

ORIGINAL

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA
ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

**CALIF. ENERGY COMMISSION
MAR 18 1985
RECEIVED IN DOCKETS**

BUSINESS MEETING

**1516 Ninth Street
First Floor Hearing Room
Sacramento, California**

**Monday, February 25, 1985
2:00 P.M.**

Reported by: Dawn Lofton

**PAPERWORKS
1330 Broadway, Suite 809
Oakland, California 94612
415/763-9164**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

- Charles R. Imbrecht, Chairman
- Geoffrey D. Commons
- Barbara Crowley
- Russell L. Schweickart

EX OFFICIO

- William Foley

STAFF PRESENT

- William Chamberlain, Staff Counsel
- Kent Smith, Executive Office
- Ted Raugh
- Ross Deter
- Rick Donaldson
- Lorri Gervais, Secretary

ALSO PRESENT

- Jean Melious, Attorney, Pacific Thermonetics, Inc.
- Gordon E. Davis, Attorney, Pacific Thermonetics, Inc.
- Patrick Ritter, Woodward-Clyde Consultants
- Richard Pagni, Crockett Power Plant Committee
- Edward Denton, Crockett Power Plant Committee
- Stephen Nelson, Crockett Power Plant Committee
- Jay Gunkelman, Chrmn., Contra Costa Air Quality Task Force
- Ruth Blakeney, Crockett Improvement Association
- Michael Hartman, Crockett Power Plant Committee
- Dale Bosley

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
1	
2	
3	1
4	1
5	1
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	1 8
11	
12	9
13	9
14	9
15	
16	
17	
18	9 11
19	15
20	
21	22 22 24
22	44
23	44
24	45
25	46

P R O C E E D I N G S

--oOo--

1
2
3
4 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Will the meeting please
5 come to order. I apologize for the delay. We had two
6 matters that we had to consult on with most members of
7 the Commission. Commissioner Schweickart would you
8 like to lead us in the flag salute?

9 - FLAG SALUTE -

10 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Both Items 1 and 2 have
11 been removed from the agenda and been put over until
12 the next hearing on March 6th, and I presume that's at
13 the request of the applicant. The first item then to
14 come before us today is Item #3 which is Commission
15 Consideration and Possible Approval of Commission
16 cosponsorship of a conference on Energy Strategy for
17 Decisionmakers: Demand Side Planning for the 1990's.

18 COMMISSIONER CROWLEY: Mr. Chairman, this has
19 appeared on our agenda and I have been unable, and nor
20 has my office been able to get any information or
21 background data on this. I respectfully move that it
22 be tabled until the meeting of the 20th of March.
23 Failing to be able to do my homework, I believe that it
24 would be appropriate that this be dealt with at a later
25 time when we do have some backup.

1 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: I'll second it just to
2 allow the item to be discussed. Is there discussion on
3 the motion on the table?

4 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Is there a motion on
5 table to be...?

6 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: I think you're
7 correct. Thank you. In that case I will withdraw the
8 second to allow Commissioner Commons, if he wants to,
9 comment on the item.

10 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: When a Commissioner
11 makes a motion to the table an item that another
12 Commissioner has put forward knowing that that motion
13 is not able to be discussed, I don't think that's the
14 art of courtesy with a Commission. I thank the
15 Chairman for withdrawing the second so we could discuss
16 the matter first.

17 The reason that we don't have a full set of
18 information concerning this, and you do have
19 information as to who the proposed persons are in terms
20 of being the co-sponsors -- the California
21 Manufacturers Association, the California Public
22 Utilities Commission, The University of California,
23 and The California Energy Coalition, and plus the topic
24 is Demand Side Management, which is primarily oriented
25 to load management. It is my belief that when this

1 Commission co-sponsors them, we should be involved in
2 the planning and the setting up of the program. And,
3 until such time that we are, in fact, a co-sponsor, it
4 would be difficult to have agreed as to what the
5 program is and who are the participants. Some of the
6 people that we are requesting -- we're requesting, Mr.
7 Chairman as the Energy Advisor to the Governor to be
8 the lead-off speaker and to represent the Governor at
9 this meeting which would occur on May 2nd, the day
10 after this Commission adopts the Biennial Report to
11 give a report on that document. We're also asking
12 Commissioner Calbo who has played the lead at the
13 California Public Utilities Commission to discuss load
14 management and the Public Utilities Commission's
15 perspective concerning cooperation between the
16 utilities and the private sector in trying to get
17 cooperatives going in this area. It would be a one-day
18 conference at the University of California.

19 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Who is making the request
20 that we co-sponsor?

21 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I'm making the
22 request.

23 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Yeah, but who made the
24 request of the Commission? Who is the principal
25 sponsor of this?

1 COMMISSIONER COMMONS; There would be no
2 principal sponsor. The five organizations would be co-
3 sponsors. The conference would be located at the
4 University of California, and we have asked the CMA to
5 act as the host for the conference. But, there are
6 just five, equal co-sponsors.

7 COMMISSIONER CROWLEY: It is this sort of
8 information that I would have found helpful in knowing
9 about how to make a decision on this. It wasn't that I
10 was expecting anything other than something ahead of
11 time. And the other thing, who is lead?

12 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: The five groups.

13 COMMISSIONER CROWLEY: Thank you.

14 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I believe the
15 information put onto the packet for the Commissioners
16 did identify who were the five co-sponsors, at least
17 the information as I submitted did.

18 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: That's what's on the
19 agenda, but there's no ... Who is the instigator?
20 Maybe that's a better question.

21 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Well, I guess there
22 were three of us that would be the instigators
23 -- myself, John Phillips and Art Rosenfeld.

24 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Well, I have to say my
25 initial reaction is not negative, but I would like some

1 more information on it in terms of what is to be
2 expected financial participation.

3 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: No cost. No cost to
4 the Commission.

5 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: How about staff time?
6 Commissioner Commons, I've had a real concern of late
7 that a lot of demands are being made on staff that
8 exceed what was contemplated in our work plan that was
9 adopted. I think we're running into some problems in
10 terms of meeting other output requirements.

11 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I know that staff has
12 had to spend a fair amount of time in preparing various
13 Commissioners and the Executive Director's speeches for
14 various occasions. And, I guess the main staff time
15 would be if one of the Commissioners felt that, in
16 their preparation, that they needed staff assistance
17 that that normally is offered. But, no formal report,
18 no staff report, no request of such is requested or
19 needed.

20 The primary participants would be people in
21 the field and the private sector who are working on
22 coops; some people developing equipment as to what's
23 available. It's a public-private partnership type of
24 conference, but aimed at the very specific topic of
25 Demand Side Management in the load management area.

1 And, it seems to me to be an opportunity for this
2 Commission to try to act as a catalyst to help the
3 utilities and the private sector generate programs and
4 projects without financial assistance by working
5 together. And, that's essentially what would be
6 accomplished.

7 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Would you compromise if
8 this decision were delayed?

9 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: No problem if we'd hold
10 it off. I think we have a business meeting on the 6th
11 and ten days, I think, to the 20th of March would make
12 it difficult to organize it and put this together by
13 May.

14 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: We can put this item over
15 since it has been noticed here. And, I think that's
16 probably the appropriate way to handle it, and see if
17 somebody in your office can't provide some type of
18 summary of exactly what is contemplated.

19 COMMISSIONER CROWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I said
20 the 20th only because our agenda for the 6th is quite
21 full already. I was thinking that in order to allow
22 ample time to discuss this and not give it short
23 tripped, it might be appropriate to have it on the
24 20th. That was just a suggestion for allowing time.

25 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Let me suggest the 6th,

1 middle ground here for both.

2 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Well, If you could
3 give me a reason - what you need that you don't have
4 now in order to go forward, I could understand it.

5 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Commissioner Commons, if
6 you, well for Commissioner Crowley, I'm trying to be
7 responsible to all members of the Commission and their
8 particular concerns about how we conduct our business.
9 As you are aware, Commissioner Crowley has expressed
10 some concern on repeated occasions in the last several
11 months about inadequate agenda material to allow her to
12 do her preparation in advance of a meeting. In this
13 instance, there is no agenda material. Not even agenda
14 material arrived here at the meeting time, but none
15 whatsoever. And, it seems appropriate to me that, to
16 be responsive to her concerns, that we ought to put
17 this over and ask that something in writing be
18 prepared. I don't think that's an excessive burden and
19 I'm going to suggest that we do it on the 6th rather
20 than the 20th, but we'll accommodate your time
21 schedule.

22 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Well, it's obvious
23 that there aren't three votes, so it would accomplish
24 us nothing to proceed.

25 COMMISSIONER CROWLEY: You asked what

1 information would be required. It seems to me part of
2 that has been answered at this point. I would like to
3 know when this meeting is, what the rationale and
4 subject of the meeting will be, what is expected to be
5 affectuated by having such a meeting, what will be
6 discussed, where it will be, and things that generally
7 bear on the structure and content of the meeting. And
8 this is what I couldn't find out anything about.

9 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: I must suggest that we
10 put it off until the 6th and ask that someone in your
11 office try to prepare something of that nature and
12 distribute it to the other members of the Commission.
13 Is that reasonable?

14 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Sounds fine.

15 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Okay, the next item is
16 Item #4 which is Commission Consideration and Possible
17 Acceptance or Non-Acceptance of the Application for
18 Certification (AF) for the Crockett Cogeneration
19 project.

20 (ITEM #4 SENT UNDER SEPARATE COVER)

21 --oOo--

22

23

24

25

1 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Alright, the next item to
2 come before the Commission are the Policy Committee's
3 Reports. Are there Policy Committee Reports? I might
4 suggest that unless there are essential ones that we
5 take these on March 6th. Okay, we'll pass with those
6 until the 6th. Approval of Minutes. Any corrections,
7 deletions? Without objection, we'll approve as
8 printed.

9 General Counsel's Report. Mr. Smith. Let me
10 just indicate a couple items here that I think is
11 probably the best way to handle them. Under Executive
12 Director's Report, you'll see Commission Consideration
13 of CEC-originated proposals for expenditure of
14 potential future PVEA funds. This issue was heard
15 before a Budget Committee this past Friday at which
16 point we were informed that, as a result of direction
17 we had given to staff, communication had been
18 undertaken with the Department of Finance to inquire as
19 to what their intentions were as to the entire issue of
20 PVEA. In other words, whether or not it should be
21 dealt with in the context of the current budget that's
22 before us, whether it should be dealt with a separate
23 legislation. When the Governor's Task Force would be
24
25

1 meeting to produce an Administration recommendation for
2 allocation of funds, etc. etc., the response was that
3 considering the current uncertainty as to Congressional
4 action for actual appropriation of those funds, the
5 Department of Finance at this point had decided that
6 this issue would not be dealt with in the context of
7 the current budget process; and, that they have no
8 plans for any determination or decision by the
9 Administration at this juncture for allocation.

10 In other words, they were not requesting of
11 individual agencies like our own our actual proposals
12 for funding from a variety of PVEA items that we had
13 submitted to LBO for evaluation. As a consequence it
14 was the unanimous conclusion of the Budget Committee
15 that we should therefore simply defer action on this
16 until we had been directed by the Department of Finance
17 to submit Energy Commission Proposals for funding to
18 the department. As a consequence, this item, I believe
19 the Executive Director's report, will suggest that we
20 put over, and that's my recommendation and Commissioner
21 Gandara's recommendation as well. When we get the
22 communication from the Department of Finance, we will
23 expeditiously agendize this item after consideration by
24 the Budget Committee. Commissioner Commons.

25 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Unless you're

1 expecting this to occur forthrightly, which I gather
2 from your statement, it may not occur for a year.

3 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Yes, I would guess
4 probably three to six months would be my guess.

5 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: That, since we have
6 expended a substantial sum on a contract to review and
7 since this Commission, through a Committee, did submit
8 a Projects Review, I would have no problem of our not
9 taking it up today, but I would not feel comfortable in
10 terms of following through at least on those projects
11 that came out of this Commission in terms of
12 establishing our own priorities either for PVEA funding
13 or otherwise.

14 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Let me just state why we
15 decided to take that action. In addition to the fact
16 that Congress has not taken action, nor do we know when
17 Congress will take action, it has also become apparent
18 now that the money is not likely to be awarded to the
19 states in one lump. As a consequence, the whole issue
20 of strategic considerations as to what we asked for and
21 what order and in what dollar level, et cetera, would
22 be really much dictated by how much money is actually
23 available in each increment. Further, because of the
24 fact that the sum of the money that is at issue for
25 California has already grown dramatically because of

1 the interest that the money is generating because is
2 all in the hands of the federal treasury at this
3 juncture, it is conceivable, and this is particularly
4 relevant to your own concerns that it might be possible
5 for the Commission to ultimately request greater funds
6 than what we had initially targeted. The dollars have
7 grown in the last eight months from roughly \$120.0
8 million to \$160.0 million for California and, if this
9 issue is not considered until September of October,
10 it's not inconceivable that the dollar figure is going
11 to be knocking on the door of \$200.0 million. So with
12 all of those caveats and with that information having
13 been presented to the us after discussion with Finance,
14 we thought it would be prudent to delay formulating or
15 concluding or finalizing Energy Commission
16 recommendations to Finance.

17 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Well, I'd like to
18 pursue it for a moment if I may. There are also I
19 understand, hearings going on before the Legislature
20 where some of the programs that we have identified are
21 being put forth in terms of proposals. And some of the
22 projects which have been designed are, I think, very
23 exciting and are the types of things that this
24 commission should pursue. I can understand stand that
25 the Department of Finance may want to make an overall

1 allocation of \$250.0 million. But I think we have a
2 responsibility where there are projects that can help
3 the State of California and you know that I vote
4 against more times money projects than a lot of people
5 do. But when we have projects that pay off in six
6 months, I think we have a responsibility to try to
7 identify and go forward with them. And some of
8 projects come out of the PVEA proposals. What I would
9 like to suggest is that we continue the matter for 90
10 days and leave it with the Budget Committee and then
11 bring it back and ask that some more careful evaluation
12 be made.

13 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Let me suggest this. In
14 90 days, the Budget Committee will make a another
15 report to the Commission as to the current status and
16 what our recommendation is, if any, in terms of change.

17 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Right. And if I could
18 just have one more short comment.

19 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Will you note that to
20 make sure that's agendized for Budget Committee?

21 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I have one more short
22 comment. One of the concerns I've heard in terms of the
23 evaluation of the projects was that for the electricity
24 projects an average price of electricity of 5.5 cents
25 per kilowatt hour was used. For example, on the

1 refrigerator incentive programs this resulted in their
2 having, although a very positive benefit cost ratio,
3 substantiallay less than they would have if you looked
4 at the existing or Commission-adopted forecasts. I
5 think it's very important that the evaluation by our
6 own staff of the different projects include Commission-
7 adopted policies in terms of the fuel forecasts so we
8 have a consistent basis with our own policy internally
9 so we are comparing things in the same way throughout
10 the Commission.

11 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Absolutely. I think
12 that's a valid point. In essence, what we have right
13 now is draft document from LBO that's out to all
14 agencies to get comment. Is that accurate? I assumes
15 that that includes us.

16 MR. SMITH: Yes, and we certainly will
17 comment on any portions of the analysis that are
18 inconsistent with the Commission's findings.

19 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Okay. Let's see.

20 MR. SMITH: One additional item with regard
21 to the Executive Director's Report, before we take up
22 the action item for this afternoon which will be the
23 March Change Proposal, and that is with regard to the
24 Second Quarter review. We would propose that that be a
25 part of Executive Director's Report at the next

1 business meeting. It'll provide us with an opportunity
2 based on the discussion with Budget Committee this last
3 Friday to get revised material into the hands of the
4 Policy Committee and other Commissioners before that
5 discussion. With that...

6 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Before you go into
7 the review, I brought to the attention of the Executive
8 Office that our Commission is listed as a co-sponsor.
9 It states here government agencies were sponsors.
10 We're not even a co-sponsor or a sponsor -- a RETSE '85
11 Conference. This Commission adopted a policy which I
12 tried to implement today, not too successfully, as we
13 do not sponsor conferences without going through the
14 Commission. And this has not gone through the
15 Commission. I also understand there's been some
16 consideration and there may have been last year some
17 payments made in the form of postage. I'd like to know
18 what the status is and what the Executive Office's
19 action is in terms of removing us as a sponsor since
20 we're not.

21 MR. SMITH: First item here is that we
22 believe that the Commission may have addressed this
23 issue in the Fall. We don't have a definitive answer
24 to that. We'll be checking agendas and transcripts to
25 confirm whether or not the Commission did take a formal

1 action at the time that that policy change took place.
2 The Commission sponsored the RETSE Symposium and
3 Conference last year. It was not, as far as I can I
4 recall, a controversial item then. But there's been an
5 expectation that the Commission's co-sponsorship or
6 sponsorship is something that had the Commission's
7 support.

8 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I believe last year
9 it was sponsored. It wasn't controversial in that it
10 wasn't brought before the Commission, so there was no
11 controversy. And it resulted in the Commission
12 adopting this policy that we do sponsor or in part was
13 based on that.

14 MR. SMITH: That part's not clear to me, but
15 what we will be doing is taking a look at the agendas
16 and transcripts; and we'll be getting back to you or
17 your office to confirm that. With regard to the
18 Commission mailing, as we have discussed before, we
19 obviously, as part of our sponsorship will disseminate
20 information about the conference when it's in the
21 interest of the Commission's objectives and serves the
22 State to do that.

23 Specifically with regard to the mailing of
24 material for RETSE, staff has been in the process of
25 insuring that the Commission not only would have access

1 to floor space for its displays and participation in
2 this symposium and conference, but that also there
3 would be at least equal if not greater value provided
4 to the Commission and the State in the form of not only
5 floor space but waived fees and that sort of thing.
6 Before we come forward with a specific recommendation
7 on what kind of support we would provide for them,
8 we'll ask that General Counsel's office review comment
9 on the basic approach. But, we're quite comfortable
10 with the direction that we're heading.

11 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I strongly object. I
12 think it's clearly, as was evidenced by the discussion
13 earlier today, a matter for the Commission to decide
14 how they allocate or expend the funds. I believe one
15 of the questions that Commissioner Crowley and
16 Commissioner and Chairman Imbrecht asked, would there
17 be any expenditure of funds? Would there be any impact
18 on our work plan? Would there any effort undertaken by
19 staff in regard to this? And, I think those questions
20 are relevant...

21 MR. SMITH: We can provide answers to those
22 questions and we'll be getting back to your office with
23 those.

24 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: And before there'd be
25 any staff time allocated to this function, I think the

1 same questions and the same statements that were asked
2 of me should be answered by somebody else. My question
3 then is...

4 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: I have no objection to
5 that at all. I have a recollection of this matter to
6 come before the Commission, but I can't cite you
7 chapter or verse now either since I had all of about a
8 half-hour notice that you were going to raise this
9 today.

10 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Alright. I've had
11 communications with the Executive Office on this matter
12 for must be two or three weeks, and there's been
13 written correspondence on it. So it's nothing that has
14 just arisen.

15 MR. SMITH: That's correct. We've briefed
16 Commissioner Commons in his office on the way that we
17 were proceeding with this over, really the past month
18 or so.

19 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: And I only became
20 aware that our name was used when I went to this
21 conference last week and this item was passed out and
22 it showed us as a co-sponsor. I thought this was only
23 a theoretical consideration where they were asking us
24 to be a co-sponsor. I never realized that someone had
25 already used our name. If there is, in fact, no

1 transcript that shows that we have authorized this,
2 what is the action that the Executive Director is
3 proposing? I would assume that it would to notify them
4 to eliminate our name.

5 MR. SMITH: I think what we would do is we
6 would find out what the recommendation of the
7 Commission is.

8 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: The question would be
9 whether or not the remainder of the Commission, whether
10 you agree with it or not, would choose to, I guess,
11 retroactively authorize sponsorship. It would
12 certainly be my recommendation that we do so. Well,
13 sir, I'll just put you clearly on notice that however
14 you feel about it, Commissioner Commons, I intend to
15 bring it to the Commission and seek approval for
16 whatever action, if in fact, that has not incurred in
17 the past.

18 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Alright, we can
19 discuss..

20 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: We can discuss it at that
21 at that time and we'll see if we get three votes.

22 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: We can discuss it at
23 that point in time. I would like to find out if we, in
24 fact, have not voted to do this. Generally, this is an
25 area I would support, but it bothers me that last year,

1 for example, I wanted to go there and I was told that
2 there was a significant fee and then I found out that
3 we had allocated a significant expenditure of funds to
4 avoid that and under what basis they had assumed that
5 we were co-sponsors.

6 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: I'd be happy to very
7 quickly tell you that actually the Commission that co-
8 sponsored... this is the third RETSE Conference and the
9 Commission co-sponsored each of the first two. There
10 was a change in management of the conference between
11 the first and second. And, it's my understanding that
12 there were a variety of complaints about the management
13 of the second Conference. In turn, the original
14 management team that assembled the first conference has
15 been restored for that position for the third
16 Conference. There were a substantial number of
17 complimentary credentials, commission tickets and all
18 these sort of things were provided to the Commission
19 and the staff.

20 The fact that somehow you have made an
21 inquiry and were not given a positive response I,
22 frankly, have no explanation for it other than it is
23 conceivable that you talked with this previous
24 management team which were staffing the office and that
25 type of thing and apparently there were a lot of

1 complaints. In any case, it was a mistake; you should
2 have been accorded such privileges; and I certainly
3 would not think it would be on the basis of that that
4 you would decide that the Energy Commission, with all
5 this investment in renewable alternative technologies
6 in this State, should not co-sponsor the single,
7 largest symposium and trade exposition on renewable
8 energy that takes place anywhere in the world,
9 particularly because it's in our own State. Well, I
10 find it incongruous that we would not be a co-sponsor
11 of this particular item concerning some of the other
12 items that we do co-sponsor, which are penal by
13 comparison from my perspective.

14 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Well, we can discuss
15 all of those factors at the time it's properly before
16 us. My concern now was that our name is being used and
17 there's some consideration of expenditure of funds and
18 I'd like us to follow the same procedure on one
19 application as on the other.

20 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: It should be. I believe
21 it has been; I believe it has been or at least I think
22 it has been. If it has not been, then it's a mistake
23 and we certainly will act to rectify that.

24 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I'd also like to ask
25 the Executive Director to provide me the agreement that

1 was arrived at last year on the expenditure of funds
2 and on the availability and why our office were not
3 notified that we were allowed to go. Particularly, our
4 office was the Presiding Member of the R&D Committee
5 which would normally be interested in this conference.
6 And so, I do not know what the agreement was reached
7 since it was never brought before the Commission. I
8 don't know how it was implemented and I would like to
9 know what actually transpired.

10 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: For whatever it's worth
11 Commissioner Commons, I recall the first year of SSE,
12 every member of the Commission attended. And my
13 recollection is that last year, every member with the
14 exception of Commissioner Crowley attended and that was
15 -- she had been invited and chose not to for whatever
16 reason.

17 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I did not attend.

18 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: You did not attend as
19 well. Okay. We could have had a Commission down there
20 at least the first year, because I remember running
21 into everybody. Alright.

22 MR. SMITH: The major item we need to act on
23 this afternoon will be the Commission's March Change
24 Proposal. Basically, this is an opportunity for the
25 Commission to update its budget proposal for 1985-86.

1 The primary criteria for that updating is additional
2 information that's become available to us since the
3 time we put together the budget proposals in the Fall.
4 In some cases, there are additional proposals, but the
5 major change this year is our awareness of additional
6 funding that's available. Some four-fifths of the
7 dollars represented by these March change proposals
8 are, in fact, proposed to be budgeted for contracts
9 that were approved by the Commission as part of its
10 original BCP request for the '85-'86 fiscal year.
11 There's remaining a little over \$1,200,000 in new
12 proposals. What we'll be doing this afternoon is
13 focusing on those new proposals. I would suggest that
14 we begin by providing Administrative Services and the
15 Budget Office with an opportunity to highlight some of
16 the information on the summary sheet, essentially a
17 Balance Sheet showing the sources of the revenue and
18 the proposed expenditure by major division and program
19 area here. This is included in the February 21st
20 package that each of you have in your binders. What
21 we'll do then, following that comparison of the
22 dollars, is to essentially take the program areas in
23 reverse order starting with Siting and Environmental,
24 going to Development, Conservation, Assessments, and
25 then Administrative Services highlighting the new

1 proposals that we had discussed with the Budget
2 Committee over the last few weeks.

3 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Mr. Smith, can we
4 conclude this prior to six o'clock due to parking
5 constraints?

6 MR. SMITH: I think -- we can try to do that.

7 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: You don't think so?

8 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: No.

9 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: I'm going to have to
10 leave before six o'clock. Rather than getting a
11 presentation, why don't we just... Every member of the
12 Commission has had this. If you have concerns, why
13 don't we just hear the concerns and let's go directly
14 to those issues. Okay? That's acceptable.

15 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Alright, on
16 Administrative Services, EDP purchases -- personal
17 computers. Can you give me a little more information
18 as to the number ---

19 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: It's on Exhibit 1. Let
20 me try something here. I'm the Presiding Member of the
21 Budget Committee and I sat through all this. Let me
22 see if I can answer these questions. I would suggest
23 to you Commissioner Commons, both Commissioner Gandara
24 and I had extensive concern about the EDP purchase
25 issue. We raised it in two successive Budget Committee

1 meetings. At the first Budget Committee meeting there
2 was substantial question and concern by the various
3 divisions as to the extent to which Administrative
4 Services had taken into consideration their working
5 characteristics, needs, workload, et cetera. Everybody
6 went back to the drawing board, and at the last Budget
7 Committee meeting last Friday, there were no concerns
8 expressed. Whenever everybody was on board, all
9 divisions found it acceptable; they felt the effort to
10 expand the utilization of our Data General and the
11 microprocessor purchase makes it compatible with IBM
12 equipment and then the individual personal computers
13 would be spread throughout the Commission similar
14 compatibilities so everything will tie in and it will
15 be an integrated system.

16 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: With which type of
17 personal computer or is that going to be mixed?

18 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: I think it's basically
19 going to be IBM-compatible, but not necessarily IBM
20 equipment.

21 MR. SMITH: Now, the question of the
22 individual computer hasn't gone out to bid and we don't
23 have the number. Well, first of all, we are going to
24 resolve the word processing problem.

25 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: The consensus from all of

1 the staff, division chiefs, General Counsel's office,
2 etc., in their presentations to be Budget Committee was
3 that they wanted equipment that was IBM-compatible.

4 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: For example, that
5 would eliminate the Apple.

6 MR. SMITH: Yes, it would.

7 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: It would. However, it
8 would make it possible through a modem for the Apple to
9 receive information from the system. And Commissioner
10 Gandara, who happens to own an Apple, is fully
11 cognizant of that and he approved this as well. The
12 bottomline is the consensus was that the IBM equipment
13 was the most --- and for the broad purpose,

14 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Just had some
15 questions here. Four wheel drive vehicle.

16 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: There were efforts made
17 successfully to get a 4-wheel drive vehicle from the
18 State Garage and so forth. The only people who have
19 them are Fish and Game and they've got first preference
20 on them. We can't get the 4-wheel drive when we need
21 it for Siting cases, and after a lot of examination, we
22 came to the conclusion that we should follow the lead
23 of other State agencies which is to purchase our own.
24 Now, this would be part of the State Motor Pool; other
25 agencies could use it when

1 we're not using them, but we have first priority on
2 them.

3 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: How many times a year
4 do we need a 4-wheel drive vehicle?

5 MR. DETER: This year, we needed it about
6 four or five months. The reset in a normal year, we
7 will need it probably every month throughout the year
8 and it would depend upon maybe, two or three days, four
9 days, five days a month. It's for compliance
10 activities up in the Geysers.

11 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: And we have rung up
12 substantial bills renting this equipment to date.

13 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: What was the bill last
14 year?

15 MR. DONALDSON: I don't have that
16 information. We were paying about \$800 per month for
17 the rent.

18 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Times four months
19 -- that's \$3,200.00

20 MR. DONALDSON: We're paying \$10,000 a year.
21 \$800 a month times two vehicles. So we're actually
22 paying \$1,600 a month this year. Now, last year was
23 less -- it was in the neighborhood of about \$800 a
24 month, like Mr. Basley says. But this year, we're
25 paying even more.

1 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I was about to say I
2 would oppose it. I will not vote against it today
3 because I recognize that that would mean it couldn't
4 go. I just want to state that I oppose the item, but I
5 won't stop it now.

6 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Let me just indicate that
7 we asked extensively; we were satisfied that because of
8 the Siting workload we anticipate a lot of these
9 projects are in rural and inaccessible sites, the
10 likelihood is that we were going to the generated costs
11 over the four or five-year life that we would expect
12 from this vehicle and that we would exceed this sum.
13 The other problem is just convenience. The staff can't
14 get it when we need it otherwise. Okay? I would vote
15 for it as well.

16 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Alright, this 4PY
17 augmentation.

18 MR. SMITH: Commissioner Commons, let me
19 comment on that. That was commented on and discussed
20 at some length with Budget Committee. We conferred as
21 a result of the Budget Committee discussion with the
22 Department of Finance this morning and there is not a
23 need for us to raise this particular item as part of
24 the March Change Proposal. We can continue the
25 temporary arrangement the Commission directed.

1 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: This item is struck?

2 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Yes, that's correct.

3 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: No further discussion
4 needed.

5 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: It was not an
6 augmentation; it was just to make permanent the re-
7 allocation of the staff that we did through
8 Conservation last Fall.

9 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Alright, the next item
10 is this \$20,000 contract on Retrofit and Energy BCP No.
11 21. Is that still before us?

12 MR. SMITH: Is that a Conservation?

13 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Conservation had one
14 for \$20,000 BCP No. 21.

15 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I believe I oppose
17 this, but I'm going to listen.

18 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Basically what it is is
19 California had more natural award winners than other
20 state by roughly double in the DOE Energy Awards
21 Program which is continuing again this year. The whole
22 premise behind one of the criteria for seeking winners
23 was the susceptibility of the technology to transfer.
24 Many of these projects were local government
25 utilization and this was considered to be a small sum

1 of money to ensure that indeed there was an effort made
2 to transfer technology to other entities and facilities
3 around the State. This includes the Watt Application
4 of Conservation, co-generation and other types of
5 activities that are particular suitable to, and in
6 those instances, municipal-type facilities.

7 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Has this Commission
8 determined who wins the California award?

9 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: It was a committee of
10 staff from this Commission that did so. If you're
11 asking how they determined it, the answer is no.

12 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Well, unless it came
13 before the Commission or there was a procedure adopted
14 by the Commission as to how the awards were granted....

15 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: There were no California
16 award winners; they were only nominees made to the...

17 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Well, unless this
18 Commission were to either establish a procedure by
19 which one is nominated or were to do the nominations
20 itself, I could not see us expending money on
21 technology transfer for this project. So I would
22 oppose this one.

23 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: It comes down once again,
24 Commissioner Commons, to making your decision based
25 upon personal peak or on the merits of the proposal and

1 I find it a little surprising that you constantly apply
2 the latter criteria rather than the former. Did I
3 reverse that? The former rather than the latter. If
4 you want to know the approximates, it is very simply is
5 simple energy request for the Governor of the State of
6 California participate. If you want to know precisely
7 how that was handled, there was a Committee of
8 technical people that evaluated the 51 applications
9 that were done on a double-blind basis; no one knew who
10 was doing it; who the applicants for the awards were,
11 et cetera; and in turn those who were then passed along
12 to ... and interestingly, each and every one of the
13 nominees from California won the national award which
14 was extraordinary and it's fairly indicative of the
15 quality of what goes on in this state. I might say as
16 well that we objected strenuously to the fact that
17 California was being limited to ten nominees just as a
18 statewide. North Dakota was limited to ten nominees.
19 Obviously, that was not very fair considering the
20 population differences, much less a lot of other
21 considerations. They relented and allowed us to submit
22 fifteen nominees. This year it's going to be, as I
23 understand it, a population-weighted number of nominees
24 available for submission at the national level.

25 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Well, is there

1 anything in the DOE procedure that precludes it coming
2 before this Commission?

3 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Not that I'm aware of
4 other than the fact that it is the Governor's decision
5 and not the Commission's decision.

6 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I have to no further
7 comment. The Governor clearly has the ability if he
8 would like to do this transfer and take credit for it
9 to incorporate a \$20,000 budget for it. Or he could
10 make that initiative and ask if the Energy Commission
11 were to sponsor it. I don't know the criteria; I know
12 very little about this other than it is something that
13 doesn't come through the Commission that we're asked to
14 look at technology transfer. And, since I don't know
15 what that transfer is and what the technology basis is
16 for the criteria are, there's a lot of things that I
17 think are better for us to allocate funds to which
18 we're not getting funded on. Alright the next one.

19 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: These BCP's have to be
20 submitted to Finance this Friday. So, by virtue of you
21 taking this action considering the fact that there are
22 only three of us present, it would kill this proposal.
23 I would like to suggest that you consider the courtesy
24 of allowing us to go forward and allow yourself, in the
25 meantime, to become informed as to what the process

1 criteria, etc. were. And if you subsequently choose to
2 oppose, I will insist that it be withdrawn at your
3 personal call. But, in essence, you're precluded from
4 that kind of consideration.

5 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I recognize that.
6 That's why on the four-wheel vehicle, despite the fact
7 that there were four Commissioners here, I would have
8 voted to oppose it; I would not be opposing that. I
9 feel that you and Commissioner Gandara reviewed that
10 one carefully that....

11 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: I reviewed this one as
12 well.

13 MR. SMITH: I would add that that particular
14 contract, if it were approved as part of the Budget
15 process, it would be coming back through the Commission
16 next as part of the work planning process this summer
17 and then when the contract became final so that there
18 are two more opportunities to address any concerns.

19 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Well, you're talk of
20 the \$20,000. I've still been waiting for the \$20,000
21 that this Commission twice has allocated for
22 Cooperative Load Management and each time I'm told that
23 it's now or the funds have been otherwise utilized.
24 So, that \$20,000 might be an equal amount that we're
25 discussing here. It would make it an opportunity for

1 those funds actually to be made available. And in the
2 same respect, we've voted a few months ago to expend
3 \$35,000 for a public participation and I've seen no
4 progress made on that contract. Can you bring me up-to-
5 date on that?

6 MR. SMITH: You've indicated concern about
7 that earlier. It's not clear to me what contract title
8 or what specific contract that was. Is that tied to
9 the Rental Program?

10 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I believe the Chairman
11 asked for a short period of time to review that. That's
12 been roughly two months and I've heard nothing come
13 back although the Commission did vote to authorize the
14 funding.

15 MR. SMITH: Well, am I not correct that
16 that's part of the rental program?

17 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: That's right.

18 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: I thought it had gone
19 forward.

20 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: That's what I had
21 thought, but I haven't heard anything about it.

22 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: I don't recall asking for
23 any further review on my part. It's just a matter...

24 MR. SMITH: I don't know. Was that funded
25 with the carryover PVEA funds?

1 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Yeah.

2 MR. SMITH: Okay, then that's no doubt a part
3 of the package that was submitted to Finance some time
4 ago.

5 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: It's out of my shop. I'm
6 certainly not holding it up.

7 MR. SMITH: Basically the process there is
8 that we will be getting DOE approval for the SEECF Plan
9 Change and then we expect that Finance will forward
10 that as Sec. 28 to the Legislature.

11 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Next item.

12 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: The next one is a new
13 proposal on the Evaluation of California's Export
14 Potential for an Alternative Energy Technology and
15 Products. I used to work with the U.S. Dept. of
16 Commerce. In fact, put on workshops in working with
17 the Pasadena business community in this regard. The
18 people that put this program together are correct that
19 small and medium-sized business needs assistance. I
20 have a few concerns and at least one amendment that I
21 would like to make to it. First of all, I don't think
22 the people put this together reviewed with the U.S.
23 Department of Commerce what are the existing programs
24 and the existing information that's currently
25 available. They already provide pretty substantial

1 help and will arrange trade seminars. There's a lot of
2 information and data. But, I understand that the
3 Budget Committee was looking at this particularly in
4 reference to the Pacific realm which will be the area
5 which I would think our real potential is and I would
6 encourage that we have direction in that area rather
7 than trying for all countries and all markets. It's
8 very easy in this type of study and this type of work
9 to become too diverse or diffused and it's better to
10 aim at particular markets where there's significant
11 opportunities.

12 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Actually the Budget
13 Committee suggested that this be designed to evaluate
14 those countries where the greatest opportunity for
15 penetration exists particularly taking into
16 consideration importation restrictions that resist in
17 various underdeveloped countries and not focus
18 attention on those where are there substantial
19 obstacles.

20 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Or to work with our
21 own U.S. Department of Commerce. For example, in Japan
22 where there might be obstacles, the role we might play
23 best is identifying those obstacles and trying to
24 encourage federal government to negotiate away some of
25 those obstacles.

1 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Let me just stress,
2 Commissioner Commons, I'm going to have to leave. This
3 is not something that we need to flush out all the
4 details on. If you have a concern....

5 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I've got one amendment
6 to this that I'd like to give. I attended the workshop
7 last week where the Conservation and Load Management
8 technologies where we have hundreds of firms in the
9 State of California that have developed technologies in
10 terms of building the various products and I see no
11 reason to restrict this to alternative energy
12 technologies, but it should be...

13 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Is there any objection to
14 that, Commissioner?

15 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: None. That takes care
16 of of that one. Alright, and the last one which I'd
17 like to discuss which is the hardest one is I'd like to
18 have an understanding of what this power plant site
19 certification element is. We recollect, Exhibit V-1.
20 If you recollect, I was willing to vote for the
21 emergency use of funds going out to contract during its
22 current year, but I stated at that time I want to
23 reserve the opportunity as to future contracts that I
24 wanted to make sure we are not using contract labor at
25 a higher cost than hiring staff on a permanent basis.

1 And I want to understand what this proposal is. We
2 also got some very adverse publicity, I believe, in the
3 Bee where we're going to contract people that are
4 raising the cost of doing work. I don't know if it's
5 true or not, but

6 MR. SMITH: Yes, the information in the Bee
7 is going to be corrected. We're going to provide the
8 legislative analyst with information to correct that.

9 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: What I'd like to do is
10 have an understanding, if you would please, on
11 this....There was an editorial which called out the
12 Energy Commission in terms of using... and it was not
13 the one that we recently approved. It was some other
14 project.

15 MR. SMITH: There's a different proposal.
16 We'll bring you up to date on that. It was a much
17 smaller contract.

18 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I'd like to understand
19 to how many contract dollars we're going out with, what
20 is the PY element, and I would like to have an
21 understand of this one. And this, I understand, is the
22 largest one.

23 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Okay, the bottom line is
24 this. Originally there was identified up to \$1.5
25 million for this different contract work. The Budget

1 Committee decided to do is \$1.0 million plus an
2 additional seven?

3 MR. DETER: In other words, we had originally
4 proposed \$2.0 million and the Budget Committee
5 suggested a second option which would be \$1.4 million
6 and an additional 7.8 limited term positions.

7 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Right. And that's the
8 BCP request we would go for now.

9 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: \$1.4 million you say?

10 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Yes, that's correct.

11 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: What did we just
12 approve?

13 MR. DETER: For this fiscal year? \$1.328
14 million.

15 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: So, in essence, the same
16 amount.

17 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Why are we having a
18 continuation in the second year? Why are we not hiring
19 staff when the cost is roughly half?

20 MR. DETER: We are hiring staff and the
21 context, if you're quoting the Bee, that was taken out
22 of....

23 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: No. I'm not quoting
24 the Bee. I'm looking at the \$85,000 per year cost
25 which is about twice what our cost per year is.

1 MR. DETER: It is twice the cost per year per
2 person year. However, in order to meet peakload I
3 don't have to have a contract on board all year long.
4 I can follow the workload with using contracted
5 dollars. I can't follow the workload if I have to have
6 staff here doing nothing in times when we don't have
7 the peak workloads when, in fact, that's a misnomer.

8 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: But my reading of the
9 different projects that you have coming in and your own
10 statement in here is this is going to be a continuing
11 condition that's going to go on for a number of years.
12 And when I look at the projects and I see, for example,
13 Geysers 22 which I know is not coming in. PGandE's
14 already told us that it's coming in later. We have
15 some of these projects that are not going to be coming
16 in next year and we're going to be needing these
17 contract dollars year after year after year if we
18 follow this process.

19 MR. DETER: I would be highly surprised if we
20 would need these contract dollars the year after this
21 coming one.

22 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Well, in the write up
23 here, it says two to five years.

24 MR. DETER: The write up is two to five years
25 average workload for staff, not for contract dollars.

1 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Well, what is the
2 justification of going from \$1.328 million to \$2.0
3 million?

4 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: It's not \$1.32 million;
5 \$1.4 million -- an increase of less than \$100,000.

6 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I see in the last
7 paragraph of this, it's saying 'therefore, requesting
8 only \$2.0 million be allocated in contract funds for
9 fiscal year 1985-86.' Maybe I'm reading something
10 incorrect though.

11 MR. DETER: Where we have changed, I believe
12 you've got....

13 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: This is an old draft.
14 They gave us three different options, and we picked the
15 middle option.

16 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I can only go by what
17 I have here.

18 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: I understand that. The
19 Budget Committee option was part staff and part money
20 rather than all money.

21 MR. DETER: Correct. And we have rewritten
22 it based on the Budget Committee's reactions to us late
23 Friday.

24 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: We share your memo
25 perspective on these issues and we decided to go for a

1 mixture approach rather than a single approach. And
2 that carries with it a certain amount of risk without
3 question because of the fact that, you're aware as well
4 as I am, that it's very different to achieve additional
5 PY. And that's a strong position the Administration is
6 taking with respect to many, many agencies.

7 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Well, you know I voted
8 for the other one because I didn't think that we
9 should... The Department of Finance is taking an action
10 and that is their belief and that might occur this
11 time. That doesn't mean that we should not go along
12 with them subsequently. I still feel that we have a
13 responsibility to proceed on what we think is fair for
14 the applicants and most cost effective for the State
15 and if the Department of Finance is listening to our
16 belief and they're overall wish to make a different
17 decision, my tendency is to go along with them. So, I
18 think our first responsibility is to state what we
19 think is our initial viewpoint, then if they disagree
20 we should accept their wisdom. They're more expert at
21 that than I am. And that's how I believed the last
22 time, but I would still say that we should go forth
23 with what we think is our own best and fairest effort
24 in terms of initiation.

25 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Well, I frankly believe

1 that's what we've done.

2 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Alright, then that's
3 different than what's before me.

4 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Okay. Commissioner
5 Gandara and I did consider that in some detail and it
6 was Mr. Deter's recommendation that we take the half-
7 and-half approach; and we agreed that that's what we
8 should do. I agreed to that with no illusions that
9 this was going to be an easy effort. It's pretty damn
10 tough, frankly. But, nonetheless we're going to do it,
11 but I am going to give it my all to try to convince
12 people across the street that we've got to have those
13 7.0 PY, which I believe quite candidly, we do. But
14 it's not going to be an easy effort. We have to enlist
15 the support of our friend in the private sector as
16 well.

17 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: Well, let me just go
18 back. I have no problem with that. Let's go back to
19 BCP No. 21. This will be the technology transfer
20 workshops that would be for the conservation and load
21 management and the different devices that would have
22 been incorporated for the architectural and design.

23 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: I don't think.. Pardon
24 me?

25 MR. RAUH: Yes, it would be for whatever the

1 winning proposals are.

2 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: That's right, there were
3 15 different awards. Most of them were devices, I
4 would say. Methane recovery cogeneration....

5 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: I tell you what, I
6 think when you're talking \$20,000 a year and a
7 Commissioner who strongly believes in something, he
8 should give the courtesy vote. You have a courtesy
9 vote.

10 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Without objection, we
11 will approve the BCP's work plan as presented, as I
12 understand.

13 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: With that one
14 amendment.

15 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: With that one amendment,
16 we're going to include load management and
17 conservation, and the export technology. Okay.
18 Alright, is there anyone from the public who wishes to
19 address the Commission? Hearing none, we stand
20 adjourned.

21 MR. DETER: Excuse me. I didn't realize
22 that. We have testimony which we would like your
23 approval.

24 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Oh, yes. I think we've
25 all reviewed it. Is there objection to approving the

1 testimony as has been drafted for Mr. Messenger to
2 present to the PUC?

3 COMMISSIONER COMMONS: My understanding ...
4 is aware of this, is that correct?

5 MR. RAUH: That is correct.

6 CHAIRMAN IMBRECHT: Okay, hearing no
7 objections, so approved. We stand adjourned.

8 (Thereupon the afternoon session of the
9 business meeting of the California Energy Resources and
10 Conservation and Development Commission was adjourned
11 at 6:05 p.m.)

12 --oOo--
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

--oOo--

1
2
3 THIS IS TO CERTIFY that I, Dawn Lofton,
4 Reporter, have duly reported the foregoing proceedings
5 which were had and taken in Sacramento, California, on
6 Monday, February 25, 1985, and the foregoing pages
7 constitute a true, complete and accurate transcription
8 of the aforementioned proceedings.

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for any of the parties to said hearing, nor in
11 any way interested in the outcome of said hearing.
12

13
14 *Dawn Lofton*
15 Reporter

16 Dated this 14th day of March, 1985.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25