

**NOTES | Tuesday, 3/13/2007**  
**Altamont Scientific Review Committee**  
**Conference Call**

Notes Prepared by Gina Bartlett, Center for Collaborative Policy  
 Reviewed & Approved by the SRC

**Documents Related to this Meeting Summary**

[S13 Questions for Settling Parties Response—Follow-Up to Feb 5 SRC Meeting](#)

[S14 Attorney General Concerns Regarding the Baseline \(3/1/07\)](#)

[S15 Smallwood Estimated Effects of Proposed Measures to be applied to 2500 Wind Turbines \(3/8/07\)](#)

[S16 Smallwood's Replies to the Parties' Response to Queries from the SRC and the... Attorney General \(3/9/07\)](#)

[S17 Yee Comments 3-12-07 on S16 Smallwood's Replies to Parties](#)

**Key Outcome**

The SRC agreed to prepare a clarifying document for the County and Board to inform their understanding on settlement-related issues that affect the monitoring program. The purpose of this document would be to clarify areas of uncertainty for settlement-related and monitoring program issues. This document would include responses by the SRC to document "S13\_ Questions for Settling Parties Response"

**Parties Response to Remaining SRC Questions and Attorney General's Letter**

The following topics are identified in the settling parties' responses to the SRC and Attorney General. The SRC discussed these topics and considered public comment on the issue.

**1) Precision Level**

- One SRC member expressed concern about parties using "avian mortality" stressing that "raptor mortality" is more precise.
- Smallwood and Thelander (2004) used a range of estimates referred to as the uncertainty range which had high and low values for mortality. The settling parties chose the high end of the uncertainty range as its value for the baseline. The SRC initially expressed concern about the parties using the high-end value because it seemed incongruous with the parties' statement in document S13 that they will accept the point estimate of mortality reduction (for the example of 55% ± 10%, the parties would accept the 55% figure without regard to the low or high values of the range 45-65%). However, Shawn Smallwood clarified that the high value of the uncertainty range from the 2004 report has been corrected using both types of adjustments (scavenger and searcher detection error), while the low value has been corrected using only the searcher detection error. The SRC agreed that an estimate based on both types of corrections was more appropriate than an estimate based on just one of the corrections, therefore the high-end value from the 2004 report is more comparable to what the SRC said should be used as a baseline. Statistician Julie Yee said that the high-end value from the 2004 report serves as a point estimate.
- **Agreed: insert the SRC precision memo text in the SRC clarifying document**
- **Agreed: clarify the adjustment factors that were used and comparability of point estimate in the SRC clarifying document**

**2) Relocation Criteria**

- FPLE will provide the County and SRC information related to how many turbines have been relocated and how many have been removed. This information is forthcoming. Other settling companies,

except for FPLE, have completed removal of Tiers 1 and 2 turbines so this issue really only applies to FPLE.

- The SRC requested clarification about whether blade and motors are only being moved to other towers. In the language of the settling parties, it appears that the companies can move turbines to existing pads that do not have towers.
- **FPLE Clarification: FPLE representative Joanne Stewart clarified that the relocations that FPLE is planning to complete will be to existing towers (not existing pads).**

### 3) Exhibit G-1 (settling) and G-2 (non-settling) Strategies

County Question to the SRC

Is it possible to monitor two separate set of conditions under one monitoring program?

Permits and NCCP

The amended permits are in effect for the next three years. The NCCP will not be approved in the near term. Settling party Elizabeth Murdoch, Golden Gate Audubon, described the settlement as having two phases: phase 1 is the permits; phase 2, the long term is the NCCP. In phase 1, the settlement agreement will lead to the 50% reduction and has language for the SRC to make recommendations on management strategies other than those prescribed in the settlement. In phase 2, the NCCP will look at the repowering issue and siting of those turbines. In response to a question by the facilitator, both the County rep Sandra Rivera and Elizabeth Murdoch said that the SRC could likely add recommendations to the NCCP. Although the NCCP process is still being developed, it would likely want to factor in SRC and other scientific insights.

Management Strategies under the Settlement

Shawn Smallwood prepared an estimate on the likelihood of achieving the 50% reduction (see S15 above). The SRC is concerned about the parties' ability to achieve the 50% reduction. The SRC recognizes its charge to recommend management strategies to assist in achieving the 50% reduction, but questioned limitations on its role in light of the recent settlement. County representative Sandi Rivera clarified that the SRC can recommend other management actions; however, the settlement has changed circumstances in that the County must consult with and get approval from the settling parties on the recommended management strategies rather than mandate them under the permit conditions.

The SRC requested clarification on which items under G2 are required under G1. Although this issue is still being discussed among the settling parties, it sounds as if management actions under G2 will likely need to be recommended to the settling parties in phase 1 (under the permits) or agreed to under phase 2 (through the NCCP).

**Outcome: SRC can make additional recommendations for additional management actions, but the County as a settling party must consult with the other settling parties regarding implementation.**

**Follow-Up on the Document**

- **SRC Agreement:** The SRC agreed to include Smallwood March 8 estimates (S15) to document SRC concerns that the parties may not realize a 50% reduction, clarifying that Smallwood's estimates do not include Buena Vista or Diablo Winds data. Two issues should be highlighted for the settling parties: a) problems could be associated with incorporating data from these two studies if the study methods are different from the proposed APWRA monitoring plan, and b) repowering can be a "confounding factor."
- **April Agenda Item:** The SRC will examine and consider how to incorporate the Diablo Winds data and methodology.
- **Action:** Sandi Rivera will inquire about monitoring at Buena Vista and the status of the Technical Advisory Committee.

**Public Comment:**

- Brian Walton stressed urgency to reduce the mortality and expressed concern that monitoring will occur and nothing will change because the settlement strategies may not support a substantial reduction in mortality.
- Michael Boyd: Items in the conditional use permits that should have already happened should still happen.

**SRC Follow-Up to Public Comment**

Joanna Burger stressed that the monitoring is necessary to show any reduction and learn new things about avian mortality. The issue for the SRC is what else can and should be done to get to the 50% reduction. Shawn Smallwood reiterated this as well.

- 4) **Repowering Projects:** Deferred due to time constraints.
- 5) **Baseline:** Deferred due to time constraints.
- 6) **Scaling Factor:** Deferred due to time constraints.
- 7) **50% Reduction:** Deferred due to time constraints.

**Agenda Topics for April 9-11 Meeting**

Topic was deferred to next call on March 19, 2007, at 1:30 p.m.

**Monitoring Team Scope**

SRC will send any remaining questions to the monitoring team via email. If SRC agreement is needed on any matter, the SRC will discuss the item on its next conference call scheduled March 19, 2007, at 1:30 p.m.

**General Public Comment**

Mike Boyd: Would like to receive all materials 72 hours in advance.

---

**Participants**

Joanna Burger, SRC  
Jim Estep, SRC  
Sue Orloff, SRC  
Shawn Smallwood, SRC  
Julie Yee, SRC  
Sandi Rivera, County of Alameda

Brian Walton, USCS, Monitoring Team Rep  
Wally Erickson, WEST, Monitoring Team  
Ed West, JSA, Monitoring Team

Mike Boyd  
Tara Mueller  
Elizabeth Murdoch  
Joanne Stewart

Facilitator and Notetaker: Gina Bartlett, Center for Collaborative Policy