

DOCKET
BUS MTG

DATE May 06 2009
RECD. May 28 2009

BUSINESS MEETING
BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of:)
)
Business Meeting)
)
)
_____)

 ORIGINAL

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
HEARING ROOM A
1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 2009
10:00 A.M.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC
52 LONGWOOD DRIVE
SAN RAFAEL, CA 94901
(415) 457-4417

Reported by: Mary Clark CERT*D-214

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

Karen Douglas, Chairman

James D. Boyd, Vice Chair

Jeffrey D. Byron

Julia Levin

Arthur H. Rosenfeld

STAFF AND CONTRACTORS

William Chamberlain, Chief Counsel

Bill Pennington

Christopher Meyer

Betty LaFranchi

Sylvia Bender

Mike Gravely

Chris Scruton

Claudia Chandler, Chief Deputy Director

ALSO PRESENT

Camille Champion, Counsel for Solar One

I N D E X

	Page
1	
2	
3	4
4	
5	4
6	
7	6
8	12
9	17
10	20
11	22
12	25
13	
14	27
15	28
16	28
17	28
18	47
19	47
20	48
21	49
22	
23	
24	
25	

P R O C E E D I N G S

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

CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Good morning, everybody.
Welcome to the Energy Commission Business Meeting of
May 6th, 2009. Please join me for the Pledge of
Allegiance.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was
recited in unison.)

CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Before we start, I wanted to
make a quick announcement. The next business meeting will
be on the 27th of May, not the 20th, as had been originally
scheduled, so please mark that down in your calendars.
Our next Business Meeting on May 27th.

We will begin with Item 1, Culver City Locally
Adopted Energy Standards. Possible approval of proposed
Culver City Locally Adopted Energy Standards requiring
greater energy efficiency than the 2005 Building Energy
Efficiency Standards for all newly constructed commercial
and multi-family residential buildings. Bill.

MR. PENNINGTON: Good morning, Commissioners.
This is I think the Energy Commission's 15th application by
local government for approval of a local energy ordinance.
And, you know, what might be unique about this is that
they have looked at buildings that are less than 50,000
square feet, either buildings or major renovations, and
have a list of energy efficiency measures and other green

1 measures that there's 25 measures on their list, and their
2 criteria is that someone has to meet 20 of those 25 on the
3 list, and so that is what they do for less than 50,000
4 square feet.

5 And then for other buildings, they require lead
6 certification. And to meet lead certification, you need
7 to be -- there's a minimum threshold of needing to be 14
8 percent better than the Building Code in Title 24.

9 So on both of those types of buildings, they are
10 going to be in excess of our standards, and they've met
11 all the requirements for approval, so we recommend
12 approval.

13 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Thank you. Are there
14 questions or comments?

15 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: Comments, I think it's
16 wonderful.

17 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: I second that, Art. I think
18 it's wonderful, too.

19 COMMISSIONER BYRON: This is an extraordinary
20 ordinance. I mean a great of detail and thought and
21 effort went into this. Isn't that somewhat unique as
22 well?

23 MR. PENNINGTON: I think we get pretty good
24 thought and effort put into each of them. I think they
25 did a good job.

1 COMMISSIONER BYRON: Great. The word is getting
2 out, and there's more and more of these.

3 MR. PENNINGTON: Right.

4 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: I understood that there might
5 be someone from Culver City on the phone. Is there a
6 call-in at this point? Not at this point?

7 MR. PENNINGTON: No.

8 COMMISSIONER LEVIN: I would move to approve.

9 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: All in favor?

11 (Ayes.)

12 MR. PENNINGTON: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: This measure passes. Thank
14 you. Item 2, Stirling Energy Systems Solar One Project,
15 (08-AFC-13). Christopher Meyer, please.

16 MR. MEYER: Good morning, Chair Douglas and
17 Commissioners. My name is Christopher Meyer. I'll be
18 Staff's Project Manager for the Stirling Energy Systems
19 Solar One Project. Galen Lemei is Staff Counsel for this,
20 and the applicant is represented by Allan Thompson is
21 their Counsel, and Camille Champion will be the
22 Applicant's Project Manager. And we're -- On the NEPA
23 side, we're probably going to have Jim Stovall. We're
24 still trying to get a final on that as the BLM's Project
25 Manager, who will be my counterpart.

1 Basically, SES Solar One Project is an 850-
2 megawatt project -- renewal project based on the Stirling
3 engine design, and it will be on approximately 8,230 acres
4 of BLM land adjacent to Interstate 40 about 37 miles east
5 of Barstow in San Bernardino County. And so the primary
6 equipment will be 34,000 of these Stirling energy systems
7 that will be throughout the case referred to Sun Catcher
8 Units. There are just, to give you an idea, there are
9 about 38 feet in diameter, 40 feet tall mirror dish.

10 And the project is proposed to go in two phases,
11 initially a 500-megawatt phase to be followed up by an
12 additional 350 megawatts. And one of the benefits is that
13 a project of this nature as it's completed in small units
14 of the 34,000, each of the 60 of these Sun Catcher units
15 when they come on, they can start putting energy onto the
16 grid at that point instead of having to wait for full
17 build-out of either the full project or even a phase.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: You said they can. Excuse
19 me. Will they?

20 MR. MEYER: Yes. That's what they are proposing
21 in the AFC is that each unit of 60 will go onto the grid.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: Thank you.

23 MR. MEYER: And the project would also include a
24 new 230 kV substation in the center of the site. And then
25 it would tie into Pisgah, which is immediately adjacent to

1 the site, so it would be off site. Interconnection is
2 less than a quarter of a mile.

3 Initially, staff identified 15 areas that were
4 data inadequate, and that was adopted back at the January
5 14th Business Meeting. And subsequently the applicant has
6 provided a supplement. We received that April 6th, and
7 technical staff reviewed it and found that they had
8 addressed the data inadequacy issues and the revised
9 recommendations went out on April 27th from Melissa.

10 So at this point, staff recommends that the
11 Commission find that SES Solar One application for
12 certification data adequate and, if so, would recommend an
13 assignment of a committee.

14 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Thank you very much. Can we
15 hear from the applicant?

16 MS. CHAMPION: Yes. This is Camille Champion
17 with Stirling Energy Systems. We are also under the name
18 of Tessera Solar as part of the development company as
19 well.

20 I just wanted to extend our thanks to
21 Christopher and the staff for their review and commitment
22 to the project and reviewing our supplemental filing.
23 We've worked with the staff in the past as well, and
24 currently are working with them on our Solar Two project,
25 which is in Imperial Valley right now that's proceeding,

1 and that was deemed adequate I think last October, so
2 we're very excited about this project and looking forward
3 to working with you guys and the staff on this as well,
4 and as well with BLM through our MOU that you guys have
5 so.

6 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Thank you. Are there
7 questions, comments or --

8 COMMISSIONER BYRON: Well, if I may, Madam
9 Chairman, just briefly. This is the, you know, the latest
10 in many of these large renewable projects. I've had
11 discussions and we've talked publically about the
12 importance of these projects at this Commission. We're
13 very excited about them because they're renewables, and
14 this Commission has a long history of promoting them.

15 But we also know, as you do, Ms. Champion, a
16 great name to have as a the Project Manager, that there
17 are some significant land use issues associated with this,
18 and we've pushed our staffs very hard to get through these
19 as quickly as possible. We find the Bureau of Land
20 Management is not relinquishing these land uses very
21 easily and very quickly.

22 So I would ask you, as an applicant, to continue
23 to be very responsive to the data requests. These early
24 examples of large land use renewables are going to set the
25 bar for how we're going to do a lot of these we hope going

1 forward. But I know this Commission is very committed to
2 doing these as quickly as we can and seeing as much
3 renewables get online as soon as we can.

4 So welcome aboard and would you consider
5 changing the names on the two projects so we can get them
6 back in order? I noticed that you have two --

7 MS. CHAMPION: Yes, we've been asked that.

8 COMMISSIONER BYRON: -- two ahead of one, which
9 you probably didn't plan, but we'll try and keep track of
10 that.

11 MS. CHAMPION: Okay. Thank you very much.

12 COMMISSIONER LEVIN: With that, I just wanted to
13 make two comments. For the applicant and staff, I really
14 want to underscore what Commissioner Byron just said that
15 we have a very steep path to climb to meet our renewable
16 energy goals. And we all need to move as quickly as
17 possible and more quickly than we have in the past.

18 We do want to see a lot of new renewable energy
19 development without prejudging any particular project. It
20 is absolutely incumbent on us to prioritize these projects
21 and move the right ones forward.

22 I also want to say in interest of full
23 disclosure I was part of a tour that a number of
24 companies, government agencies, State and Federal, and
25 Senator Feinstein and much of her staff was on several

1 weeks ago in the desert. I want to be very clear that I
2 stepped out of any project-specific discussions. I
3 stepped out of the tent during the discussions of your
4 project, but I want to be upfront that I was a member of
5 that tour. I don't think that I had any conversations
6 that should be troubling to anyone, but I was there so
7 just to be upfront about that.

8 And then I just would like to thank you all for
9 moving this forward.

10 COMMISSIONER BYRON: So, Madam Chair, I'd be
11 more than happy to move Item 2, accepting staff
12 recommendation that we find Stirling Energy System Solar
13 One Project data adequate.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: All in favor?

16 (Ayes.)

17 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: This item passes and thank
18 you. And moving on to Item b, possible appointment of a
19 siting committee for the Stirling Energy Systems Solar One
20 Project. I have Commissioner Boyd and Byron, Boyd
21 presiding. Do I have a motion?

22 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: I move it.

23 COMMISSIONER LEVIN: I second it.

24 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: All in favor?

25 (Ayes.)

1 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: This item passes.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: You notice and the motions
3 and seconds coming from the -- I didn't say anything about
4 how good a project this is because I knew was coming as an
5 assignment, so I'll lots of opportunity

6 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: The juicier times.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: I'll have lots of
8 opportunities to see it and talk about it nicely I hope.

9 MR. MEYER: Thank you very much.

10 COMMISSIONER BYRON: Excellent. Thank you very
11 much.

12 MR. MEYER: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Item 3, CPS Human Resources
14 Services. Possible approval of Contract 200-08-005 for
15 \$100,000 with CPS Human Resources Services to assist with
16 revision of class specifications specific to the Energy
17 Commission and perform other work associated with the
18 consolidated classification proposal submitted to the
19 Department of Personnel Administration in May 2008.
20 Ms. LaFranchi.

21 MS. LAFRANCHI: Yes. I'm Betty LaFranchi, and
22 I'm substituting this morning for Gina Tosi-Smith on this
23 item.

24 The proposed contract before you with CPS, which
25 is a Joint Powers Authority, made of the State of

1 California, the City and the County of Sacramento, and
2 several other, about a half a dozen other local
3 jurisdictions and special districts throughout actually
4 the country, is the contractor that we proposed for this
5 work.

6 And CPS is very well qualified to perform the
7 work because it is staffed with individuals who have
8 extensive government-related expertise especially in the
9 human resources area. And additionally, this is a follow-
10 on contract to a contract that we have currently with CPS.
11 And the contract that we have right now will be expiring
12 this month, and it's produced several major products for
13 the Commission.

14 And probably the best-known product is one that
15 was submitted to the Department of Personnel
16 Administration, which requests the consolidation of many
17 of our classifications, in fact, 20 of our
18 classifications. And although that product has been
19 submitted to DPA, it still needs to be taken through all
20 of their review process and hopefully approval. And for
21 that, we would like to have the services of CPS. They're
22 quite familiar with how the State control agencies work
23 and would be of a great benefit to the Commission if we
24 could continue to have their services.

25 But additionally, we would also like to use CPS

1 for several new projects, projects that we do not have the
2 in-house time or staff expertise to complete at this
3 point. One of those or several of those projects would
4 include the updating of many of our classifications that
5 we use at the Commission to make the classifications more
6 in sync with how we use those classes these days.

7 These classes are literally in some cases 25 or
8 30 years old, and you can imagine how the energy industry
9 and the work that we do here has changed in those years,
10 and they just don't adequately describe the work that our
11 staff are expected to do. So when it comes to trying to
12 recruit the right staff and to test those staff in a
13 manner that would be of great benefit to the Commission,
14 we're not able to do it because we have to stick with the
15 knowledges, and the skills, and the abilities that are
16 described on these current, outdated classifications.

17 So for those reasons, we are here today to
18 request the approval of this particular contract.

19 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Questions?

20 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: I'll move approval if there
21 are no questions.

22 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Do you have a question?

24 COMMISSIONER BYRON: If I may, I just -- No.

25 Let's go ahead and vote. I'll comment afterwards. Thank

1 you.

2 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Very good. All in favor?

3 (Ayes.)

4 MS. LAFRANCHI: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: This item is approved.

6 Commission Byron?

7 COMMISSIONER BYRON: Thank you. Ms. LaFranchi,
8 thank you for briefing me on this subject. And I'm not as
9 well versed in State policies and procedures around
10 personnel, but I did get two pieces of advice when I
11 joined this Commission. One is read the Integrated Energy
12 Policy Report, and second is we have some personnel issues
13 that need to be dealt with at the Energy Commission.
14 Retaining and recruiting staff is a serious issue. It
15 comes up repeatedly and I understand that, you know, we've
16 had this classification consolidation request at DPA now
17 for a while.

18 MS. LAFRANCHI: Right.

19 COMMISSIONER BYRON: But this will help. This
20 additional work will help position us, so when the State
21 has the funds and has the motivation to move on these
22 corrections, we'll be in a better position.

23 But I share the frustration that our staff must
24 have at how slowly this all moves and how long this takes,
25 so I please implore my executives here, and you're no

1 longer in the human resources department, but the HR
2 department as well, please be at the front of the line.
3 Keep this in front of the Governor's Office, in front of
4 the DPA, and I'd like to do whatever I can to help support
5 this issue as a Commissioner.

6 We have a highly dedicated staff. I value most
7 all of them, and I would certainly -- I would certainly
8 like to make sure that we take care of our staff. It's a
9 very difficult time right now and you know --

10 MS. LAFRANCHI: It is. It's a --

11 COMMISSIONER BYRON: I'm frustrated with how
12 long this has taken to fix, so I will make my commitment
13 to Ms. Tosi-Smith as well, and I'll meet with her soon on
14 this issue.

15 MS. LAFRANCHI: I would appreciate that
16 dedication.

17 COMMISSIONER BYRON: Thank you.

18 MS. LAFRANCHI: We share a lot of your
19 frustration by the way. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Thank you. And thank you,
21 Commissioner Byron. I agree that this is -- this is a
22 very important issue and it absolutely requires our
23 focused attention.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: If you think you're
25 frustrated, just think how long I've been around doing

1 this.

2 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Item 4, Aspen Environmental
3 Group. Possible approval of Work Authorization 1900.003
4 under Contract 400-07-032 with Aspen Environmental Group
5 in an amount not to exceed \$242,408.16, that's very
6 precise.

7 MS. BENDER: That's very precise. We are
8 indeed. CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: -- to build upon and address
9 findings from the Aspen Phase I Demand Forecast Modeling
10 Methodology Evaluation. Ms. Bender, please.

11 MS. BENDER: Good morning, Commissioners. I'm
12 Sylvia Bender from the Electricity Supply Analysis
13 Division.

14 This proposed Phase II Work Authorization is
15 part of our ongoing analytical capability improvement
16 effort. This is also coming in response to the 2008
17 Integrated Energy Policy Report that directs staff to
18 review and evaluate Energy Demand Forecasting
19 Methodologies to determine the type of models and/or other
20 analytical tools that most closely meet the Commission's
21 analytical and forecasting needs.

22 Recently completed by Aspen under the direction
23 of Dr. Carl Linville, Phase I of the project evaluated the
24 Energy Commission's existing Demand Forecast Modeling
25 Methodology and identified its chief advantages and

1 disadvantages. Phase I further identified at least 13
2 different uses of the Commission's energy and peak load
3 forecasts.

4 The disparate nature of the multiple methodology
5 applications calls into question whether these uses all
6 fall within or beyond the scope of the original
7 methodological design and resource commitments that we can
8 make or whether some of these uses might be better met
9 with alternative methodologies, perhaps more flexible
10 short term econometric models or even other non-modeling
11 tools or methods.

12 Phase I revealed that, while the original
13 purpose in building the methodology was clear, the
14 purposes of other activities for which that methodology is
15 now being applied may not be as clear. Commitment to too
16 many disparate activities with vague purposes may well
17 lower product quality, over commit staff resources, and
18 degrade the reputation of the Energy Commission's
19 forecasting capabilities.

20 In this Phase II, staff and the consultant team
21 working together will implement a formal framework to
22 identify and evaluate three things. First, the underlying
23 purpose of each of the forecast uses, the feasibility and
24 the useful for the Energy Commission to allocate resources
25 to these uses, and how the Energy Commission can ensure

1 the methodological and data transparency to produce
2 trustworthy results for use.

3 This framework will be used to evaluate
4 alternative modeling and non-modeling methodologies for
5 performing predictive and non-predictive energy analyses.
6 The framework will allow assessment of whether our tools
7 are valid for the purposes that they are being put.

8 At the conclusion of Phase II, the framework
9 evaluations and the collected information will make it
10 possible for us to assess the feasibility of these
11 forecast uses, to demonstrate synergies or lack thereof
12 between the various uses, and to prioritize any competing
13 uses. We will also be able to frame the organizational
14 benefits and costs of maintaining, initiating, or
15 eliminating modeling or non-modeling capabilities to serve
16 any given purpose.

17 And with that, we ask for your approval.

18 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Questions?

19 COMMISSIONER BYRON: I hope I have the right
20 committee. I believe we reviewed this in Electricity and
21 Natural Gas.

22 MS. BENDER: Yes, you did.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: Yes, you did. Yes, we did.

24 COMMISSIONER BYRON: Ms. Bender, I don't have
25 any questions. I know this work is important. I'm

1 relying on it for the IPER as is Commissioner Boyd, and I
2 would like to move this item.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: I'll second it.

4 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: All in favor.

5 (Ayes.)

6 MS. BENDER: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: This item passes. Thank you.

8 Item 5, University of California, Office of the President.
9 Possible approval of Amendment 4 to Contract 500-01-043
10 with the University of California, Office of the
11 President-CIEE to add \$1,900,000 to the contract and
12 extend the term by 30 months to continue long-term
13 research into enabling technologies for demand response.
14 Mr. Gravely.

15 MR. GRAVELY: Good morning, Chairman Douglas and
16 Commissioners. I'm Mike Gravely from the R and D
17 Division.

18 And this project here is a Fourth Amendment to a
19 project we've had a lot of success with. This particular
20 area has been run through the University of Berkeley.
21 They focus on high technology devices and items that we
22 can bring into the marketplace, specifically in a command
23 and control area, energy storage area, and other types of
24 creative areas.

25 We had a lot of success. The program started in

1 2001. We are able to bring products to the marketplace.
2 We have the opportunity to use this program by giving them
3 this type of funding that allows them to make some long-
4 term commitments with their professors and with their
5 students, so we get them to do the research. The majority
6 of the work is done at Berkeley.

7 The projects that have extra promise they
8 actually have public workshops and public meetings, and
9 they bring in entrepreneurs and they bring in venture
10 capitalists and ask them to look at those technologies and
11 take them to the commercial marketplace. In the past, we
12 have had success with that. In fact, when they have these
13 open houses and share their technology, it's a very
14 popular activity. We usually have it once or twice a
15 year.

16 So they take the knowledge. They look at the
17 creative. They look for things like technologies that
18 will disruptive where they were a tenth of the cost and
19 ten times the performance, so you're looking at both
20 higher performance and lower cost. Things like devices
21 you can put in your home to very simply put on the wall
22 and measure temperature and measure the charge by the
23 vibration in the wall, new innovative communication type
24 architecture that can be used for thermostats and meters,
25 and those types of things. So they focus in the energy

1 market but they bring to market and bring to the surface
2 technologies that are ready for commercialization.

3 And so we have had a long history with this
4 project, and we're very happy with it, and we encourage
5 them to continue. And this project and this funding will
6 allow them to have the stability they need to keep the
7 students and the professors and bring in the commercial
8 interest that they have in past.

9 And I'm asking for your approval to go forward
10 today.

11 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: I move the motion.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: All in favor?

14 (Ayes.)

15 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: I should note it did come
16 before the Research Committee and we've reviewed and
17 approved it there.

18 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Item 5 is approved. Moving
19 on to Item 6, Electric Power Research Institute. Possible
20 approval of Amendment 1 to Contract 500-05-030 with
21 Electric Power Research Institute to extend the
22 performance period to June 30th, 2010, and augment the
23 budget by \$1,272,706. The project is to conduct WESTCARB
24 Phase II CO2 storage pilot test in northern Arizona. Mr.
25 Gravely.

1 MR. GRAVELY: Thank you. This is project is
2 under WESTCARB, stands for the Western Coast Regional
3 Carbon Sequestration Partnership. We have been involved
4 in that partnership for many years. This is part of what
5 they call Phase II, which is doing the small-scale pilots
6 of underground sequestration. This is funding is
7 primarily funded by DOE. In fact, the funding that we
8 have today is all Federal funding that we're asking
9 permission to use.

10 What happens in these projects is we plan these.
11 In this case, the project will be in Arizona, and we will
12 be doing underground sequestration in a site there, and
13 the Cholla Power Plant area. What they run into, as you
14 would understand, is permitting delays and those types of
15 things. We've also experienced increases in well drilling
16 costs, and materials cost, and the cost of carbon for the
17 sequestration.

18 And in this case, we've presented this to the
19 Department of Energy, and they agree that it was a valid
20 cost increase, and so they funded it. And we presented it
21 to the R and D committee, and they've agreed to this
22 project, so we're asking for your permission to amend this
23 contract to allow us to continue and finish the project
24 and use the Federal funds to do that.

25 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: Well, as the patron of

1 WESTCARB and one of the Commissioners up here and on the
2 Research Committee, and I would move approval of the item
3 and just comment that, Mike is right, we have faced all
4 kinds of delays on all the WESTCARB components, this just
5 being one of them, this one being in Arizona, because it's
6 so new, because people have a lot of trouble with
7 understanding the whole subject.

8 And in the not too distant future, I would trust
9 there will be people in this room talking about 'not under
10 my backyard.' So anyway, this is still part of the
11 research and development and a well-reasoned project that
12 we've talked to the DOE about quite a bit lately.

13 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Are there questions,
14 comments?

15 COMMISSIONER BYRON: No. I'll be glad to move
16 the item.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: I'll move that you can
18 second it.

19 COMMISSIONER BYRON: I'll be glad to second
20 that.

21 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: All in favor?

22 (Ayes.)

23 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: That item passes. Thank you.

24 MR. GRAVELY: Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER BYRON: Mr. Gravely, you get all

1 the interesting projects. Commissioners, he's one of
2 those people, those highly dedicated employees that I do
3 appreciate at the Commission. But, Mike, I know you've
4 had a tough week this last week personally. I hope
5 everything is good.

6 MR. GRAVELY: Thank you very much. I appreciate
7 that.

8 COMMISSIONER BYRON: You work tremendous hours.
9 In fact, I should also mention, you know, that the earlier
10 project you did, the University of California and all the
11 research that we do there, I'm actually speaking this
12 afternoon at a joint, I should say this evening, at joint
13 Stanford-Berkeley Energy Summit I think it's called where
14 they'll be touting a number of the various technologies
15 that have been developed out of the PIER Program and
16 particularly energy storage, which I know is an area
17 you're very much involved with. And so it pains me to go
18 Berkeley, but I'm doing it this afternoon because it's
19 joint Stanford-Berkeley.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: You're lucky Berkeley will
21 actually talk to Stanford people at all.

22 COMMISSIONER BYRON: Mike, thank you very much.

23 MR. GRAVELY: Thank you, Sir.

24 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Item 7, UC Berkeley Center
25 for the Built Environment. Possible approval of Contract

1 500-08-44 for \$2,100,000 with UC Berkeley Center for the
2 Built Environment. Mr. Scruton.

3 MR. SCRUTON: Good morning, Commissioners. I'm
4 Chris Scruton with the PIER Buildings Program.

5 Over the last several years with funding from
6 PIER, the Center for the Built Environment at UC Berkeley
7 has had a significant impact on the performance of
8 commercial buildings across the country and especially in
9 California.

10 Their technological specialty has been
11 underfloor air distribution systems, which now account for
12 about 20 percent of new commercial installations. The CBE
13 has developed simulation tools, designed guidelines, and
14 commissioning tools used by the major implementers of
15 these systems and that effort continues.

16 The other major research areas for the CBE
17 concern how people assess their indoor environments.
18 These research topics include thermal comfort
19 investigations and an indoor environmental survey tool and
20 database. As fundamental as this research seems, little
21 data has been collected on these topics outside of CBE,
22 and filling this information vacuum has enabled them to
23 capture the high ground in an area of great relevance for
24 building energy use.

25 For example, having access to thermal comfort

1 data allowed them to beat back an attempt to define a
2 Class A indoor environment within ASHRAE standards in a
3 way that could have only been met with very high energy
4 use. Their work includes systems combining radiant
5 cooling and heating with natural ventilation, which shows
6 great promise to enable California to reach its goal of
7 zero energy commercial buildings.

8 The proposed three-year research contract before
9 you today would fund them to continue work in all of these
10 areas and others, and the stable longer-term funding
11 allows the CBE to attract topnotch graduate student who
12 tend to populate the best design firms and many of them
13 remain in California.

14 The PIER Building team recommends approval of
15 this contract, and I'd be happy to try to answer any
16 questions you might have.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: I move approval of this
18 item for the research committee.

19 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: All in favor?

21 (Ayes.)

22 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: This item passes. Thank you.

23 MR. SCRUTON: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Item 8, Minutes: Approval of
25 the April 22nd, 2009, Business Meeting Minutes.

1 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: I move the minutes.

2 COMMISSIONER BYRON: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: All in favor?

4 (Ayes.)

5 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: This item is approved. Item
6 9, Commission Committee Presentations and Discussion. Not
7 today?

8 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: All we do is economic
9 stimulus recovery these days, and I think we all know what
10 we're all doing.

11 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Well, that's right. And not
12 only that, but we have a report on that in the Executive
13 Director's Report. Item 10, Chief Counsel's Report.

14 CHIEF COUNSEL CHAMBERLAIN: I have no report
15 today, Madam Chairman.

16 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Item 11, Executive Director's
17 Report.

18 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR CHANDLER: Good morning,
19 Commissioners. I'm Claudia Chandler, the Chief Deputy
20 Director for the Energy Commission. Our Executive
21 Director, Melissa Jones, is at the Assembly Budget
22 Committee hearings today, and tomorrow we will have Senate
23 Budget Committee hearings on our budget.

24 California was first in the nation to file its
25 State Energy Program Plan application with the Department

1 of Energy late last week. We filed that because we wanted
2 to be first in the nation to receive the funding from the
3 State Energy Plan.

4 The Department of Energy has indicated that they
5 will begin allocating funds 60 to 90 days after the May
6 12th date, the cutoff date. Originally, they had said 60
7 days and so we want to make sure that we're first in the
8 queue as well to get the funds in and to get them out to
9 the qualified recipients.

10 This also gives us time to focus on the Energy
11 Efficiency Block Grant, that application to DOE. That
12 application is due on the 26th of May. It's much more
13 complicated in terms of the completeness of it, whereas
14 the SEP grant application or the SEP application was
15 broad, more administrative, asked us to identify programs
16 areas in the matrix that we would be measuring our
17 proposed programs by. The SEP application or the Block
18 Grant application is a little bit more complicating.

19 We had, as many of you know, an 811 workshop
20 recently, the 27th of April, very well attended, very
21 interesting and fascinating, you know, material that was
22 presented. I think that we had about 180 people here. We
23 know that we had about 50 to 80 on the phone or on
24 webcast. So it clearly is a topic that is well received
25 and of interest to local jurisdictions as well as others.

1 Our next steps are to assign staff to address
2 the opportunities that were identified in the workshop,
3 and also to further develop that concept because that
4 concept does fall both within the SEP grant or SEP
5 application and possible within the Block Grant, so that's
6 what we're working forward on right now.

7 Earlier this week on Monday, we had the two
8 workshops in Diamond Bar, the SEP grant or the SEP
9 application workshop and the Block Grant workshops. We
10 had about 150 people at the Block Grant workshop and about
11 60 people at the SEP workshop. It was quite informative.
12 I think that the consistent comment was how appreciative
13 these folks were that we came down to Diamond Bar and
14 talked to them in their community about conceptually the
15 approaches that we're taking, and that was a very positive
16 experience for us.

17 We heard varying input. We gave them some broad
18 overarching guidelines that we were looking at and then we
19 spent a lot of time in the workshop listening to their
20 feedback and their comments on that. We'll be compiling
21 those workshop notes. We have one right now going on
22 today in Fresno from 1:00 to 3:00 for the Block Grant
23 Program and then from 4:00 to 8:00 tonight for the SEP
24 Grant. And then tomorrow we'll be up here in Sacramento.

25 As I said, the workshops went so well from the

1 standpoint of the Block Grant input that we are looking at
2 adding four additional workshops specific to the Block
3 Grant to cover broader regions of California to get these
4 local jurisdictions' input.

5 The SEP concepts and information will go into
6 helping us develop the guidelines, which is now where
7 staff is headed related to the SEP Program. The
8 guidelines are what is going to basically provide us with
9 the programmatic structure for the SEP Program.

10 So with that, any questions?

11 COMMISSIONER LEVIN: I've got a couple of
12 questions. Can you just summarize the nature of why the
13 Block Grant's application is more complicated than the SEP
14 application? And the workshops that you mentioned, the
15 potentially four additional workshops under the Block
16 Grants, are you thinking that those would occur before or
17 after the Block Grant application deadline to inform the
18 application to inform the guidelines?

19 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR CHANDLER: As I understand
20 it in terms of the Block Grant application, it calls for
21 more specificity than what we were required to do in the
22 SEP grant. We were able address the overarching rules.

23 But in the Block Grant, we have to be more
24 specific about the funding mechanisms that we're going to
25 use to move out that 60 percent of the funds that go

1 directly into the smaller, local jurisdictions, so that's
2 what we're focused on right now, and that is in part why
3 we are looking for more input.

4 In terms of your second question, the schedule
5 and we're just talking about that right now. In fact,
6 staff is probably a little surprised that we're adding and
7 some staff, but we're looking to add that before the May
8 26th because that really is important.

9 I can't stress enough how valuable it was to get
10 their, the local jurisdictions, input on what we call the
11 conceptual proposals. We kind of threw out five different
12 kinds of conceptual proposals that maybe we could use the
13 funds for and then opened up the discussion for hearing
14 from them.

15 I think that what we'll be doing is refining our
16 conceptual proposals based on kind of the input that we
17 got and maybe even adding a couple of more conceptual
18 proposals based on some of the input that we received from
19 the local jurisdictions as to kind of what their needs
20 were or what they, you know, their perceive needs.

21 COMMISSIONER LEVIN: Thank you. I also --
22 Commissioner Rosenfeld and I met with some of the local
23 governments after the AB 811 workshop here and got only
24 extremely positive feedback, so thank you for all of this
25 work.

1 And I think we would like to see the conceptual
2 proposals I think right away if possible, and then as they
3 get refined as the Efficiency Committee takes over more of
4 the planning as we move into the guidelines part of this
5 and actually on the application as well, so that we really
6 can participate in shaping that since that one --
7 especially since that one needs to be more specific.

8 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR CHANDLER: Absolutely.

9 COMMISSIONER LEVIN: So thank you.

10 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR CHANDLER: I should say
11 that at the -- one of the conceptual proposals is the 811
12 for both SEP in the industrial or, excuse me, in the non-
13 res and in the res, and it was also included in the Block
14 Grant because it could fall either way at this point in
15 time.

16 And local jurisdictions were very, very
17 enthralled with that idea, as were some of the people that
18 were providers. We had people that were like
19 installations companies. We had folks who were from green
20 jobs, work investment boards, so they were all very, very
21 interested in the 811 concept and the energy efficiency on
22 to photovoltaics as we discussed it.

23 COMMISSIONER BYRON: Madam Chairman?

24 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Please.

25 COMMISSIONER BYRON: Thank you, Ms. Chandler.

1 My thanks to the staff. I mean I think being first out in
2 terms of the application and all the effort that's gone
3 into that. I have not followed it as closely as I'd like,
4 but I think that's tremendous.

5 And also, Madam Chairman, thanks to you and your
6 office. That AB 811 workshop last week was, to say it was
7 informative is somewhat of an understatement for me. I
8 really got a lot out of that including some follow-up
9 meetings the next day as well with folks that wanted to
10 meet with me, so that was very good and very informative.

11 And I also would like to report back to my
12 fellow Commissioners the efforts that I've undertaken with
13 Commissioner Chong at the PUC on Smart Grid Continues, and
14 this Governor has demonstrated tremendous support. I
15 think he issued a letter and a press release surrounding
16 getting the criteria right so that California can
17 participate in a more substantial way. And that's a good
18 test because we're going to look for continuous support
19 out his office as the applications come forward from the
20 various utilities. They look like exemplary proposals. I
21 think they're called applications by the Department of
22 Energy.

23 So we're very hopeful that the Department of
24 Energy will responsive to the leadership California
25 demonstrates both technically and otherwise to move

1 forward in this area of Smart Grid technology as well as
2 others, but I'm very pleased thus far.

3 The proof of the pudding, though, will be in how
4 well the Federal government responds to California's
5 proposals, so we'll stay on this make sure that we
6 position ourselves well. I understand some of my fellow
7 Commissioners are going to D. C. soon as well on this
8 issue, correct?

9 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: I was actually going to help
10 prompt some discussion of that if it didn't come up on
11 it's own, but that's absolutely right. As you know,
12 Commissioner Byron, your trip to D. C. I think was very
13 helpful, as has been your involvement and close work on
14 this issue.

15 I was very pleased to learn that Commissioners
16 Levin, Rosenfeld, and Boyd are planning on going to
17 Washington D. C. the week of the 18th, and in large part to
18 do meetings on stimulus funding and to learn more about
19 DOE and other Federal agencies' perspectives and also to
20 communicate the State of California's priorities, goals,
21 platforms, programs, and so on.

22 I don't know if any of you would like to say
23 something about that.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: Just on the meeting. We
25 could put out a notice and convene a meeting in Washington

1 if you'd like.

2 Just to build on that, each of us has similar
3 and differing goals and objectives as it relates to our
4 committee assignments and our personal interests, so we'll
5 be going our separate ways and going our collective ways
6 at various times, never violating the rule of three, Mr.
7 Chamberlain, to meet with various agencies.

8 I am particularly interested in all the
9 transportation areas. I am particularly interested in
10 bioenergy, be it biopower or biofuels, and I think USDA
11 has to be added to the list of agencies, who have a lot of
12 money to spend on biomass, bioenergy, and their types of
13 activities. And, you know, we'll, of course, be working
14 through our Washington -- California-Washington office
15 folks to help us along, so I look forward to the
16 opportunity.

17 I don't like to venture inside the beltway very
18 often in life, but this is for a good cause to the State
19 of California, so I'm hopeful that we'll make an
20 impression being first there with some of our
21 applications, having complete program packages, and other
22 areas that should prove to be attractive to the Federal
23 government. It's certainly a benefit to the California
24 and to this agency, so hopefully we'll be able to make a
25 good impression and bring back bags full of money or IOUs

1 at least.

2 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR CHANDLER: I should also
3 mention that we are awaiting one more funding award to the
4 Energy Commission and that is the Energy Star Program.
5 We'll be hearing from a webinar tomorrow more about the
6 Energy Star Program and DOE's plans through the National
7 Association and State Energy Offices.

8 They'll be holding a webinar tomorrow and our
9 key staff will be on that to hear. This will be the first
10 that we're really hearing about the Energy Star Program
11 and the parameters for that. You might be aware that we
12 are looking at approximately \$30 million to be
13 California's share. Without any guidelines, of course,
14 right now from the Department of Energy, as to how that
15 will be allocated.

16 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: Claudia, I mention one
17 specific point there, which is a big irritation. The
18 bill, which authorizes rebates for Energy Star, calls for
19 Energy Star Products, which intrigues me because that
20 would include rebates for cool-colored roofs.

21 One place in the darn bill it says Energy Star
22 appliances. How do you think of a roof as an appliance?
23 I called the DOE and said I hope you leave the guidelines
24 without adding the word appliance, and make them
25 applicable to products in general. The DOE lawyer said,

1 no, the word appliance appears. It has to be an
2 appliance.

3 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR CHANDLER: So we put a
4 plug on that cool roof. Is that what we do?

5 VICE CHAIRMAN BOYD: Plug it in.

6 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: I haven't figured out a
7 good way out, but it would nice. Thank you for that.
8 That's a great suggestion. It would nice if there's some
9 discussion of the guidelines to point out California's
10 issue that we could do market transformation on cool-
11 colored roofs if they will allow rebates. PG and E and
12 Edison E could do rebates on cool-colored roofs, and DOE
13 lawyers are a pain in the neck.

14 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR CHANDLER: Well, I see
15 that Valerie Hall is our Deputy Director for the Energy
16 Efficiency Division is here, and she'll be leading that
17 call, ably attended by Bill Pennington and Tim Tutt.

18 So we'll make sure that our perspective gets
19 encouraged not only on the call but follows through, and
20 you know we have been talking with the Department of
21 Energy specifically about this issue and this concern.

22 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: I might say also, one
23 of the things we'll do, Commissioner Levin and I, at DOE
24 is to talk with them about tools for doing audits of
25 retrofits and -- well, particularly retrofits. Bill

1 Pennington has been putting together a group to turn CAL-
2 RES into an audit tool and then there's -- that has to be
3 coordinated with DOE's efforts who were producing our
4 audit tools, so that's another area where we'll try to get
5 some coordination.

6 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Okay. It sounds good.

7 COMMISSIONER LEVIN: Can I ask just a follow-up
8 question. I know the staff is just overloaded with all of
9 this work. But I am wondering, have there been
10 discussions or where in the schedule will we start to talk
11 about what would be the appropriate role for the
12 Commission to help with competitive grants from California
13 because there's so many more billions in the various
14 competitive pots?

15 How do we make sure that the right set of
16 projects from California are eligible? What's the
17 appropriate role for the Commission to help competitive
18 grant applications that wouldn't necessarily come through
19 us but is a role that we could plan to ensure, as the
20 Governor has said, that we get our fair share or more of
21 the competitive pots?

22 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Commissioner, we've been
23 doing that largely led at times through Policy Committees
24 and coordinated through the Budget Management Committees.

25 So for example, the Transportation Committee

1 developed an approach for the transportation pots that
2 came out in a program opportunity notice where we offered
3 118 funding as match share for California projects that
4 are consistent with the investment plan. And the reason
5 and justification for going with that approach is that the
6 way that the most relevant funds at DOE were set up it was
7 impractical for the Energy Commission to itself be an
8 applicant. So it made more sense for us to step up and
9 offer some match to California applicants. That's not
10 always the case in other areas.

11 Commissioner Byron on working on the Smart Grid
12 applications -- Well, maybe, Commissioner Byron, you
13 should say something about the strategy on Smart Grid in a
14 moment.

15 There are other areas that we haven't yet looked
16 as hard at as we should, and I'm particularly interested
17 next in working through the R and D Committee to think
18 about PIER and is there a -- is there a potential link
19 with some of the California institutions doing research,
20 PIER, the Energy Commission, and some of the Federal
21 research funds that are out there, so I guess that's an
22 early head ups to PIER staff, but those questions are
23 about to go your way.

24 I think, Commissioner Levin, it would very
25 helpful, you know, if you look at the list of -- We

1 certainly have not covered everything, so if you look at
2 the list of competitive solicitations that may be going
3 forward and you have ideas for how the Energy Commission
4 can help in any one of these, please bring those to me or
5 through the Budget Management Committee and we'll to get
6 work.

7 And the way that we tend to address this just
8 because it takes a lot of work and follow up is that, you
9 know, often one of the Commissioners will take the lead in
10 working with staff on -- working with staff and
11 stakeholders in these different areas.

12 Commissioner Byron, would you like to say
13 something about Smart Grid?

14 COMMISSIONER BYRON: Thank you. I'll go into
15 just a little bit more detail so hopefully it's helpful.
16 First, I should mention that it's not just myself at the
17 Commission. There's been a significant amount of staff's
18 work, but I've also been working closely with Commissioner
19 Rosenfeld on this. We just decided to divide up labor and
20 not both make the trip back to D. C.

21 Commissioner Chong is very much engaged on
22 behalf of the investor-owned utilities, and we were
23 somewhat representing the interest of publically-owned
24 utilities. Although I chair a committee -- a research
25 committee on transmission here at the Commission that has

1 all the investor-owned utility, the right folks involved
2 from the IOUs at the VP level and above, so that we did
3 conference calls with them. We found out what they're
4 planning on proposing to DOE. This was all before the
5 notice of -- NOI, Notice of Intent?

6 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR CHANDLER: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER BYRON: Thank you, came out. So we
8 were really -- And our technology and leadership in this
9 market area I think speaks for itself. We just want to
10 make sure that the DOE is fully aware of it. So we plan
11 to provide the Governor's Office support for all the
12 proposals that are submitted to the DOE.

13 We've also weighed in the Governor -- We sent --
14 Commissioner Chong and I sent a letter to the Department
15 of Energy on their criteria, pointing out how it
16 disadvantages California. The Governor has weighed in on
17 that as well I think even with a press release. And I
18 think each one of them will be a little bit different.

19 The balance is making sure that we get the
20 information to the Department of Energy. We can't make
21 the decision for them, but helping them to see, as I said
22 earlier, the leadership that we've got in this area. This
23 is really where they can best spend their money if they
24 want to set good examples for the rest of the States on
25 how to develop Smart Grid technologies and move them

1 forward.

2 I hope that's enough. Maybe that's too much.

3 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: No. That's very helpful and
4 actually I did not mean to leave Commissioner Rosenfeld
5 out of that description because I know very much about his
6 partnering with Commissioner Byron on the Smart Grid
7 issues.

8 I'd also say we are looking at, because we're
9 doing so much in the area of workforce development
10 particularly through the 118 program but also potentially
11 through the SEP Program, we're definitely looking at the
12 possibility of a statewide application on workforce
13 issues. That's not a decision. It's something that needs
14 to be vetted with the workforce agencies. And we wouldn't
15 necessarily be the lead applicants, and that is an
16 approach in some areas.

17 ARB was the lead applicant in the DERA funds,
18 for example, the Diesel Emission Reductions, so that's
19 another approach that is at times out there. It just
20 hasn't been front and center in the pots that we've
21 focused on so far.

22 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR CHANDLER: We also have
23 learned since maybe the first flurry of press releases and
24 information on the competitive funds that although DOE
25 called the funds competitive, they're not competitive in

1 the sense of the word that you might think where it's open
2 for all states or all entities to participate.

3 We are -- We have Martha Crabbe (phonetic),
4 she's our very well versed Department of Energy D. C.
5 person, is tracking very closely those funds that are
6 probably designated for the national labs. Those funds
7 where they expanded a program opportunity notice in maybe
8 a technical area had three projects that they had accepted
9 and then opened it up to take four, five, and six as a
10 result of this. So it was competitive in a sense, but it
11 was not opened up for a full --

12 So I think that you raise a good point, which is
13 let's take a look at that list and really look at what's
14 competitive for California Energy Commission's
15 participation either with partnerships, external
16 stakeholders, other State agencies, and refine the list to
17 give true kind of where should we direct our resources
18 because we are a little limited right now. We still
19 haven't received any new bodies, so operating with the
20 ones that we've got, the able bodies that we have.

21 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Well, we thought we had full
22 days before there was a stimulus act, and so I think a lot
23 of us have both diverted the time and attention from other
24 issues at times but also increased the hours worked as
25 needed. I think we've seen a lot of that.

1 COMMISSIONER LEVIN: Well, this is really
2 helpful and it makes me realize that, Chairman Douglas, as
3 the Renewable Energy Committee, we need to catch up I
4 think to some of the other committees in terms of focusing
5 on where because the one area that I haven't discussion of
6 and I'm not aware of is on the renewable, energy-related,
7 competitive grants.

8 Certainly, Commissioner Rosenfeld and I are
9 starting to look at some of the energy efficiency pots
10 beyond the SEP funds and the Block Grants. But I'm sorry
11 to add more to your overfull plate, but I think, as the
12 Renewable Energy Committee, we need to take this up as
13 well because we want to take -- I know everyone is
14 overloaded, but we need to take full advantage of the
15 range of different grant programs.

16 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR CHANDLER: Or at least
17 know where our resources should be going.

18 COMMISSIONER LEVIN: Yeah.

19 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR CHANDLER: I can
20 appreciate that. It's very daunting from the standpoint
21 of the tsunami that's coming towards us and it would be
22 nice to divert -- clarify what of these our folks should
23 be focused on and what is going to be not in our ballpark.

24 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Right. I completely agree
25 with you, Commissioner Levin. My focus -- One of the

1 things that is probably the most important thing we could
2 do for renewables that's R-related is get some projects
3 permitted on time for them to take advantage of stimulus.
4 And so that is something that Commissioner Levin and I,
5 and Commissioner Byron and probably everybody here is very
6 cognizant of. And one of the reasons why we're looking
7 hard at the timelines and encouraging staff to work
8 faster, which I know that they are very much trying.

9 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR CHANDLER: Sleep fewer
10 hours.

11 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Sleep fewer hours.

12 COMMISSIONER LEVIN: And to be fair to staff and
13 applicants as well, I mean this is certainly not our
14 staff's fault many times when they are delays. We
15 recognize that, and we definitely recognize staff are just
16 incredibly burdened right now with so many different
17 things, but all parties, our colleagues in other agencies,
18 State and Federal as well, we all need to accelerate this.

19 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Absolutely. But I do agree.
20 Let's take this up at the Renewables Committee and let's
21 look at other opportunities as well as just the siting
22 issue.

23 If there are no more questions or comments, I
24 just wanted to add my appreciation to staff for their hard
25 work on all of this. The SEP application was very well

1 put together. It was great to be able to be first in the
2 nation. It also made a lot of sense to submit the
3 application earlier. I think by doing that we may have
4 very well saved ourselves or potentially saved ourselves
5 some headaches down the road. And we put ourselves in the
6 front of the line to get money flowing into California and
7 then through us to Californians, so very well done on
8 that.

9 I also appreciated the hard work on the
10 workshops, the 811 workshops, and the workshops that are
11 happening this week. I have never seen -- I've
12 occasionally seen this room full and I've occasionally
13 seen hearing room B get close to capacity, but I've never
14 before seen a set up TV in the lobby and broadcast the
15 workshops.

16 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: It was all day, too.

17 CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Absolutely. We had people
18 just in the lobby watching a TV and listening to the
19 broadcast, and it was just amazing the attendance we got
20 for that workshop. So it's both a message to us about how
21 important this is, and a sign of the interest of the
22 public, so I wanted to thank you again for that hard work.

23 And with that, I believe we are on to -- No.
24 There's no Legislative Director's Report. We're on to the
25 Public Advisor's Report.

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

FROM AUDIENCE: Nothing to report and
(inaudible).

CHAIRMAN DOUGLAS: Thank you. Nothing to
report. Public comment. Is there public comment? Very
well. Meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the Business Meeting
was adjourned.)

--oOo--

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

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

I, MARY CLARK, a certified electronic reporter, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the foregoing California Energy Commission Business Meeting, dated May 6, 2009; that it was thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting, nor in any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 20th day of May, 2009.



MARY CLARK CERT*D-214

California Reporting LLC