

NOTES | 6/12/2007

Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area Scientific Review Committee Conference Call

Prepared by the Center for Collaborative Policy
Reviewed & Approved by the SRC on 8/17/2007

Meeting Summary Approval

The SRC approved the following meeting summaries:

- [P14, Notes from 2/27/2007](#)
- [P19, Notes from 3/19/07](#)
- [P28, Meeting Summary April 9-11, 2007](#)
- [P29, Notes from 4/23/07](#)
- [P31, Notes from 5/8/2007](#)

FPLE Credit Issue

Related Materials

- [P24A: Partnership – Green Ridge Power, Wind Turbine Removal and Relocation Project, 4-10-07](#)
- [P24B: FPLE Relocation Sites](#)
- [P24C: Species & Date Found](#)
- [P24D: FPLE Turbine Operating Hours for Derelict List](#)
- [P22: Verification of Tier 1 & 2 Wind Turbine Shutdowns and Relocations, K. Shawn Smallwood, 15 April 2007](#)

Brown Act Violation

Facilitator Gina Bartlett apologized to the SRC and other participants for violating the Brown Act public meeting law. Her goal in communications leading up to the call was to clarify SRC member concerns about the FPLE credit similar to what has been discussed in the previous public meetings so she could summarize the range of opinion and have the SRC make a decision on issuing the credit during the public meeting conference call. Her plan was for the SRC to make the agreement in the public meeting today. However, summarizing SRC members' perspectives in an individual telephone conversation with Shawn Smallwood was a mistake, which constitutes a violation of the Brown Act. After her apology, the SRC then discussed the FPLE credit issue, as summarized below, and decided to defer its decision on issuing the credit to a July 20 conference call.

FPLE Turbine Operating Hours for Derelict List (P24D)

Eighteen of the 96 turbines that are part of the FPLE credit request are in question regarding their operation status in 2002. The issue is whether these 18 turbines were operating in 2004 when they were removed. FPLE presented power output data that indicate that the turbines were operating in 2002 and 2004. Smallwood and Thelander (2004) have data indicating that these 18 turbines were derelict in 2002. Derelict means that some piece of the turbine was missing that prevents it from operating. One explanation might be that the turbines were repaired so they were again operating in 2004. Another explanation might be data confusion with adjacent turbines that were not operating (FPLE is unsure if the adjacent turbines were derelict or not operating).

Due to these concerns, the SRC has requested that FPLE provide the 2002 monthly power output data for these 18 turbines. FPLE is also preparing power output data for turbines adjacent to the 18 turbines.

SRC Concerns on Granting the Credit

Individual SRC members have different concerns about issuing the credits. In brief, remaining SRC concerns are:

- ✓ Criteria for removal provided by FPLE was not applied consistently or wasn't the real criteria used
- ✓ Removing other turbines could have provided substantial reduction in mortality
- ✓ Would like FPLE to commit to the pylon study to ensure that 50% target is being pursued
- ✓ The power output data are not conclusive
- ✓ Avian mortality may not have decreased and possibly increased since FPLE shut down and moved these turbines

The settlement language on issuing the credit is that the SRC should base its decision on technical and scientifically based information. SRC members indicate that it is incumbent on FPLE to put together a proposal to ensure that the SRC is in compliance with the settlement agreement in issuing its credit.

Although the SRC did not make a decision on the credit during the call, three members support granting the credit. Of these three, one member's support is not strong. A fourth member would prefer to link the credit to a commitment to implement some other strategy. The fifth member does not support granting the credit because of the way the criteria were applied and for other reasons listed above. However, this member stated that granting the credit would be reasonable if FPLE made a substantial commitment to implementing an additional management strategy.

Public Comment

Two members of the public spoke in favor of reviewing the additional 2002 power output data on a monthly basis before reaching a decision.

Follow-Up on Credit Issue

- ✓ FPLE will respond to questions on the application of the criteria
- ✓ FPLE will provide the monthly power output data for 2002

Planning July 2007 SRC Agenda

Related Materials: [Draft July 2007 Agenda](#)

The SRC recommended that the entire morning of day two focus on management strategies. The conversation on re-classifying tiers was deferred to a later meeting. The facilitator will modify the agenda accordingly. The agenda and meeting materials will be posted on the web and sent to the SRC on July 2.

Field Protocols for Monitoring

Related Materials:

[P12 SRC Meeting Summary Feb 2007 Final](#)

[M1: Monitoring Protocols](#)

[M2: Burrowing Owl and American Kestrel Mortality Survey and Scavenger Rate Study Protocols](#)

NOTE: The following recommendations are numbered for easy reference only. The numbers do not denote any importance or priority.

1. Consider moving the criteria on what constitutes a fatality to a later part on data classification.

2. Fatality

M1-A Currently States:

To be considered a turbine-related fatality, each find must include at least 5 bones, 5 tail feathers, or 2 primaries within at least 5 meters of each other, or a total of 10 feathers. 2 primaries, or greater than or equal to 10 feathers, or greater than or equal to five tail feathers.

The SRC agreed to change this to the underlined text which is consistent with the SRC Recommendation from Feb 2007 meeting summary, P12.

3. When remains of the bird are discovered, collect all the data. Then determine at later time, what is a fatality. The field staff can make a judgment on the fatality, but the supervisor will make the ultimate judgment on the cause of death.

4. Distance: The distance from the nearest intact turbine to the fatality is in meters. The SRC has not specified whether the distance should be measured to the closest remain or to the center of the cluster.

5. Observation Points: The Monitoring Team will make recommendations on where observation points should be located. Then, the MT will review with Lee Neher who has the capacity to identify appropriate observation points based on topographical and site-line characteristics. The location of observation points will be modified as needed based on this review and discussion.

6. The MT could use feedback from the SRC on turbines of interest, which the SRC can provide in writing.

7. Search Radius: The SRC thinks the 800 meter search radius for behavior data is too long; members recommend making it 400 meters.

8. Point Count Data: Currently the MT is recording data onto maps. Need the distance from the observer to the point. The SRC recommends using digital voice recorders rather than mapping. The data can be downloaded digitally, and the observer does not have to move his or her eye to a map to record information. Moving eyes to a map could cause the observer to miss other bird activity.

9. Observation Interval: The SRC recommends Option 2 (previously discussed and summarized below). The MT reported that it could do either.

Option 1: 40-Minute Observation Interval at Diablo

- Record 30 minutes of behavioral data, distinguish first 20 minutes
- Follow with 10-minute point count

This would allow 30-minute intervals to compare with the first two years of data collected at Diablo Winds and 20-minute intervals to compare with the current Altamont-wide monitoring program. This option is based on the assumption that modifying the current program is easier than going back to query old data and separate the first 20 minutes. Uncertainty is the cost of additional data collection.

Option 2: 20-Minute Behavior Observation Interval for all Studies

In this option, all the studies would be evaluated using a 20-minute observation interval for all studies. Analysts would re-query old data from Diablo and the 2004 CEC Study to analyze the first 20 minutes of observation.

For this to work, the MT has reported that WEST can separate the 30-minute intervals into the first 20 minutes for the Diablo Winds project, which is the contingency for this to be successful.

Participants

SRC

Joanna Burger
Jim Estep
Sue Orloff
Shawn Smallwood
Julie Yee

Identified Members of Public

Joan Stewart, AIC & FPLE
John Moorman
Ely Saddler, Golden Gate Audubon
Janice Gan, F&G
David Cleary

Brian Walton, Monitoring Team

Sandi Rivera, County of Alameda

Facilitator Gina Bartlett