208066	4100	0.778	0.838	0.47	-0.257	IssueYear (6.6)	CNPY_MEAN (5)	dist2Mouth (4.9)
	Recreation	NA (see Tier 2 category)	F209	1550	0.733	0.796	0.17	-0.127	POINT_X (12.3)	Height (6.8)	SierG_PA (6.8)
	Flow	Provide recreational flow releases	F209071	700	0.655	0.713	--	--	--	--	--
	Operations	NA (see Tier 2 category)	F210	3050	0.734	0.819	0.53	0.040	FlowYr (8.6)	q16_avg (4.5)	N_URBANLC (4.5)
		Flow mgmt. plan	F210073	3350	0.893	0.985	0.09	-0.399	Length (13)	wshedG_PA (11.4)	IssueYear (8.6)
		Operations compliance mon. plan	F210074	5150	0.807	0.913	0.41	0.146	politics (8.8)	PrmryPurps (4.8)	FlowYr (4.7)
		Provide flow or lake levels electronically	F210075	1750	0.795	0.917	0.14	-0.282	SierG_PA (18.8)	POINT_X (6.2)	Mode (6.1)
Water Quality	DS	NA (see Tier 2 category)	F311	4300	0.838	0.887	0.55	-0.240	ResDay (12.3)	SfArea (6.8)	wshedG_PA (4.6)
	Water	Benthic macroinvertebrate mon.	F311077	1500	0.724	0.938	0.12	-0.396	BFI_MEAN (16.9)	unemplmnt (8.3)	POINT_X (7.8)
	Quality	DO enhancement or mitigation plan	F311078	2200	0.832	0.676	--	--	--	--	--
		Water quality mon. plan	F311086	6000	0.852	0.873	0.50	-0.375	ResDay (7.7)	SfArea (6.9)	IssueYear (5.1)
	US	NA (see Tier 2 category)	F312	4000	0.831	0.860	0.23	-0.320	unemplmnt (7.6)	POINT_Y (6.8)	N_PASTUREC (6.8)
	Water	Fish tissue sampling & analysis	F312087	4500	0.965	0.823	0.39	-1.704	unemplmnt (13.4)	wshedG_PA (9.7)	dist2Mouth (8.8)
	Quality	Impoundment sediment analysis	F312088	4100	0.993	0.999	0.19	0.334	wshedG_PA (21)	dist2Mouth (13.3)	unemplmnt (11.8)
		Inflow water quality mon. plan	F312090	1650	0.831	0.904	0.11	0.106	wshedG_PA (12.1)	KFACT (9.3)	Length (6)
		Impoundment water quality mon. plan	F312091	4100	0.828	0.805	0.22	-0.166	N_PASTUREC (10)	unemplmnt (6.5)	CNTC_MEAN (5.6)
			F413	4150	0.847	0.832	0.64	-0.638	POINT_X (17.8)	SfArea (8.7)	Height (6.4)
Biodiversity	Terrestrial	Noxious weed & invasive plant mgmt.	F413094	6650	0.912	0.901	0.39	0.068	POINT_X (13.8)	IssueYear (10.4)	PPT30MEAN (6.2)
		Species conservation mgmt. mon.	F413095	5850	0.832	0.899	0.40	-0.265	damRmvs (8.9)	Length (8.5)	Mode (6.7)
		T&E species protection plan	F413096	3950	0.879	0.905	0.21	0.965	L_POPDENS (12.5)	SLP_PERC (6.8)	SfArea (5.8)
		Transmission related avian & bat protection	F413097	6250	0.936	0.941	0.19	-0.109	PPT30MEAN (10.3)	POINT_X (9.7)	dsDams (7.5)
		Wildlife terrestrial habitat mgmt.	F413098	4100	0.844	0.937	0.27	0.146	FlowYr (6.3)	SfArea (5.6)	SierG_PC (5.2)
	Aquatic	NA (see Tier 2 category)	F414	3500	0.791	0.859	0.35	-0.271	FlowYr (11.1)	CNPY_MEAN (6.2)	PPT30MEAN (5.7)
		Aquatic species conservation mgmt. mon.	F414100	3400	0.807	0.869	0.34	-0.336	FlowYr (7.9)	POINT_X (7.1)	dist2Mouth (5.4)
		Diadromous species mgmt. mon.	F414101	3000	0.871	0.901	0.26	0.124	POINT_Y (22.1)	FlowYr (11.2)	PPT30MEAN (8.4)
		Invasive aquatic species mgmt.	F414102	2800	0.800	0.881	0.19	0.552	FlowYr (15.3)	L_POPDENS (6.4)	POINT_Y (6.2)
	Habitat	Fisheries	F515	2650	0.776	0.730	0.27	-0.038	POINT_X (8.5)	PPT30MEAN (7.4)	Length (5.6)
		DS habitat enhancement	F515105	1200	0.687	0.680	--	--	--	--	--
		DS woody debris restoration or passage	F515106	2850	0.863	0.879	0.25	0.071	POINT_Y (7.3)	Length (6.2)	damRmvs (5.5)
	Riparian	NA (see Tier 2 category)	F516	2600	0.771	0.869	0.28	0.084	L_POPDENS (8.6)	BFI_MEAN (7.8)	POINT_X (7.4)
		Establish riparian buffers	F516108	3100	0.866	0.864	0.25	0.673	Mode (10)	IssueYear (9)	MAVELU (6.5)
		Riparian habitat mon. or planning	F516110	2300	0.793	0.912	0.22	-0.368	L_POPDENS (8.1)	SierG_PA (7.4)	PPT30MEAN (7)
Habitat	Reservoir	NA (see Tier 2 category)	F517	6100	0.858	0.905	0.40	-0.082	ResDay (6.4)	IssueYear (5.8)	SfArea (5.4)
		Noxious invasive aquatic plant mgmt.	F517111	6950	0.928	0.952	0.25	-0.348	fishGroups (9.2)	IssueYear (7.6)	Length (4.9)
		Shoreline mgmt. plan or program	F517112	4800	0.856	0.952	0.27	0.192	POINT_Y (10.2)	SfArea (8.4)	Height (7.5)
	Wetlands	NA (see Tier 2 category)	F518	3800	0.828	0.874	0.19	0.207	SierG_PA (10.5)	POINT_Y (10.4)	L_POPDENS (5.4)
		Wetland protection	F518116	3500	0.878	0.875	0.14	0.082	POINT_Y (12.4)	Mode (8.5)	PPT30MEAN (6.6)
	Recreation	Resources	F619	3200	0.741	0.744	0.65	0.089	SfArea (10.6)	FlowYr (7.6)	Length (6.9)
		Boating facilities	F619118	1200	0.625	0.660	--	--	--	--	--
	Mitigation	Canoe portage launch	F619119	5000	0.859	0.773	0.37	-0.161	POINT_X (10.2)	dsDams (8)	N_DAMSC (6.7)
		Fishing pier	F619120	1700	0.797	0.869	0.13	0.055	N_DAMSC (18.3)	SfArea (10)	POINT_Y (8.2)
		Interpretive education sign & displays	F619123	1900	0.720	0.731	0.20	-0.192	MAVELU (7.3)	PPT30MEAN (7.3)	dist2Mouth (6.7)
		Parking	F619125	3550	0.715	0.722	0.32	0.441	MAXELEVSMO (13)	FlowYr (8.2)	ResDay (6.5)
		Shoreline access	F619128	750	0.623	0.759	--	--	--	--	--
		Stocking recreational fish species	F619129	1250	0.756	0.796	0.09	0.069	FlowYr (14)	PPT30MEAN (9.8)	Height (9.7)
		Trail trailhead or camping areas	F619130	3200	0.781	0.601	--	--	--	--	--
		Other day use area improvements	F619132	4900	0.750	0.781	0.44	-0.430	ResDay (8.5)	IssueYear (7.3)	PPT30MEAN (6.3)
Planning	NA (see Tier 2 category)		F620	2450	0.753	0.883	0.74	-0.001	PrmryPurps (15.8)	SfArea (10.6)	Length (9.6)
	Recreational mgmt. plan study or mon.		F620131	2450	0.753	0.883	0.74	-0.001	PrmryPurps (15.8)	SfArea (10.6)	Length (9.6)

See Table 1 for variable descriptions; if no influential variables are shown, model rejected due to poor fit; mgmt. = management; DS = downstream; US = upstream; T&E = threatened and endangered, mon. = monitoring; NA = not applicable; CV ROC = internal cross-validation ROC; V ROC = validation ROC; OT = optimal threshold; MI = Moran's Index; italics indicates spatial autocorrelation detected in training data; color scheme for influential variables corresponds to Table 1 color scheme.

3.2. Explanatory variables

The three variables with the highest relative influence in each model are presented in Table 2, and partial dependence plots for these variables are presented in Appendix B. Overall, we considered a variable important if its relative influence was $\geq 5\%$ (Parisien et al., 2011). A summary of the important variables for the Tier 3 models (Fig. 3) shows that nearly all the categories of variables (i.e. biological, facility, human, hydrologic, landscape, locational, and stream network) were influential within each Tier 1 category.

Fish passage (n=7)		Hydrology (n=15)		Water quality (n=7)		Biodiversity (n=8)		Habitat (n=6)		Recreation (n=10)	
Variable	F Inf	Variable	F Inf	Variable	F Inf	Variable	F Inf	Variable	F Inf	Variable	F Inf
POINT_X	7 0.63	Mode	5 0.79	unemplymnt	4 0.68	FlowYr	4 0.88	POINT_Y	3 1.00	FlowYr	7 0.72
MAXELEVSMO	6 0.92	POINT_X	5 0.74	wshedG_PA	3 0.91	PPT30MEAN	4 0.66	Mode	3 0.74	PPT30MEAN	6 0.72
POINT_Y	4 0.67	Length	4 0.81	BFI_MEAN	3 0.61	POINT_X	3 0.95	PPT30MEAN	3 0.64	ResDay	5 0.59
bigPlyrSum	4 0.41	SfArea	3 0.94	dist2Mouth	3 0.57	SfArea	3 0.57	Issue Year	2 0.86	MAXELEVSMO	4 0.80
Height	3 0.58	midStorSum	3 0.64	SierG_PC	3 0.41	L_POPDENS	2 0.71	fishG_PC	2 0.59	Height	4 0.66
dist2Mouth	3 0.57	Height	3 0.45	SfArea	2 0.87	POINT_Y	2 0.70	L_POPDENS	1 1.00	Length	4 0.66
dsDams	2 0.74	politics	2 1.00	Issue Year	2 0.56	SLP_PERC	2 0.55	fishGroups	1 1.00	dist2Mouth	4 0.65
fishG_PC	2 0.39	Issue Year	2 0.83	POINT_X	2 0.44	damRmvls	1 1.00	SierG_PA	1 0.91	SfArea	4 0.56
FlowYr	2 0.33	CNPY_MEAN	2 0.73	N_PASTUREC	1 1.00	Length	1 0.95	Length	1 0.85	L_POPDENS	3 0.73
wshed_PC	1 1.00	N_PASTUREC	2 0.25	N_DAMSC	1 1.00	SierG_PC	1 0.82	SfArea	1 0.82	dsDams	3 0.54
SierG_PC	1 0.92	unemplymnt	2 0.22	ResDay	1 1.00	Mode	1 0.75	damRmvls	1 0.75	MAVELU	2 0.84
L_ROADLEN	1 0.89	SierG_PA	1 1.00	KFACT	1 0.76	Issue Year	1 0.75	Height	1 0.73	N_DAMSC	2 0.83
fishGroups	1 0.84	N_CROPSC	1 1.00	POINT_Y	1 0.67	dsDams	1 0.73	MAVELU	1 0.65	Issue Year	2 0.77
politics	1 0.74	SLP_PERC	1 1.00	CNTC_MEAN	1 0.55	PrmryPurps	1 0.70	education	1 0.59	SLOPE	2 0.72
PrmryPurps	1 0.62	wshedG_PA	1 0.88	Length	1 0.50	dist2Mouth	1 0.69	wshedG_PA	1 0.42	POINT_X	2 0.70
SfArea	1 0.50	fishG_PC	1 0.63	damRmvls	1 0.44	Height	1 0.38	PrmryPurps	1 0.41	POINT_Y	2 0.54
SLOPE	1 0.43	owner	1 0.40	Height	1 0.35					PrmryPurps	1 1.00
MAVELU	1 0.43	POINT_Y	1 0.37							unemplymnt	1 0.48
		FlowYr	1 0.33							Mode	1 0.47
		bigPlyrSum	1 0.29								
		dist2Mouth	1 0.29								
		PPT30MEAN	1 0.25								
		BFI_MEAN	1 0.24								
		CNTC_MEAN	1 0.23								
		MAVELU	1 0.21								
		SierG_PC	1 0.19								

Fig. 3. Explanatory variables with relative influence ≥ 5 for Tier 3 models, broken down by Tier 1 category. Relative influence normalized to 0 to 1 scale for each model; Inf = mean relative influence for variable across all models in which relative influence ≥ 5 ; F = frequency, or number of times variable had Inf ≥ 5 ; color scheme corresponds to Table 1.

Across all Tier 3 models (Fig. 4), the most important variables were longitude (location), reservoir surface area (hydrology), average annual flow (hydrology), precipitation (landscape), and latitude (location). Stream network, facility, human, and biological variables were also important but exceeded the $\geq 5\%$ relative influence threshold less frequently.

Fig. 4. The 20 most frequently occurring important variables across all Tier 3 models, sorted in descending order from left to right by frequency of occurrence. Colored bars present frequency, while grey bars present the normalized average relative influence for the variable across all of the models in which it was important.

To identify potential key environmental and social drivers of mitigation that may warrant additional future research, we examined important variables across all of our Tier 3 models based on frequency of importance and average relative influence. We grouped important variables into the potential future research areas of socio-political conditions, regional trends, network/landscape position, hydrology/site design, regulatory tendencies, and fisheries (Table 3).

Table 3. The 20 most frequently occurring important variables across all Tier 3 models, with potential future research areas that correspond to each variable. F= frequency; Inf = normalized average relative influence.

Variable	Category	F	Inf	Future research area
POINT_X	Location	19	0.70	Regional trends
SfArea	Hydrology	14	0.70	Hydrology/site design
FlowYr	Hydrology	14	0.68	Hydrology/site design
PPT30MEAN	Landscape	14	0.65	Hydrology/site design
POINT_Y	Location	13	0.71	Regional trends
Height	Facility	13	0.55	Hydrology/site design
dist2Mouth	Stream network	12	0.58	Network/landscape position
Length	Facility	11	0.74	Hydrology/site design
MAXELEVSMO	Landscape	10	0.87	Network/landscape position
Mode	Facility	10	0.74	Hydrology/site design
IssueYear	Human	9	0.76	Regulatory tendencies
unemplmnt	Human	7	0.52	Socio-political conditions
L_POPDENS	Human	6	0.77	Socio-political conditions
ResDay	Hydrology	6	0.66	Hydrology/site design
dsDams	Stream network	6	0.64	Network/landscape position
SierG_PC	Human	6	0.53	Socio-political conditions
wshedG_PA	Human	5	0.80	Socio-political conditions
MAVELU	Hydrology	5	0.59	Hydrology/site design
fishG_PC	Human	5	0.52	Socio-political conditions
bigPlyrSum	Biological	5	0.39	Fisheries

3.3. Predictions to NPDs

We made predictions to 568 NPDs with >1MW potential capacity for each of the 49 acceptable Tier 3 models (Fig. 5). The optimal present/absent threshold for each model is presented in Table 2. The number of predicted mitigation requirements ranged from 9 to 34.

Fig. 5. Number of predicted Tier 3 mitigation requirements at NPDs with >1MW energy potential.

4. DISCUSSION

The spatial modeling approach developed here integrates GIS techniques, novel data, machine-learning algorithms, and niche modeling concepts common in landscape ecology (see Guisan and Thuiller, 2005) to predict environmental mitigation requirements at hydropower project sites. Given the multifaceted, complex nature of demonstrated (Kosnik, 2010) and hypothesized (FERC, 2001) drivers of environmental mitigation requirements, we were uncertain of their predictability. However, we have demonstrated that a broad-scale, multidisciplinary geographical predictor dataset can effectively predict many environmental mitigation requirements across an environmentally and culturally heterogeneous study area.

We summarized and evaluated the influence of the important (relative influence $\geq 5\%$) explanatory variables at several different levels of aggregation (Table 2, Fig. 3, and Fig. 4). Since nearly all the categories (e.g. biological, facility, etc.) of variables were influential within each Tier 1 category (Fig. 3)

and every Tier 3 model had at least two variable categories represented in the top 3 influential variables (Table 2), it appears that the multi-faceted nature of the predictor dataset we compiled was a key to our modeling success.

Based on our analysis of the top predictor variables across all of the Tier 3 models (Fig. 4), the most common important predictors include metrics of project location (latitude and longitude), project size (annual flow, reservoir size, dam height, and dam length), stream network position (distance along the stream network to network mouth), and climate (precipitation). Elevation above mean sea level, statewide prevalence of local watershed associations, local population density, license issue year, dam length, and dam mode-of-operation were the predictors with the highest average relative influence (Fig. 4) among the most important predictors. Given that the study area is large, environmentally and culturally heterogeneous, and comprised of many diverse physiographic regions, we anticipated latitude and longitude would be valuable predictors that capture regional trends across the U.S. For example, the inclusion of latitude and longitude in models predicting fish passage are related to the fact that most mitigation for passage occurs in the US northeast and northwest. We expected variables related to project size, facility characteristics, and hydrology to be important, given that larger projects are likely to have a higher impact to the environmental and social landscape than smaller projects. Elevation is a proxy for head and a measure of landscape position, and is a very powerful descriptor of landscape context. Stream network position, such as distance to river mouth, can explain presence of diadromous fish species, network connectivity, and existing hydrologic alteration, all of which can heavily influence decisions on mitigation requirements. It is well known in the U.S. that environmental stakeholder groups can be influential in ordered mitigation, so it was not surprising that anthropogenic variables, such as the prevalence of environmental groups, were important. Previous research (Kosnik, 2010) has shown that regulatory trends can influence hydropower mitigation requirements, and the license issue year proved to be an important variable in several models.

Examination of partial dependence plots to assess the direction of variable influence (Appendix B) seems to show that, while there appears to be some consistent direction of influence for important predictors, particularly in the fish passage and water quality models, there are as many examples of contrasting direction of influence within the six broad mitigation categories. This underscores the complexity of the interplay of the nature and magnitude of a given mitigation requirement with the environmental, economic, political, cultural, and social conditions that coalesce at a project and also underscores the need for further investigation into the causality of different drivers of mitigation.

While it is impractical to research causality for all specific mitigation requirements given the sheer number of different types, we identified several potential future research areas (Table 3) that warrant further investigation. One approach to prioritizing future research into mitigation requirement causality would be to delve further into the socio-political and environmental concerns of non-governmental organizations and environmental resource agencies regarding hydropower development, and how those concerns are manifest in prescribed mitigation. These stakeholder groups have a powerful voice and are important to engage early and throughout the project development process if hydropower's contribution to the U.S. renewable energy portfolio is going to be optimized (Fu et al., 2014). A high-level review of The Nature Conservancy's Hydropower by Design strategy (The Nature Conservancy, 2015) and American Rivers Hydropower Reform Coalition platform (Hydropower Reform Coalition, 2016) reveals a common theme of maximizing hydropower sustainability through 1) careful selection of dam location within river networks to optimize both hydropower and conservation objectives, 2) implementing cumulative watershed-scale mitigation strategies, 3) reducing uncertainty and risk associated with project development by directing dam development away from environmentally and socially sensitive areas, and 4) improved outcomes for ecosystem services. Future research into the interplay between socio-political demographics, stream connectivity, ecosystem services, and watershed-scale mitigation approaches and their influence on project siting and ultimate success or failure could serve to catalyze future sustainable

hydropower development in the 21st century (Crook et al., 2015; Fu et al., 2014; Karjalainen and Jarvikoski, 2010; Yu et al., 2016).

Another future direction of this research space is the inclusion of cost estimates for different mitigations, which could inform a cost-based approach for identifying priority mitigation types for future investigation of causality. Cost data would also provide a useful constraint for model predictions. Hydropower projects included in the mitigation database (Fig. 1) have a maximum number of 25 mitigation requirements (of the 49 that we modeled), while the model predictions to NPDs included as many as 34 mitigation requirements. Incorporating cost data would allow for additional realism to be integrated into the predictions by sequentially predicting mitigation types from most to least costly with a control on cost.

Our results should be interpreted with caution given that several models showed significant spatial autocorrelation. Since one of our goals was spatial prediction beyond the spatial extent of our dataset, we did not implement methods for accounting for spatial autocorrelation because previously developed methods do not allow for prediction beyond the dataset (Dormann et al., 2007; Rickbeil et al., 2014). We recognize that our models did not use an independent validation dataset, but rather a split of our original dataset. Since there is no comparable dataset available, we argue that our data split combined with tenfold internal cross-validation allowed for reliable evaluation of model performance to be made (Rickbeil et al., 2014).

The BRT models could potentially be improved by improving some of the more coarse resolution predictors – such as those derived at the state-scale – to represent a more refined local scale. A disconnect may exist between the spatial scale at which mitigation requirements are ordered and the scale at which some of our explanatory variables are derived. This disparity of scales and varying resolution of predictors can affect the apparent importance of a predictor variable (Brewer et al., 2007). Schramm et al. (2016) described several possible limitations to the development of the mitigation database, which was limited to a review of mitigation prescribed explicitly in FERC licenses issued from 1998 to 2015. More

specifically, some of the reviewed licenses were for relicensing of existing projects and thus may not include previously required mitigation under the original license. Also, FERC encourages the use of settlement agreements (legal agreements developed between hydropower developers, agencies, and other stakeholders on project operations and environmental conditions) that may include mitigation not included in the final license.

5. CONCLUSION

We demonstrated in this study an approach including specific statistical models that can be used by developers and regulators alike to identify and anticipate likely environmental mitigation at existing and proposed hydropower projects in the U.S. The results demonstrate that mitigation requirements in existing licenses have been a result of a range of factors from biological and hydrological to political and cultural. That such a range of variable types is needed to predict mitigation requirements explains much of the difficulty and uncertainty that surrounds the development of effective environmental mitigation during the licensing process in the U.S. Further research is needed to establish robust links between specific explanatory variables, mitigation requirements, and mitigation strategies. However, use of these models by developers can reduce uncertainty with regards to cost projections and inform decisions about project design. Regulators will be able to use the models to more quickly identify likely environmental issues and potential solutions, hopefully resulting in more timely and more effective decisions on environmental mitigation.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank R. McManamay for statistical advice, suggestions for predictor variables, and valuable comments on this manuscript. We also thank S.C. Kao for assistance with the NHAAP database and FERC licenses. This study was funded by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Office, Wind and Water Power Technologies Program through Oak Ridge

National Laboratory, which is managed by UT-Battelle, LLC, for the DOE under contract DE-AC05-00OR22725.

7. REFERENCES

- Abram NK, Meijaard E, Wells JA, Ancrenaz M, Pellier A-S, Runting RK, et al. Mapping perceptions of species' threats and population trends to inform conservation efforts: the Bornean orangutan case study. *Diversity and Distributions* 2015; 21: 487-499.
- Araujo M, Guisan A. Five (or so) challenges for species distribution modelling. *Journal of Biogeography* 2006; 33: 1677-1688.
- Arganaraz J, Pizarro G, Zak M, Landi M, Bellis L. Human and biophysical drivers of fires in Semiarid Chaco mountains of Central Argentina. *Science of the Total Environment* 2015; 520: 1-12.
- Blumm MC, Nadol VA. The decline of the hydropower czar and the rise of agency pluralism in hydroelectric licensing. *Columbia Journal of Environmental Law* 2001; 26.
- Brewer SK, Rabeni CF, Sowa SP, Annis G. Natural landscape and stream segment attributes influencing the distribution and relative abundance of riverine smallmouth bass in Missouri. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 2007; 27: 326-341.
- Bunn S, Arthington A. Basic principles and ecological consequences of altered flow regimes for aquatic biodiversity. *Environmental Management* 2002; 30: 492-507.
- Cada GF. Fish passage mitigation at hydroelectric power projects in the United States. *Fish Migration and Fish Bypasses* 1998: 208-219.
- Crook D, Lowe W, Allendorf F, Eros T, Finn D, Gillanders B, et al. Human effects on ecological connectivity in aquatic ecosystems: Integrating scientific approaches to support management and mitigation. *Science of the Total Environment* 2015; 534: 52-64.
- Deshazo JR, Freeman J. Public Agencies as Lobbyists. *Columbia Law Review* 2005; 105.
- Dormann C, Elith J, Bacher S, Buchmann C, Carl G, Carre G, et al. Collinearity: a review of methods to deal with it and a simulation study evaluating their performance. *Ecography* 2013; 36: 27-46.
- Dormann C, McPherson J, Araujo M, Bivand R, Bolliger J, Carl G, et al. Methods to account for spatial autocorrelation in the analysis of species distributional data: a review. *Ecography* 2007; 30: 609-628.
- Elith J, Graham C, Anderson R, Dudik M, Ferrier S, Guisan A, et al. Novel methods improve prediction of species' distributions from occurrence data. *Ecography* 2006; 29: 129-151.
- Elith J, Leathwick J, Hastie T. A working guide to boosted regression trees. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 2008; 77: 802-813.

- FERC. Report on hydroelectric licensing policies, procedures, and regulations, http://www.ferc.gov/legal/maj-ord-reg/land-docs/ortc_final.pdf (accessed 1.15.15), 2001.
- FERC. workload, <http://www.ferc.gov/industries/hydropower/gen-info/licensing/workload.xls> (accessed 1.15.15), 2015.
- Fink D, Hochachka W, Zuckerberg B, Winkler D, Shaby B, Munson M, et al. Spatiotemporal exploratory models for broad-scale survey data. *Ecological Applications* 2010; 20: 2131-2147.
- Fraley J, Marotz B, Decker-Hess J, Beattie W, Zubik R. Mitigation, compensation, and future protection for fish populations affected by hydropower development in the upper Columbia system, Montana, U.S.A. *River Research and Applications* 1989; 3: 3-18.
- Fu B, Wang Y, Xu P, Yan K, Li M. Value of ecosystem hydropower service and its impact on the payment for ecosystem services. *Science of the Total Environment* 2014; 472: 338-346.
- Grimm N, Foster D, Groffman P, Grove J, Hopkinson C, Nadelhoffer K, et al. The changing landscape: ecosystem responses to urbanization and pollution across climatic and societal gradients. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 2008; 6: 264-272.
- Guisan A, Thuiller W. Predicting species distribution: offering more than simple habitat models. *Ecology Letters* 2005; 8: 993-1009.
- Hadjerioua B, Wei Y, Kao S-C. An Assessment of Energy Potential at Non-Powered Dams in the United States. ORNL/TM-2011/341. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, 2012.
- Hosmer DW, Lemeshow S, Sturdivant RX. *Applied Logistic Regression*. Hoboken, NJ, U.S.A.: John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- Hydropower Reform Coalition. Platform, http://hydroreform.org/sites/default/files/HRC%20Platform_2.pdf (accessed 2.15.16), 2016.
- Karjalainen TP, Jarvikoski TB. Negotiating river ecosystems: Impact assessment and conflict mediation in the cases of hydro-power construction. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 2010; 30: 319-327.
- Knittel CR. The Adoption of State Electricity Regulation: The Role of Interest Groups. *Journal of Industrial Economics* 2006; 54: 201-222.
- Kosnik L. Balancing Environmental Protection and Energy Production in the Federal Hydropower Licensing Process *Land Economics* 2010; 86: 444-466.
- Kuby MJ, Fagan WF, ReVelle CS, Graf WL. A multiobjective optimization model for dam removal: an example trading off salmon passage with hydropower and water storage in the Willamette basin. *Advances in Water Resources* 2005; 28: 845-855.
- Kuhn M. Building Predictive Models in R Using the caret Package. *Journal of Statistical Software* 2008; 28: 1-26.
- Liermann C, Nilsson C, Robertson J, Ng R. Implications of Dam Obstruction for Global Freshwater Fish Diversity. *Bioscience* 2012; 62: 539-548.

- Ligon FK, Dietrich WE, Trush WJ. Downstream ecological effects of dams. *Bioscience* 1995; 45: 183-192.
- Manzano-Agugliaro F, Alcayde A, Montoya F, Zapata-Sierra A, Gil C. Scientific production of renewable energies worldwide: An overview. *Renewable & Sustainable Energy Reviews* 2013; 18: 134-143.
- McManamay R, Samu N, Kao S, Bevelhimer M, Hetrick S. A Multi-scale Spatial Approach to Address Environmental Effects of Small Hydropower Development. *Environmental Management* 2015; 55: 217-243.
- Moore ID, Grayson RB, Ladson AR. Digital Terrain Modeling - A review of hydrological, geomorphological, and biological applications. *Hydrological Processes* 1991; 5: 3-30.
- NatureServe. Digital Distribution Maps of the Freshwater Fishes in the Conterminous United States, Arlington, VA. U.S.A., 2010.
- Nilsson C, Reidy C, Dynesius M, Revenga C. Fragmentation and flow regulation of the world's large river systems. *Science* 2005; 308: 405-408.
- Oppel S, Meirinho A, Ramirez I, Gardner B, O'Connell A, Miller P, et al. Comparison of five modelling techniques to predict the spatial distribution and abundance of seabirds. *Biological Conservation* 2012; 156: 94-104.
- Parisien M, Parks S, Krawchuk M, Flannigan M, Bowman L, Moritz M. Scale-dependent controls on the area burned in the boreal forest of Canada, 1980-2005. *Ecological Applications* 2011; 21: 789-805.
- Peltzman S. Toward a more general theory of regulation. *Journal of Law and Economics* 1976; 19: 211-240.
- Poff N, Allan J, Bain M, Karr J, Prestegard K, Richter B, et al. The natural flow regime. *Bioscience* 1997; 47: 769-784.
- Poff N, Olden J, Merritt D, Pepin D. Homogenization of regional river dynamics by dams and global biodiversity implications. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2007; 104: 5732-5737.
- R-Core-Team. R: a language and environment for statistical computing, Vienna, Austria. Version 3.2.2. Available at <https://www.r-project.org/>. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2015.
- Renofalt B, Jansson R, Nilsson C. Effects of hydropower generation and opportunities for environmental flow management in Swedish riverine ecosystems. *Freshwater Biology* 2010; 55: 49-67.
- Rickbeil G, Coops N, Drever M, Nelson T. Assessing coastal species distribution models through the integration of terrestrial, oceanic and atmospheric data. *Journal of Biogeography* 2014; 41: 1614-1625.
- Schramm MP, Bevelhimer MS, DeRolph CR. A synthesis of environmental and recreational mitigation requirements at hydropower projects in the United States. *Environmental Science & Policy* 2016; 61: 87-96.

- Shmueli G. To Explain or to Predict? *Statistical Science* 2010; 25: 289-310.
- Tarlock D. Hydro law and the future of hydroelectric power generation in the United States. *Vanderbilt Law Review* 2012; 65: 1723-1767.
- The Nature Conservancy. The Power of Rivers, <http://www.nature.org/media/freshwater/power-of-rivers-report.pdf> (accessed 2.15.16), 2015.
- Tong S, Chen W. Modeling the relationship between land use and surface water quality. *Journal of Environmental Management* 2002; 66: 377-393.
- Trussart S, Messier D, Roquet V, Aki S. Hydropower projects: a review of most effective mitigation measures. *Energy Policy* 2002; 30: 1251-1259.
- U.S.-Congress. House Committee on Natural Resources. Mandatory conditioning requirements on hydropower: How federal resources agencies are driving up electricity costs and decreasing the original green energy, 2012.
- VanDerWal J, Falconi L, Januchowski S, Shoo L, Storlie C. Package ‘SDMTools’, <http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/SDMTools/index.html> (accessed August 2015), 2012.
- Wang L, Lyons J, Kanehl P. Impacts of urbanization on stream habitat and fish across multiple spatial scales. *Environmental Management* 2001; 28: 255-266.
- Yu B, Xu L. Review of ecological compensation in hydropower development. *Renewable & Sustainable Energy Reviews* 2016; 55: 729-738.
- Yu B, Xu L, Yang Z. Ecological compensation for inundated habitats in hydropower developments based on carbon stock balance *Journal of Cleaner Production* 2016; 114: 334-342.

Appendix A

Mitigation categories in the hierarchical database and the percent of times each was required. Bold indicates model was fit for mitigation category.

Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	ModelID	Percent required
Fish Passage	--	--	F1	48.8%
	Downstream Fish Passage	--	F101	24.9%
		Surface Collector	F101001	1.9%
		Trap and Transport	F101002	1.4%
		Modification of Spill or Gate Operation	F101003	3.3%
		Sluiceway	F101004	0.4%
		Bypass Facility	F101005	2.1%
		Conduit	F101006	1.2%
		Fish Friendly Turbine	F101007	0.2%
		Generation Shut Down	F101008	2.1%
		Flashboard Removal or Modification	F101009	0.2%
		Downstream Passage Plan Study Design	F101010	15.5%
		Modify spill or gate design	F101011	2.7%
		Modify sluiceway	F101012	1.6%
		Modify bypass facility	F101013	0.2%
		Modify intake	F101014	0.2%
	Upstream Fish Passage	--	F102	19.4%
		Adult fishway	F102015	0.4%
		Conduit	F102016	0.2%
		Eelway	F102017	7.4%
		Fish Ladder	F102018	3.3%
		Lock or elevator	F102019	2.3%
		Modify spill or gate operation	F102020	0.2%
		Tailrace exclusion device	F102021	2.5%
		Trap and transport	F102022	4.3%
		Upstream passage study plan or design	F102023	12.2%
		Modify adult fishway	F102024	0.2%
		Modify fish ladder	F102025	0.8%
		Modify lock or lift	F102026	0.2%
		Modify trap and transport	F102027	0.6%
	Passage Planning	--	F103	26.2%
		Design plan entrainment avoidance system	F103028	1.6%
		Downstream fish passage monitoring sampling	F103029	13.6%
		Entrainment or turbine mortality monitoring	F103030	3.7%
		Fish passage and operations plan	F103031	7.4%
		Fish passage feasibility assessment	F103032	3.1%
		Fish stranding plan monitoring evaluation	F103033	7.2%
		Fisheries disease management	F103034	0.6%
	Entrainment	Hatchery operations and management	F103035	1.9%
		Upstream fish passage monitoring sampling	F103036	10.7%
		--	F104	23.9%
		Barrier or guidance net	F104037	1.6%
		Fish screen	F104038	4.3%
		Gateway exclusion screen	F104039	0.4%
		Perforated plate	F104040	0.2%
		Solid panel and bar rack	F104041	0.4%
		Strobe light	F104042	0.2%
		Trash or bar rack	F104043	17.1%
Hydrology	--	--	F2	95.1%
	Flow Mitigation	--	F205	61.9%
		Tailrace adaptive flow management	F205044	1.6%
		Tailrace flow monitoring plan	F205045	34.0%
		Tailrace flow studies	F205046	3.5%
		Tailrace flushing or flood flows	F205047	1.9%
		Tailrace flow or stage monitoring equipment	F205048	14.2%
		Tailrace flow control device	F205049	2.7%
		Tailrace ramping rate restriction	F205050	11.1%
		Bypass adaptive flow management	F205051	1.9%
		Bypass flow monitoring plan	F205052	12.8%
		Bypass flow study	F205053	2.5%

Appendix A

Mitigation categories in the hierarchical database and the percent of times each was required. Bold indicates model was fit for mitigation category.

Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	ModelID	Percent required
	Tailrace Minimum Flow	Bypass flushing or flood flow	F205054	5.6%
		Bypass flow or stage monitoring equipment	F205055	7.2%
		Bypass flow control device	F205056	0.8%
		Bypass ramping rate restriction	F205057	6.2%
		--	F206	64.5%
		Run-of-river Tailrace	F206058	39.0%
		Seasonal Tailrace	F206059	13.6%
		Seasonal and type of year Tailrace	F206060	1.6%
		Year-round Tailrace	F206061	10.3%
		--	F207	41.9%
	Bypass Minimum Flow	Seasonal Bypass	F207063	17.1%
		Seasonal and type of year Bypass	F207064	4.5%
		Year-round Bypass	F207065	20.2%
		--	F208	42.9%
	Sediment	Sediment and erosion control plan or monitoring	F208066	41.6%
		Dredging	F208067	0.2%
		Install or operate gate to flush sediment	F208068	0.8%
		Sediment flushing flows	F208069	0.8%
	Recreation Flow	--	F209	13.2%
		Maintain recreational lake levels	F209070	3.3%
		Provide recreational flow releases or structures	F209071	9.7%
		Recreational flow studies	F209072	4.1%
	Operations	--	F210	54.8%
		Flow management plan	F210073	6.6%
		Operations compliance monitoring plan	F210074	40.6%
		Provide flow or lake levels electronically	F210075	10.7%
Water Quality	--	--	F3	53.7%
	Downstream Water Quality	--	F311	54.0%
		Adaptive water quality management	F311076	3.7%
		Benthic macroinvertebrate monitoring	F311077	5.4%
		DO enhancement or mitigation plan	F311078	5.4%
		Establish or fund water quality stations and stream gages	F311079	3.3%
		Forebay aeration	F311080	0.2%
		Operational changes	F311081	2.7%
		Powerhouse aeration	F311082	2.1%
		Tailrace structures for aeration	F311083	0.2%
		Temperature regulating device or structure	F311084	0.6%
		Temperature regulation or mitigation plan	F311085	0.4%
		Water quality monitoring plan	F311086	50.3%
	Upstream Water Quality	--	F312	24.5%
		Fish tissue sampling and analysis	F312087	8.2%
		Impoundment sediment analysis	F312088	6.4%
		Macroinvertebrate monitoring	F312089	0.6%
		Inflow water quality monitoring plan	F312090	8.9%
		Impoundment water quality monitoring plan	F312091	17.3%
Biodiversity	--	--	F4	71.4%
	Terrestrial	--	F413	66.6%
		Acquisition easements conservation or important habitat	F413092	4.1%
		Install upgrade monitor wildlife crossings	F413093	4.1%
		Noxious terrestrial weed and invasive plant management	F413094	25.6%
		Species conservation management monitoring	F413095	42.9%
		Threatened and endangered species protection plan	F413096	10.9%
		Transmission related avian and bat protection	F413097	15.5%
		Wildlife terrestrial habitat management	F413098	27.0%
	Aquatic	--	F414	35.5%
		Adaptive fishery management	F414099	3.9%
		Aquatic species conservation management monitoring	F414100	25.6%
		Diadromous species management monitoring	F414101	7.4%
		Invasive aquatic species management (fish and molluscs)	F414102	9.3%
		Stocking fish species of concern	F414103	4.5%

Appendix A

Mitigation categories in the hierarchical database and the percent of times each was required. Bold indicates model was fit for mitigation category.

Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	ModelID	Percent required
Habitat	--	--	F5	57.1%
	Fisheries	--	F515	26.8%
		Downstream gravel and sediment restoration	F515104	4.5%
		Downstream habitat enhancement	F515105	8.7%
		Downstream woody debris restoration or passage	F515106	15.9%
		Reservoir fishery habitat enhancement	F515133	3.3%
	Riparian	--	F516	20.4%
		Dust control and abatement	F516107	0.6%
		Establish riparian buffers	F516108	7.2%
		Riparian habitat enhancement	F516109	4.7%
		Riparian habitat monitoring or planning	F516110	12.0%
	Reservoir	--	F517	31.8%
		Noxious invasive aquatic plant management	F517111	21.0%
		Shoreline management plan or program	F517112	16.1%
	Wetlands	--	F518	11.5%
		Wetland enhancement	F518113	0.8%
		Wetland mitigation	F518114	4.9%
		Wetland monitoring	F518115	2.9%
		Wetland protection	F518116	6.8%
Recreation	--	--	F6	82.3%
	Resources and Mitigation	--	F619	66.2%
		Appoint historic cultural resource coordinator	F619117	0.4%
		Boating facilities	F619118	23.1%
		Canoe portage launch	F619119	24.1%
		Fishing pier	F619120	8.9%
		Floating debris removal	F619121	1.0%
		Install fish attracting structure for recreational fishing	F619122	2.7%
		Interpretive education sign and displays	F619123	15.5%
		Navigational aids and improvements	F619124	1.0%
		Parking	F619125	26.4%
		Protection of specific historic cultural resource sites	F619126	3.3%
		Public outreach education programs	F619127	0.6%
		Shoreline access	F619128	17.9%
		Stocking recreational fish species	F619129	6.6%
		Trail trailhead or camping areas	F619130	14.2%
		Other day use area improvements	F619132	35.3%
	Planning	--	F620	72.8%
		Recreational management plan study or monitoring	F620131	72.8%

Appendix B

Partial dependence plots for the three variables with the highest relative influence for each Tier 2 and Tier 3 model with an internal CV ROC and independent ROC ≥ 0.7

NOTES: The ModelID for each model is shown in the upper-right hand corner of each set of three partial dependence plots; see Table 1 for variable descriptions; see Table 2 for details on mitigation types; ticks across the top of each plot show the distribution of deciles for each predictor variable.

Definitions for categorical variables

Mode	Value
Canal/Conduit	C
Intermediate Peaking	I
Peaking	P
Pumped Storage	S
Reregulating	R
Run-of-river	O
Run-of-river/Peaking	A
Run-of-river/Upstream Peaking	B

owner	Value
Cooperative	C
Private	P
Public	U
Wholesale Power Marketer	W

PrmryPurps	Value
Flood control and stormwater management	C
Fish and wildlife pond	F
Hydroelectric	H
Irrigation	I
Navigation	N
Other	O
Recreation	R
Water supply	S

Tier 2 Fish Passage

Tier 3 Fish Passage

Tier 2 Hydrology

Tier 3 Hydrology

Tier 2 Water Quality

Tier 3 Water Quality

Tier 2 Biodiversity

Tier 3 Biodiversity

Tier 2 Habitat

Tier 3 Habitat

Tier 2 Recreation

Tier 3 Recreation