



May 21, 2007

The Honorable Jackalyne Pfannensteil, Chair The Honorable John L. Geesman, Commissioner The California Energy Commission 1516 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: 06-OII-1 - CEERT Comment Clarification

Dear Commissioners Pfannenstiel and Geesman,

I write to respond to a series of questions and concerns raised by Commission staff regarding the comments submitted by CEERT to CEC and CDFG's "California Guidelines for Reducing Impacts to Birds and Bats from Wind Energy Development" proceeding (06-OII-1) on May 14th, 2007.

1. Science Advisory Committee Language

The top of page two of our comments contained a small but substantive typographical error. It reads:

The establishment and of this advisory committee would take place through an open and public process which allows input from all interested stakeholders.

The sentence should read:

The establishment of this advisory committee would take place through an open and public process which allows input from all interested stakeholders.

Because the concept of a state-wide science advisory committee has not been thoroughly discussed in an open forum by all stakeholders it is not appropriate for the guidelines to go into detail about the construction, operation or responsibilities of such a committee. An open and public process will allow such input, related to, but outside of the development of the guidelines.

2. Bat Monitoring Edits

On page two under section 3, "Bats – Monitoring Protocols for Rigorous Regional Studies," there was another small but again substantive typographical error. The comment reads:

Strike lines 460-483; 743-746; 1889-1883 and 2521-2533.

т

That line should read as follows:

Strike lines 460-483; 743-746; 1884-1997 and 2521-2533.

3. Goal and Value of Rigorous Regional Bat Studies

In California there is a clear willingness from both the wind energy industry and public agencies to proactively reduce impacts to bird and bat species from wind energy. Throughout the guidelines process, CEERT's goal has been to ensure that any resources, both public and private, being used for this worthy cause should be spent to maximize the benefit to bird and bat species.

In trying to address wind energy's impacts to bat species, the wind energy industry and wildlife agencies have a difficult problem. There are no preconstruction monitoring techniques which have been shown to correlate strongly with collision risk, as we outlined in our initial comments submitted on May 14th, 2007. CEERT feels that the proposal for rigorous regional bat studies represents a logical solution that will be of the greatest benefit to wildlife and is the most efficient utilization of resources from private companies and public agencies. The current draft suggests the use of a bat study protocol that is expensive but that has not been shown to be effective in providing pre-construction risk assessment. The proposed protocol represents an intense expenditure without any clear benefit to wildlife beyond what will be achieved through the rigorous regional studies.

The results of a regional study would advise the next revision of these guidelines. Ultimately the goal for these regional studies is to develop a tiered set of monitoring protocols similar to what staff has developed for bird species. The results of the regional studies would advise individual project developers on what kinds of bat studies would be appropriate for their project. If an area was determined to have a high risk, rigorous studies might be appropriate. Likewise, if an area was determined to have a very low risk, those projects would not need to perform bat monitoring studies. These regional studies represent the quickest and most efficient way to arrive at such a tiered structure.

l apologize for any errors or miscommunication in our initial comments. I hope that this letter has provided clarity on the issues addressed. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any additional questions or concerns.

Paul Vercruyssen

Sincerely,

Cc: Rick York and Misa/Ward