

**DRAFT Meeting Summary | April 29-30, 2010****Altamont Scientific Review Committee**

Developed by the Center for Collaborative Policy

Reviewed &amp; approved by the SRC.

**Key Outcomes**

- SRC Members provided feedback on Alameda County's proposed adaptive management plan for consideration by Settling Parties as they attempt to reach agreement on a plan proposal.
- The SRC agreed that the future Monitoring Program that would begin after June 30 could have a reduced sample size, based on a power analysis, and electronic data collection to reduce costs. The SRC is scheduled to finalize the program in June.
- The SRC agreed that the Monitoring Report will be finalized without waiting to incorporate digitized bird use data.

**Action Items & Meeting Follow-Up**

<b>Party</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Action</b>
Shawn & Jim	5/21	Hazard Turbine Ranking: Review/revise P70 Relocation Guidelines based on ranking trip
Shawn & Jim	5/14	Hazard Turbine Ranking: Develop a more comprehensive methodology report (P153) with rankings attribute context (on 7-7.5) and datasheet, etc.
Shawn, Jim & Monitoring Team	5/14	Hazard Turbine Ranking: Reconcile turbine ranking spreadsheet
Brian Karas as Compliance Monitor	2 weeks prior to next SRC meeting	Hazard Turbine Ranking: Report to the SRC actual vacancies from 2007 SRC hazard turbine ranking
CalWEA & SRC	Late May	Conference call to discuss CalWEA/EcoStat Altamont study. CalWEA to contact SRC to arrange.
Monitoring Team	5/14	Develop detailed study plan for future monitoring Process <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Monitoring Team draft – sufficiently detailed</li> <li>2. SRC comments</li> <li>3. Monitoring Team re-issue</li> <li>4. SRC meeting to finalize in June</li> </ol>
Julie, Shawn & Monitoring Team		Finalize Monitoring Team report without digitized bird use data. Report is to include unadjusted point estimates for fatalities by year

**Next Steps**

- Establish monitoring goals for repowering/siting, including methods to site new turbines correctly
- Align Future Monitoring Program with Adaptive Management Plan and Hazardous Turbine Removal Plan

## Table of Contents

Key Outcomes .....	1
Action Items & Meeting Follow-Up .....	1
Meeting Account .....	2
Announcements & Updates .....	2
Hazardous Turbine Ranking .....	2
Briefing on CalWEA/Eco-Stat Altamont Study .....	4
SRC Review and Feedback on Proposed Adaptive Management Program .....	6
Future Monitoring Program Discussion .....	9
Monitoring Report Update .....	12
Postponed Items: .....	12
Documents Circulated at Meeting .....	12
SRC Meeting Participants .....	13
List of SRC Agreements Developed April 29 & 30 .....	14

## Meeting Account

### Announcements & Updates

Sandra Rivera of Alameda County reported that field monitoring has continued since January, and the Monitoring Team contract continues through June 30. Brian Karas of BRC has been hired as this year's Compliance Monitor. The County hopes to issue a notice of preparation for the programmatic EIR in a few months. The notice would include companies' repowering project descriptions. The two planned Environmental Impact Analyses are:

- Programmatic EIR on CUPs, summer 2010; Alameda County is lead agency
- Conservation Plan EIS/R in fall 2010; USFWS is lead agency for EIS, Alameda County is lead agency for EIR

### Hazardous Turbine Ranking

#### Related Document

- [M51 APWRA Hazardous Turbine Ratings](#)
- [P153 Smallwood & Estep Additional Hazard Ratings](#)
- [P155 Smallwood SRC Turbine Ratings and Status](#)

SRC members in January recommended reviewing and ranking turbines they have not yet visited. In February and March, the SRC established a subcommittee of Shawn Smallwood and Jim Estep to undertake a field visit the week of March 8 and approved a field data form for the visit.

Jim Estep and Shawn Smallwood reported on the field visit, which consisted of five long days.

- They used the same rationale and approach as the SRC 2007 field visit.
- To expedite work, they ranked turbines they considered to be in the 7-10 range, and ranked other turbines as less than 7.
- If the SRC had already ranked part of a string, most of the time they assumed other turbines in the string that had not been ranked were below the 7 threshold. Where there appeared to be changes (e.g., gaps or derelict turbines) in strings that had been previously ranked, they ranked the string.
- They used mortality data when it was available.
- In some cases, companies asked them to rate vacant addresses, which they did.
- Turbines they ranked 9-10 are the most problematic and should be removed.
- They identified some areas that had lower rankings in 2007 that they considered to be fairly high risk. In some cases, fatality clusters in the mortality data didn't make sense and were assumed to have been caused by another adjacent turbine.
- They identified gaps or empty towers where hazardous situations could be improved by putting in a turbine to fill the gap. Doing so would often reduce the situation to a less than 7 hazard. Many of the situations rated 7-8 could be easily remedied, resulting in a lower hazard score. Information about these situations is in the notes.
- Rankings were generally consistent from 2007. However, there were some changes because of turbine removals and other factors. In many cases, the companies did a good job of responding to the SRC's previous recommendations.
- The two SRC members agreed on rankings 99% of the time. Differences of opinion were among those turbines ranked 7-8.5.
- For adaptive management, it will be important to look at the context of each turbine situation, rather than agreeing to abstract trade-offs between turbine rankings. For example, a large dip with high ranked turbines at the bottom and lower ranked turbines on the sides could become a problem if only the turbines at the bottom are removed.
- Shawn Smallwood clarified that P155 is an informational item he produced for the SRC, partly based on Google Earth data.

### **SRC Questions and Comments**

During discussion, the following points were made:

- It would be helpful to add in the title of P153 that the document is a methodology for the additional ratings; add an appendix; and add information about the high level of agreement between the two Subcommittee members. It should be made easy for the public to identify and find methods documents.
- It would be helpful to list those turbines in which there were differences of opinion between the two subcommittee members.

### **Public Comment**

Renee Culver of NextEra, who participated in the field visit, said her impression is those turbines ranked 9-10 are a discrete group, with ratings based on topography and mortality. Those rank 7-8.5 were often ranked because of other factors, which could be determined by reviewing criteria and maps.

Mike Boyd of CARE asked if the Subcommittee was verifying turbine removal. Subcommittee members said they were not. Boyd said the Subcommittee could be filtering their data, creating a bias. Also, he wants to resolve the data differences between the SRC and Monitoring Team turbine lists, as Settling Parties need to identify which turbines to remove for the adaptive management plan. He also asked if any turbines were missed.

Subcommittee members said they looked at every string that had not been previously surveyed, and also looked at every string that had been surveyed. If turbines are not ranked, it was because the Subcommittee looked at the string and determined it was not necessary to rank them.

### **Next Steps**

SRC members acknowledged the excellent work of Estep, Smallwood, Culver and Monitoring Team member Brian Karas., and the extraordinary time commitment involved. They agreed to the following next steps:

- Estep and Smallwood will update P70 SRC Relocation Guidelines with additional insights from the field visit, including any additional recommendations that would be useful for repowering.
- They will also update P153 to reflect the day's discussions and add information about those turbines with ratings resulting from a situational context (as an additional column to the spreadsheet).
- The Subcommittee members and the Monitoring Team will work with each other to reconcile turbine data differences.
- Brian Karas will update the turbine status table to show actual vacancies of towers and addresses.

## **Briefing on CalWEA/Eco-Stat Altamont Study**

Sandra Rivera of Alameda County said the California Wind Energy Association (CalWEA) has secured California Energy Commission funding to undertake a research project on scavenger removal and searcher efficiency. They would like to use the Altamont and the work of the Monitoring Team as part of the project.

Nancy Rader, Executive Director of CalWEA, said the project would conduct field trials to generate data to test the scavenging and searcher efficiency equation, by placing frozen carcasses, partial carcasses and feather piles on site, so that the actual number of carcasses is known. Bill Warren-Hicks of Eco-Stat will be involved in the study, and Renee Culver of NextEra is on the Project Advisory Committee. The study would be nationally applicable. The Monitoring Team would be involved by reporting when they find study carcasses. Study investigators are finishing the protocols now. They expect to perform a pilot study in May to test the design before undertaking the full study in June, which could last for about 2 to 3 months. Protocols and data would be completely transparent.

### **SRC Questions and Comments**

In response to a question, Rivera said Alameda County has not yet made a decision in response to CalWEA's proposal to use the Altamont. The purpose of the day's discussion is to consider its implications, and provide input on its methodology and collaborations if it is conducted.

In discussion, the following points were raised:

- There was concern that the placement of carcasses, if the number is significant, could introduce a swamping bias, altering the scavenging rate on the ground. Predators might tend to choose the placed species rather than naturally occurring carcasses, resulting in an artificially high adjusted mortality rate. Some SRC members thought the study could be designed to avoid swamping.
- The rates may or may not be representative of the types of birds being killed in the Altamont. Some species are far more or less attractive to scavengers than others. Non-raptor carcasses are taken by scavengers at a higher rate than other birds but frozen carcasses may not (particularly those that have been euthanized).
- The SRC's standing recommendation is for a double-observer survey (previously called a QAQC study), an elegant approach that would not interfere with scavenging activity.
- There was concern that the CALWEA study could introduce another form of variation into the Altamont that would have to be accounted for in an already complicated data set.
- In response to a question, Rader said a study field person would visit the carcasses 1 to 2 times per day.
- The advantage of the study is that it would provide a truth value regarding the fate of the experimentally deposited carcasses; however this truth could cause biases if the experimental carcasses fail to represent the scavenging response to turbine-related fatalities. The double survey study has the disadvantage that it would not provide complete information about carcasses removed by scavengers and thus never found by searchers; however it is less likely to be biased while still providing some truth.
- SRC members were interested in understanding the contribution that this study would make to the science, as there have been many other studies conducted with frozen carcasses (of non raptors).
- It will be important to design the study so that Monitoring Team members do not see the study truck or field personnel, as this needs to be a blind study.
- Foxes would follow the scent of field personnel placing and checking carcasses.
- Concern was expressed that the SRC had not been consulted before the pilot study was nearly underway, and members sought clarification as to whether the decision has already been made to move forward with the study.

In response, Rader and Culver said the principal investigators have considered the importance of not swamping the area, as well as many other factors. The study's contribution would be in helping to clarify adjustment factor issues by providing more information about how scavenging rates and searcher efficiency relate to one another, and by testing the equations.

Doug Leslie of the Monitoring Team said the potential value of this study is that it will look at the interaction between the scavenging and searcher efficiency rates, which would be a relatively unique contribution.

Rader suggested that a conference call be held with SRC members once the protocol is developed to go over the number of birds involved, how carcass placements would be

spread out, and other issues. SRC members said they would like to see the protocol before the pilot begins, in order to ask questions that the pilot can answer.

#### **Next Steps**

- CalWEA will contact Alameda County/SRC to schedule a conference call the last week of May to go over the study protocol and other issues.

## **SRC Review and Feedback on Proposed Adaptive Management Program**

#### **Related Documents:**

P156\_Alameda County Adaptive Management Plan Proposal

Sandra Rivera of Alameda County reported that the Settling Parties have been meeting since January to discuss adaptive management measures, but have not come to agreement on a joint adaptive management proposal. Therefore, P156 is a compromise proposal from Alameda County. It includes two attachments, one the proposal from the wind companies, and the second from Audubon. There is a June 15 deadline to approve an adaptive management plan. The plan would include actions that are not currently in the CUP. It is seen as an interim measure. The Conservation Plan under development will focus on future repowering and take permits.

SRC members are being asked to make recommendations in response to the proposed plan, outlined in P156. The question to consider is:

- What actions need to be taken to achieve a 50% reduction in mortality?

Rivera, representatives from wind companies, and Audubon representatives each reviewed their respective proposal and highlighted the differences between each. Rivera said the County's proposal incorporates what County staffers consider practical and possible. Wind company representatives said they believe they have achieved a 50% mortality reduction, and their understanding of adaptive management is that it is to be an iterative process with constant evaluation. They don't believe the plan should extend as far into the future because no one has told the wind companies they are that far away from the 50% reduction goal.

Audubon representatives said there is not a credible body of scientists who agree that the 50% reduction goal has been met. They tried to develop a plan based on the SRC's four major recommendations, and aimed for a significant reduction in avian mortality, rather than focusing on the 50% number. Because they are unable to address a repowering schedule, they focused on a removal schedule.

Bill Barnes of AES/SeaWest cautioned the SRC, in considering proposals, to remember that not all wind companies are going to be able to repower. His company cannot repower because of setbacks and other factors.

#### **Questions from the Audience to Frame the Discussion**

- How to measure a 50% reduction in mortality?
- What is the target?

- What is the comparison?
- What is the baseline? Is there a better comparison metric?
- Examine removals in EIR

### **SRC Discussion on the 50% Issue**

In discussion, the following points were raised:

- It would be helpful in the future if the SRC is involved up front in developing a replacement metric.
- Rather than using the baseline number, or solely the baseline study, because it did not gather sufficient data from all turbines, it seems more reasonable to use all the information available in the baseline and current studies and use a weight of evidence approach.
- There is a dilemma, because several years of data are needed in order to average out interannual variation. This means that several years of data are needed to measure a post-management action period. Averaging across years as management actions are being incrementally implemented could mask the reduction in mortality. Also, at some point, the Altamont might begin meeting the 50% reduction, but we would need several years of data to show that. Averaging would hurt the companies if averaging included years in which the 50% was not met. One approach might be to take an average of the four-year period from 2008 to 2012, because the companies believe they met the 50% reduction in 2008. This could be compared with the baseline study and the pre-settlement agreement period. The approach could be to continue to monitor with a four-year moving average.

### **SRC Feedback on Adaptive Management Plan Proposal Removal and Relocation of High Risk Turbines/Towers**

- Should remove all 9-10-rated turbines
- Modify language so its focus is not just removing turbines. The goal is not removal of turbines, but elimination of high-risk sites and situations. Reference P70 Relocation Guidelines & SRC ranking reports.
- By 2012, configurations and conditions will have changed, so there will need to be a reassessment.
- Schedule: The removal deadline is late and affects the ability to meet the 50% reduction
- Schedule: Consider removal/relocation of 8.5-rated turbines by September 2010
- The exclusions of Santa Clara and AWI affect the ability to achieve a 50% reduction
- In regards to the proposed trade-off, the concept of creating an incentive for a company to do a major repowering is a good one, but SRC members want to see turbines ranked 9-10 removed, and removal of low-ranked turbines would not reduce enough fatalities.
- How to incorporate requirements for removal/relocation of certain rankings with consideration of particular unique on-the-ground conditions? The program would be more effective if it contained language to address these "gray areas." (Example: a saddle with 9-10 on the bottom and 8.5-ranked turbines up the side.)

### **Seasonal Shutdown**

- The length of the shutdown is to be 3.5 months

- In regards to Audubon's proposed August-September shutdown: this is a high wind production period, so the companies said it is not viable
- Seasonal shutdown could account for about a 25% reduction in mortality, so other management actions are needed

### **Unproductive Turbines**

- Add language about the importance of not creating high-risk situations because of these removals.
- The presence of unproductive turbines for up to one year reduces the ability to achieve the 50% reduction

### **Burrowing Owl & Adjustment Factor Studies**

- Section b: add “current conditions and” after “will be beneficial to the analysis of.” The burrowing owl study will provide information to inform about current mortality.
- Section e: SRC members see monitoring and the studies as separate issues, and don't want one to compromise the other by using the funding source of monitoring to fund the studies.
- Add language about other studies, such as golden eagles, and radioisotope studies to determine where birds are coming from.
- Given the language in the AMP and the history of the Planning Director’s decisions throughout the Avian Protection Program, there is a lack of confidence that the Planning Director will require the special studies recommended by the SRC

### **Repowering**

- 6B: Clarify who will determine the 50% reduction (it might be in other places in the document)
- Why include Contra Costa County? An action in Contra Costa County can contribute to the 50% reduction
- Procedures need to provide for a situation in which a company doesn't repower
- In program language, clarify CUP date and which CUP is being referenced

### **Additional Items:**

1. Assessing the effectiveness of monitoring should be a component of the AMP
2. A restoration bond is already in the CUPs, so the County said it was unnecessary to include a condition for a restoration bond in the AMP.

#### **3. Penalties**

- Audubon wants to consider a financial penalty to ensure compliance
- County said that penalties should not be part of the adaptive management plan as they are not a management action
- Julie Yee cannot be part of a recommendation on penalties because of USGS limitations as a non-regulatory agency

### **Public Comment**

Zack Walton of Downey Brand suggested that, to increase the chances of the adaptive management plan's success, it would be helpful to look at how to increase the likelihood of getting information in a timely fashion.

Ross Newlin of enXco said some of the proposed conditions could drive the projects to an early financial collapse. It's important to keep in mind that it would certainly upset the scientific program if the wind companies were not around to fund it.

Emre Ergas of NextEra said the SRC is charged with balancing reduction of avian mortality with energy production.

## Future Monitoring Program Discussion

### Related Documents

[M52 Future Monitoring Scope and Costs](#)

Doug Leslie of the Monitoring Team said M52 was developed at the County's request to review options for reducing costs. The Monitoring Program costs about \$1 million a year. There are not a lot of options to reduce costs that maintain the integrity of the data, as most of the effort is focused on gathering data for the annual mortality rate, and that needs to be maintained. Options analyzed for pros and cons in the report include reducing the sample size, increasing the search interval and four options for increasing efficiency or reducing costs: discontinuing collecting information of non-native species; discontinuing collection of bird use and behavior data; incorporating dogs into survey teams; and incorporating electronic data collection.

### SRC Discussion

In discussion, SRC members raised the following points about potential options:

- Leaving non-native species on the ground (instead of removing them) could swamp the visual field, and it may be difficult to differentiate bones of non-native and native species. Monitoring Team members did not think this would be a problem and felt leaving non-native species would be an advisable cost cutting measure. Not all SRC members agreed.
- Handlers would be needed for dogs, and there is limited literature about their effectiveness in this type of work. The SRC felt that the use of dogs to find carcasses would not be a cost-saving measure at this time.

### Public Comment

Zack Walton of Downey Brand asked if a standard of "significant reduction" as opposed to 50% would create flexibility to reduce monitoring costs. Doug Leslie said it would not create much flexibility, as the prime cost is measuring an annual mortality rate for less ubiquitous species such as burrowing owl and golden eagles. Walton said he is questioning how much the monitoring data is informing the management actions. An SRC member said this is why it is important that the monitoring program start with goals and objectives.

Mike Lyons of Audubon asked if the change in the landscape from repowering would create a situation of comparing apples to oranges and skew the data. In addition, does the existing protocol adequately monitor for mortality with repower turbines? A Monitoring Team member said search radius will be an issue with repower turbines and will need to be expanded. It's possible that more prey species might be found as more ground is searched.

Ryan McGraw of AWI said he didn't see the financial sense and practicality in measuring the effects of individual management actions. What needs to be measured is APWRA-wide mortality.

Mike Lyons of Audubon said his concern is that, if there is no evidence that the management actions work, the companies will question the value of undertaking them.

### **SRC Discussion**

SRC members reviewed the outcomes of their January discussion on future monitoring. At that point, they identify the goals of future monitoring as:

- Inform repowering
- Estimate trends & fatality rates APWRA-wide
- Measure effects of interim management actions

In revisiting these goals, they agreed that the third goal could be eliminated, as currently collected data indicates there is only a limited ability to measure the effects of individual management actions. The individual interim management actions are still important, even if their individual effects are not being measured.

In discussion, SRC members raised the following issues and priorities for future monitoring: (√ indicates agreement expressed by another SRC member during the discussion)

- Specify clear research questions for future repowering
- Develop a study plan with clear goals and objectives
- Design monitoring to look at the before/after of repowering, plus consideration of burrowing owl populations
- Focus on monitoring new repowered sites
- Siting of repowered turbines depends on abundance and utilization data
- Continue to gather bird use & behavior data (using electronic tools) to inform siting of repowered turbines. Some possible approaches to gathering bird use data are the point method and a one-day-per-month driving survey,
- It may only be possible to identify annual mortality. Measuring interim management actions lacks value. Instead, spend time to focus monitoring on repowering; continue interim management actions (without specifically monitoring them); and continue to measure APWRA-wide mortality √√
- It may be possible to reduce sample size from the current effort. √√
- Reduce field effort by employing electronic data collection with quality control √√√
- Do not reduce search interval √√
- One member proposed that the Monitoring Team should provide data to the SRC, and the SRC should produce the analyses.
- Improve communication between the SRC and the Monitoring Team
- Possibly eliminate Howden monitoring
- Address how to analyze with a reduced pool of active turbines so that the reduction in mortality is not masked √

### **Public Comments and Questions**

In public comments, the following points were raised:

- A repowered Altamont will have fewer turbines with much larger blades, resulting in fewer turbines to search, but a larger search radius for each one.
- The CEC recommends a two-week search interval
- There is a 15-day search interval at Buena Vista, and a 30-day interval APWRA wide

- Changes to the monitoring program may muddy comparisons with old-generation turbines, as if the monitoring program was starting from scratch
- NextEra has tested use of dogs
- The adaptive management program, hazard turbine removal, and the reconfigured monitoring program should all be aligned with each other, to generate a design that everyone can be accountable to.
- Bird abundance data is needed in order to site repowered turbines well -- this is more important than monitoring repowered turbines

### **SRC Consensus Changes for Future Monitoring**

The following items received consensus support from SRC members:

- Sample size could be changed (reduced)
- Search interval to remain as is
- Implement electronic data collection

Issue: Consider how any changes made to Monitoring Program will affect comparability with current monitoring program data

SRC and Monitoring Team members had a focused discussion on the proposal that the SRC take over producing analyses from the Monitoring Team. Some SRC members were concerned that it would change their advisory and reviewer role, and another objective body would need to be created to review the SRC's analyses.

There is sometimes a gap between the SRC's goals and the reality of monitoring products. Monitoring Team members said the SRC is generating a large volume of good ideas. It can be challenging to implement them all, when working with the data and all of its complexity and limitations, and attempting to specifically implement SRC recommendations that are often worded fairly generally. An SRC member acknowledged that SRC opinions also change over time, as data are reviewed and new ideas emerge. Another challenge mentioned was the delay in receiving monitoring reports.

### **Public Comment**

Renee Culver of NextEra suggested a system similar to a graduate committee, where chapters are submitted as they are drafted.

### **SRC Agreement on Improved Communication with Monitoring Team**

The SRC agreed it was important to improve communication between the SRC in the Monitoring Team. SRC members agreed that the SRC Subcommittee should meet more regularly with the Monitoring Team to improve communication and assist in preparing the report. Some SRC members also said they believe the Monitoring Team should have first right of publication of their results so the Monitoring Team would release its report before SRC members issue analyses and interpretation.

### **Next Steps for Future Monitoring**

- The Monitoring Team will draft a detailed study plan for future monitoring and circulated to the SRC for comments. The study plan would be revised for SRC discussion at its next meeting in June.

- Establish monitoring goals for repowering/siting, including methods to site new turbines correctly
- Align Future Monitoring Program with Adaptive Management Plan and Hazardous Turbine Removal Plan

## **Monitoring Report Update**

SRC Member Shawn Smallwood, who has CEC funding to digitize the bird use data, said it will be at least several months before that project is complete.

### **Public Comment**

Joan Stewart of NextEra asked that the Monitoring Report include unadjusted point estimates for fatalities by year.

### **SRC Agreement on Monitoring Report**

There was SRC consensus that the Monitoring Report be completed without the bird use data. If necessary, a separate report on the bird use data could be produced afterwards.

## **Postponed Items:**

- Meeting Summary Approval
- 48-Hour Search Interval

## **Documents Circulated at Meeting**

P156\_Adaptive Management Proposal

M52\_Future Monitoring Scope and Costs

[M51 APWRA Hazardous Turbine Ratings](#)

[P153 Smallwood & Estep Additional Hazard Ratings](#)

[P155 Smallwood SRC Turbine Ratings and Status](#)

P100\_SRC Document List with Reference Numbers

## **SRC Meeting Participants**

### **SRC Members Days 1 & 2**

Joanna Burger  
Jim Estep  
Sue Orloff  
Shawn Smallwood  
Julie Yee

### **Staff**

Gina Bartlett, Facilitator, Days 1-2  
Sandi Rivera, Alameda County, Days 1-2  
Andrea Weddle, Alameda County, Day 1  
Ariel Ambruster, Facilitator Assistant, Days 1-2

### **Monitoring Team**

Doug Leslie, ICF International (formerly ICF Jones & Stokes), Days 1-2  
Jesse Schwartz, ICF International (formerly ICF Jones & Stokes), Days 1-2  
Brian Karas, BRC, Days 1-2  
Skye Standish, ICF International (formerly ICF Jones & Stokes), Day 2

### **Others**

#### **(Meeting Sign-in is optional)**

Bill Barnes, AES/SeaWest, Days 1-2  
Michael Boyd, CARE, Day 1  
Renee Culver, NextEra, Days 1-2  
Kris Davis, Drinker Biddle, Days 1-2  
Chris Dreiman, enXco, Days 1-2  
Emre Ergas, NextEra, Day 1  
Jim Hopper, AES/SeaWest, Days 1-2  
Keith Jenkins, NextEra, Day 1  
Nan Leuschel, Ralph Properties II, Day 1  
Mike Lyons, Golden Gate Audubon, Days 1-2  
Bill Mason, EnXco, Days 1-2  
Ryan McGraw, AWI, Days 1-2  
Steve Mullin, AWI, Days 1-2  
Ross Newlin, EnXco, Day 1  
Bob Power, Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society, Day 1  
Nancy Rader, Cal Wind Energy Association, Day 1  
Joan Stewart, NextEra, Days 1-2  
Zack Walton, Paul Hastings & NextEra, Days 1-2

## **List of SRC Agreements Developed April 29 & 30**

(Compiled from this document)

### **SRC Agreement on Monitoring Report**

There was SRC consensus that the Monitoring Report be completed without the bird use data. If necessary, a separate report on the bird use data could be produced afterwards.