

**AGENDA
STAFF WORKSHOP #2****Guidelines for Reducing Bird and Bat
Impacts from Wind Development in California
Docket # 06-OII-1****MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 2006** (1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.)**TUESDAY, AUGUST 29, 2006** (10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.)

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 Ninth Street, Sacramento, California
Hearing Room B

Workshop Objectives:

- Provide updates on upcoming public events and research;
- Provide information related to California wind areas and project development;
- Explore discussion items associated with pre-permitting (pre-construction) monitoring;
- Explore discussion items associated with operations (post-construction) monitoring; and
- Identify action items in advance of next workshop.

MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 2006

- 1:00 – 1:10 **Introductions, Workshop Objectives, and Agenda Review**
- *Paul De Morgan, RESOLVE*
- 1:10 – 1:30 **Updates Since Last Workshop**
- Housekeeping items – *Rick York, CEC Siting Division*
 - Future public events – *Misa Ward, CEC Siting Division*
 - Research update – *Kelly Birkinsham, CEC Public Interest Energy Research (PIER) Program*
- 1:30 – 2:00 **California Wind Overview Presentations**
- State of Wind in CA – Map Overlays – *Brenda LeMay, Horizon Wind Energy*
 - Project Development Process – *Kenneth Stein, FPL*
- 2:00 – 2:30 **Pre-Permitting Diurnal Bird Monitoring: Presentation – Dick Anderson**
- Standard (default) methodology/sample design (intensity, frequency, duration)
 - Site sensitivity (existing information, resources on-site, site size, habitat, etc.)
 - Special cases
 - Standardization

2:30 – 4:10

Pre-Permitting Diurnal Bird Monitoring: Discussion Items (*break included*)

1. Should the guidelines recommend a “model” (or multiple models depending on site conditions) or “standard” (default) pre-permitting study effort? What should the duration, intensity, and frequency be?
2. When/why is study beyond the “model” or “standard” (default) study effort needed?
3. When/why is less study than the “model” or “standard” (default) study effort needed?
4. Which pre-permitting study methods provide the best value in terms of effort expended and birds saved? Should studies focus mostly on these kinds of cost-effective methods?
5. What techniques can be most readily compared to other pre-construction studies in other states and elsewhere around the world?
6. Which species in California are known to be at greatest risk from wind development? What are the best ways to minimize risk to those species?
7. What pre-permitting study methods are most useful in aiding modern siting techniques?

4:10 – 4:30

Pre-Permitting Migratory Bird Monitoring: Presentation

- Migratory Birds in California, Assessing Migration Passage/Stopovers and Risk at Wind Sites – *Mike Green, USFWS*

4:30 – 5:00

Pre-Permitting Migratory Bird Monitoring: Discussion Items

1. What circumstances might require a detailed assessment of migratory bird passage?
2. What techniques are appropriate to quantify numbers and altitude of migratory birds?
3. Would a map of bird migration corridors in California be useful in assessing risk?

5:00

Adjourn

TUESDAY, AUGUST 29, 2006

10:00 – 10:10

Introductions and Agenda Review

- *Paul De Morgan, RESOLVE*

10:10 – 10:30

Operations Monitoring: Presentation

- General Overview – *Susan Sanders, CEC*
 - Ongoing bird and bat use surveys
 - Carcass counts
 - Study plot size
 - Frequency of carcass searches
 - Corrections for searcher efficiency, scavenging, background mortality
 - Reporting operations monitoring results

10:30 – 12:00

Operations Monitoring: Discussion Items

1. What study techniques have been the most effective predictors of avian activity and mortality?
2. Are there any circumstances in which no operations monitoring would be required for a proposed wind energy site?
3. Under what circumstances might operations monitoring need to be continued indefinitely? At what point is there a diminishing return and limited wildlife benefit in continued studies?
4. Is there a point at which the responsibility for post-construction monitoring should shift to a public rather than a private responsibility?
5. Are there circumstances in which monitoring reports should not be available to the public?
6. Should monitoring reports include raw data (i.e., field data entered into a database such as Access)?
7. Should wind energy sites offer some level of open access to outside parties for follow-up studies? Should the guidelines provide recommendations on how to develop agreements with project owners for such access?
8. Would a clearinghouse or centralized database of California wind/wildlife monitoring reports be useful? How should it be organized (by county? region?), and what agency would maintain it?

12:00 – 1:00

Lunch

1:00 – 1:20

Bat/Wind Turbine Interactions: Presentation

- Overview of status of bat/wind turbine research and study methods – *Bromwyn Hogan, CDFG*

1:20 – 2:20

Bat/Wind Turbine Interactions: Discussion

1. How applicable are bat/turbine studies from other regions for California?
2. What features of a site might indicate that detailed bat studies would be required (e.g., proximity to known maternity colony).
3. Would year-round pre-construction acoustic be warranted at such sites, or only during peak migratory periods (August – October)?

2:20 – 2:30

Break

2:30 – 3:40

Open Discussion

- Intention is to utilize time to revisit questions not fully addressed or address additional items raised

3:40 – 4:00

Next Steps

- Next steps – *Paul De Morgan, RESOLVE*
 - Future workshop planning: venue, location, topics, format

4:00

Adjourn