

State Energy Advisory Board Meeting
August 14-16, 2007
Berkeley, CA.

A Visit to the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Chris Benson (Chairman) (AR), Patricia Sobrero (Vice-Chair) (VA), Elliot Jacobson (Secretary) (MA), Robert Hoppie (ID), Janet Streff (MN), Duane Hauck (ND), Peter Johnston (AZ), John Davies (KY), William “Dub” Taylor (TX), Alexander Mack (FL), Jim Ploger (KS), Jim Nolan (MT), Susan Brown (WI), Paul Gutierrez (NM), and Steven Vincent (OR).

Others present were:

Gary Burch, STEAB Designated Federal Officer (DFO).

Pat Malone, TMS, Inc.

David Rathbun, TMS, Inc.

The following STEAB members were absent:

Henry “Ted” Berglund (FL), Elizabeth Robertson (GA)*, JamesEtta Reed (PA), Daniel Zaweski (NY), and David Terry (VA).

August 14, 2007

On first day the Board visited the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL). The Lab provided presentations of the current activities and successes of its Environmental Energy Technologies Division (EETD). The Board also toured the Lab’s Windows and Fume Hood test facilities.

WELCOMING & INTRODUCTIONS

Chris Benson opened the meeting. After introductions, he thanked the Lab for inviting the STEAB to visit.

He then summarized the Board’s objectives, especially its interest in assisting DOE Labs with outreach activities that foster a greater national awareness of energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies. Gary Burch then summarized the Board’s statutory charge, explaining that of the four EERE Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) Committees, only the STEAB crosscuts all EERE Program Offices and reporting directly to the Assistant Secretary for the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE).

PRESENTATIONS[†]

EETD presented and discussed the following:

- LBNL/ EET Division Overview: Bill Fisk, Acting EET Division Director.
- High Performance Commercial Buildings: Steve Selkowitz, LBNL Building Technologies Department Head.
- Buildings Controls and Lighting System: Francis Rubenstein, Acting Lighting Group Leader.
- Demand Response Research and Implementation: Mary Anne Piette, Research Director, LBNL Demand Response Research and Implementation.
- Recent High-Tech Industry Research and Demonstration Projects: Dale Sartor, LBNL Applications Team Group; and, Bill Tschudi, Senior Program Manager, LBNL Applications Team.

* Elizabeth Robertson participated during portions of the meeting via conference call

† Copies of the presentations are available on the STEAB Web site: <http://steab.org/>

- Digital Networks: Rich Brown, Deputy Leader, End Use Forecasting Group.
- Retail Rate Structure and the Economics of Photovoltaic Systems in California: Galen Barbose, LBNL Electricity Markets and Policy Group.
- Car Component Energy Efficiency: Alan Meier, Senior Scientist, LBNL Energy Analysis Department.
- Cool Roofing Technologies: Hashem Akbari, LBNL Heat Island Group Leader.

Closing Discussion:

Mr. Fisk requested the Board’s feedback on the LBNL’s energy efficiency technologies portfolio, suggestions on improving LBNL’s partnering with States, and, possibly, endorsement of the LBNL’s position on specific issues.

Peter Johnston was amazed by the breadth of the technologies under development at the Lab. John Davies voiced agreement with the research portfolio and doubt that many interested groups are aware of its scope. He asked how the Lab communicates its achievements so as to increase awareness of its activities. Janet Streff suggested that State Energy Offices be approached to assist in technology transfer and market deployment since they are a valuable resource(s) for creating awareness.

Chris Benson stated that the meeting was “very well put together.” He explained that the DOE Labs’ eagerness to better partner with the States seems to be a “common theme.” He believes that the greatest barrier to outreach has been the lack of a communication structure that transfers information out of the Labs in a “digestible format.” He said the Board has been developing an “*EERE/Stakeholder Collaboration Roadmap*” to show different State-stakeholders and the potential “issues” and “opportunities” that may affect them.

Mr. Fisk asked if increased communication between the LBNL and the STEAB would help the Lab open more dialogue with the States. Janet Streff suggested that that the Lab also consider approaching entities such as the National Association of State Energy Officials (NASEO) and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant-Colleges (NASULGC) as all States and land-grant parties have representatives within these organizations. Gary Burch suggested that the STEAB could open a dialogue with these two entities to see if there were any possible “missed opportunities” due to “unknown information.”

Chris Benson questioned whether the Lab determines what research activities may have the most impact (i.e., activities with the most general interest, activities that are the “most visible” and “accessible” to the public). Mr. Fisk explained that the Lab conducts long-range planning and that there are several factors that influence these determinations including the highly competitive process for how work is awarded to the Lab. He said that LBNL has a very good track record for picking projects that are the most accessible to the public. Marcy Beck agreed and added that the LBNL does not conduct classified research, and that most its research and development (R&D) activities are more or less of the “basic variety.”

Paul Gutierrez mentioned that his State (NM) has two DOE Labs and that they are always looking to increase public awareness of their research. He asked if the DOE might support a national forum that allows the Labs to openly communicate their successes.

Dub Taylor stated that the Board recommended a similar structure in a white paper titled, “*Market Transformation*.” He further explained that the adoption of a broad-based communication outlet may encourage friendly competition between the Labs. John Davies added that broader outreach could be achieved at reasonable costs and that applications such as “Webinars” can facilitate broad two-way communication without requiring travel. Gary Burch said STEAB has a genuine interest in this area. He thanked the Lab for hosting, and suggested that Chris Benson continue this dialogue with the LBNL to discuss any “next steps.”

August 15-16, 2007

On the meeting's second and third days, the Board gathered at the Hotel Durant in Berkeley, CA. In accordance with public law, the meeting was open to the public.

DISCUSSION OF ACTION ITEMS FROM THE MARCH MEETING:

Chris Benson began the meeting by presenting the agenda. He also explained that his schedule would not permit him to attend the meeting's third day (8/16), and that Pat Sobrero, the STEAB's Vice-Chair, would be leading the Board meeting in his absence.

Chris Benson summarized the action items resulting from the March (2007) D.C. meeting, and explained that several items have been adopted in the form of Recommendations and have already been delivered to the DOE: the "*Market Transformation*" white paper; the "*Enhanced Collaboration with State and Local Energy Institutions*" white paper; and, the "*REPI Action*" document.

Gary Burch briefly discussed the "*Market Transformation*" white paper, explaining that discussion on this topic began last year during the October (2006) STEAB meeting in Oak Ridge, TN. He further explained that the document was previously presented in its DRAFT form during two separate STEAB Executive Committee meetings with EERE management (November, 2006; June, 2007). Gary Burch added that although Mr. John Mizroch, the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for EERE, and Mr. Paul Dickerson, the Chief Operating Officer for EERE were especially receptive and embraced the ideas in the document, there has been no further dialogue regarding this Recommendation. Gary Burch suggested that as a "follow up," the Board could perhaps discuss methods of how EERE can initiate some of the activities identified within the document.

Chris Benson then summarized the progress of the "*Enhanced Collaboration with State and Local Energy Institutions*" white paper by providing some background on the document. He explained that David Terry originally offered up a paper to the Board that he had been developing on his own. And after some discussion, the Board made some minor adjustments to the paper and the document was subsequently voted on and adopted by the Board. Dub Taylor explained that he shared this document with Mr. Mark Bailey (Acting Program Manager for EERE's Weatherization and Intergovernmental Program) during the STEAB Executive Committee meeting this past June, and that the concepts within the document were immediately embraced. Gary Burch explained that although EERE appears to be embracing the proposed concepts highlighted in both white papers, there has been no implementation to date and that any immediate forward progress would likely come from the "financial side."

FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION OF THE LABORATORY VISIT:

Chris Benson suggested that the Board attempt to identify a few key "thoughts" or "observations" based on the presentations and discussions that were conducted the previous day.

Pat Sobrero stated that she felt that the Lab was very interested in learning more about partnership opportunities with the States, and inquired as to whether or not the STEAB could work with the EERE Project Management Center (PMC) to facilitate Laboratory outreach efforts. Peter Johnston brought up the subject of Webinars and explained that during yesterday's discussion the Lab did make mention of the fact that they have engaged in similar outreach efforts in the past. He then suggested that the Board attempt to see if the Lab has a future schedule for these types of broadcasts and attempt to obtain a copy of it. Steve Vincent stated that similar Webinar-based broadcasts are likely to garner more attention and "visibility" if they detail projects and technologies that are closer to market readiness.

Janet Streff explained that what she took away from the Lab visit was that the LBNL did a good job of giving a "big picture" perspective of their R&D activities. She explained that in terms of generating interest in Laboratory

activities, the STEAB may also want to consider assisting the Labs with highlighting “down-the-road” activities as well, and suggested that the Board consider altering the “EERE State-stakeholder Roadmap” to include entities or parties that may be able assist Labs with outreach efforts.

Sue Brown said that based on her observations from Wisconsin, if an interest exists and the State initiates the contact, then information tends to flow more readily. She also said that “grass roots” approaches can at times be very effective as well – “who you know” approach. Gary Burch agreed, and stated that information is typically easier to locate when the information is already available. He further explained that even though the Labs do currently place information about their R&D activities on their respective Web sites, there may be an opportunity to expand efforts through increased communication with the PMC.

Gary Burch reiterated on what Janet Streff mentioned the previous day about the possibility of approaching the NASEO Board to see they could assist in some fashion, and suggested that the PMC may be able to assist in this effort. He further explained that even if both the NASEO and the STEAB concentrated on assisting Labs with their communications and outreach efforts, redundancy would not be an issue provided that both groups work together.

Chris Benson inquired as to whether or not the Board should consider developing a Recommendation for this proposed effort. Gary Burch explained that PMC would likely not require a Board Resolution to begin moving on these proposed activities as he is confident that both of the PMC States Coordinators (Julie Riel & James Ferguson) would endorse this effort. He did, however, recommend that the Board clearly articulate what the actual need is so that PMC can further engage their resources to see what the best method(s) would be – perhaps multiple processes could be developed.

Janet Streff suggested that the Board attempt to solicit volunteers from the STEAB to serve as “point people” to communicate/work with the PMC. Gary Burch agreed, and recommended that the Board pose a formal motion regarding the same. Janet Streff volunteered to serve as the Board’s focal point of contact for the Western States within the PMC (Golden Office – Julie Riel), and Alexander Mack volunteered to serve as the focal point of contact for the East (Pittsburgh - NETL – James Ferguson).

Motion adopted to request that the PMC States Coordinators provide a link to transfer selected information from the National Laboratories to target audiences and other interested membership groups, and to nominate Janet Streff and Alexander Mack as the Board’s points of contact for the PMC.

Jim Ploger moved for the Board to engage the PMC States Coordinators to initiate this process and John Davies seconded the motion.

The Motion passed unanimously with no oppositions or abstentions.

It was determined that in the days following the meeting, Gary Burch will approach Julie Riel (PMC/Golden Office) to see how the PMC can facilitate the logistics for Webinars. Gary and Julie will then open a dialogue with James Ferguson (PMC/Pittsburgh - NETL) to enlist his support / participation in the process. Once the preliminary background issues are researched and identified, the Board (via Janet Streff and Alexander Mack) will then begin to initiate discussions on “next steps.”

Thoughts/Observations Resulting from LBNL Presentations and Laboratory Tour:

The following list contains the thoughts and observations captured in the Board's facilitated brainstorming session immediately after the LBNL presentations, tour, and discussions. Those items that were further deliberated and acted upon are reflected in the minutes above. The remainder may emerge as subjects for further discussion at a later date.

- Capture Webinar schedules for Labs
- STEAB to address the "Valley of Death" paper recommendations
- LBNL presented "Big Picture" in several areas
- Grants to NGOs (NASEO etc.) to implement collaboration matrix
- Who you know is important (Grass Roots)
- State Coordinators at EERE PMC to implement webinars
- Multiple approaches desirable
- STEAB guide issue presentation selection
- STEAB motion to request PMC to facilitate implementation of "Valley of Death" recommendations
- STEAB POCs for liaison with States – Janet Streff, Alexander Mack
- Move with urgency
- Push process forward
- EERE PMC Web site
- Key is finding /targeting the audience /stakeholders
- Invite key State leaders to attend "Big Picture" forums
- Budget strategy to obtain needed funding
- Recommendation similar to "REPI Action" paper

DISCUSSION OF THE EERE/STAKEHOLDER COLLABORATION ROADMAP:

Chris Benson began this discussion segment by providing a brief summary of the Roadmap. He explained that during the March 2007 Board meeting, Mr. David Rodgers, EERE's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Renewable Energy, approached the Board and requested that they assist him with developing a tool that would serve as high-level template for use by EERE program elements in identifying public and private entities and their varying degrees of interest in specific energy-related topic areas. Chris Benson then polled the Board for suggestions to see what elements could be added to the current DRAFT document to make it more effective.

Duane Hauck explained that due to all of the recent discussions regarding the need for stronger communications and connections between EERE and States, the concept for this project is certainly "on track." Gary Burch explained that this project has been an on-going topic of discussion for several months, and based on his working relationship with Mr. Rodgers, it is likely that he is expecting the STEAB to respond in a quick manner. He also suggested that Board attempt to contact Mark Bailey, the Acting Program Manager for the Office of the Weatherization and Intergovernmental Program, to see if he has any suggestions to add in terms of assisting the Board with populating the matrix.

Robert Hoppie suggested that since several months have passed since the Board was initially tasked with this project, that perhaps it would be appropriate to forward the document in its current DRAFT form to Mr. Rodgers for his review and consideration. That way, the Board would be able gauge his feelings on the product and would be in a better position to make adjustments based on his feedback. In addition, this action would allow the Board to determine if this project is still a priority of his.

Motion adopted to present the DRAFT Roadmap to Mr. Rodgers with an accompanying introductory page that summarizes the purpose and the intent of the Roadmap, and that the legend at the bottom be removed and an entry for “Regional Governors’ Organizations” be added in addition to the entry for the “State Weatherization Directors.”

Robert Hoppie moved to present the DRAFT Roadmap to Mr. Rodgers to include the fore mentioned changes and Paul Gutierrez seconded the motion.

The Motion passed unanimously with no oppositions or abstentions.

With the removal of the legend at the bottom of the Roadmap, the Board agreed to simply place an “X” in the various columns to represent that particular party’s interest in a respective “issue” or “opportunity.” It was determined that the Board would make one last attempt to populate the Roadmap prior to submission, and would deliver their recommended changes to David Rathbun (TMS, Inc.) so that he could design a comprehensive master copy/version. Jim Ploger volunteered to develop the introductory page that would accompany the Roadmap, and stated that he would complete it during the week of August 20th.

NEXT MEETING LOCATIONS:

Chris Benson began this segment by announcing the dates of the upcoming October meeting (October 16-18) in Washington, D.C. He stated that a tentative agenda was developed in advance of the August meeting so that respective speakers could be scheduled and invited as far in advance as possible. David Rathbun (TMS, Inc.) summarized the meeting’s current speaker list, announcing that representatives were invited from the following DOE Offices: Building Technologies Program; Industrial Technologies Program; Weatherization and Intergovernmental Program; Solar Energy Technologies Program; General Counsel; and, Commercialization and Deployment. In addition, both Deputy Assistant Secretaries for Technology Development were also invited to brief the Board on the current “focuses” and “priorities” of EERE.

Elliott Jacobson explained that in the past, the Board’s Executive Committee has often met separately with EERE leadership on the day(s) prior to the full-Board meetings. He commented that it was his impression that small ad-hoc discussion groups have been very beneficial in terms of increasing communications and results, sometimes more so than the appearance of speakers at Board meetings. He welcomed the Board to think on the topic of who they believe would be good candidates for the STEAB Executive Committee to approach, and suggested that the Board consider opening discussions with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Chris Benson inquired as to who would be the best person to contact at OMB. Gary Burch explained that Robert Sandoli, a Program Examiner within the OMB’s Energy Branch, would be the most ideal as he is the lead in terms of providing senior OMB personnel with analysis and advice on the budget, legislation, and management of EERE programs. He also reminded the Board that the STEAB is a unique FACA Board in that they provide an annual report to the Secretary and the Congress. He suggested that Congressman Edward Markey (D – Massachusetts) and Greg Walden (R – Oregon) would be good options because of their interest in environmental issues, and also energy efficiency and renewable energy programs.

Jim Nolan inquired as to how the STEAB Annual Report is submitted to the Congress. Gary Burch stated that STEAB Annual Report is submitted to Executive Secretary and the report is then distributed elsewhere from that level – the Board does not physically send the report directly to the Congress. John Davies suggested that the Board perhaps craft a message that properly identifies the Board’s intent should they attempt to solicit meetings with representatives from the Congress. Gary Burch explained that the STEAB does not appear as a “line-item” in the Federal budget, and suggested that if the Board attempts to approach members of the Congress that they attempt to explain and demonstrate how the Board supports EERE and its mission and functions.

Duane Hauck summarized the “e-Xtension” web-based learning environment, explaining that it is a collaborative effort for land-grant university content providers to produce new educational and information resources on a number of topics. He also stated one of its goals is to attempt to engage the educational power of land grants in support of energy efficient building technologies. Pat Sobrero recommended that the Board also invite Mr. James Wade, the Director for Outreach and Extension at NASULGC, to speak during the October STEAB meeting.

PUBLIC FORUM:

No public comments were made.

PRESENTATIONS[‡]:

The Board listened to presentations on the following topics:

- Behavioral and Direct Marketing: Powerful Tools for Energy Efficiency Goals. Alex Laskey, President, Positive Energy.
- EERE Project Management Center Update. Gary Burch, STEAB Designated Federal Officer.

STEAB STRATEGIC DIRECTION DOCUMENT DISCUSSION:

The STEAB Strategic Direction document is a tool that assists the Board with identifying strategic focus areas in which the Board can use as a basis for the development of future Board Recommendations and Resolutions. The document contains four main sections: Legislative Mission and Responsibilities, Proactive Thrust, Strategic Focus, and an Appendix on the strategic planning process.

Legislative Mission and Responsibilities: STEAB was established by Public Law 101-440 (The State Energy Efficiency Programs Improvement Act of 1990) to advise the U.S. Department of Energy and the Congress on the operation of its Federal grant programs. The Board also advises on energy efficiency and renewable energy programs in general and on the efforts of the Department relating to research and market deployment of energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies.

Proactive Thrust: The STEAB is developing a long-range, proactive approach, and will develop, maintain and periodically update a Strategic Direction and plan to guide its activities as well as determine its structural, organizational, and operational approach. The Board is adopting a more proactive and less reactive approach when addressing important issues for the states and stakeholders.

Strategic Focus: The Strategic Focus section is broken down into three focus areas: **Energy Efficiency and Policy Support; Liaison between the States and EERE Regional Offices [should be between States and the Project Management Center]; and Enable STEAB to be an effective source of information, ideas, and directional advice to EERE.** Each section highlights strategies and goals that will allow the STEAB to stay informed with strategic areas of importance, and will greatly enhance the Board’s ability to create Board Recommendations and Resolutions, and maintain a fast channel of communication when dealing with important issues. Each of the Strategic Focus Areas will be guided by expected outcomes and measurable performance indicators with benchmarks to judge progress. These performance indicators and benchmarks will enable the STEAB Board to demonstrate benefit to the U.S. Congress, the Assistant Secretary for the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE), and document value to the U.S. Department of Energy and the States.

[‡] Copies of the presentations are available on the STEAB Web site: <http://steab.org/>

Pat Malone began this discussion segment by providing a brief history of the document. He also explained that since the priorities and future goals of the STEAB and EERE do change over time, the Board should consider re-visiting the document to determine if the current Strategic Focus Areas should be redesigned in order to ensure that they remain aligned with the current priorities and goals of EERE. Pat Sobrero suggested that the Board take a few minutes to read through the document so that everyone present could refresh themselves with the ideas and context therein.

Dub Taylor stated that the STEAB Strategic Direction document is very comprehensive, but emphasized that the document should be viewed as a “starting point.” He added that the Strategic Focus Areas within document were designed in such a way so that they can be revised to evolve with future Board – and EERE – priorities. He further explained that when the document was initially developed (2005), the current Strategic Focus Areas were linked to EERE’s Strategic Goals. He suggested that since EERE is now under new management, then perhaps the time is right for the Board to determine whether or not the goals should be linked more closely to more “current priorities.” Gary Burch explained that the Board began to re-evaluate the way that they report to HQ back in 2005. He made mention of the fact that the current STEAB Strategic Direction document references a few of the priorities of the previous EERE administration (Former Assistant Secretary Garman), and agreed with Dub Taylor’s suggestion of attempting to better align the Strategic Focus Areas with the current administration’s (Assistant Secretary Karsner) top priorities.

Elliott Jacobson explained that the Board needs to maintain a certain degree of flexibility because directions/priorities are often subject to change. Chris Benson agreed, but suggested that the Board is doing its job. He also explained that one of the Board’s primary and ongoing needs would be the development of a mechanism in which EERE can provide feedback on Board activities. Jim Nolan agreed, and explained that regardless of what new focus areas the Board develops, the STEAB should attempt to develop a better communication/feedback structure to determine if the Board’s work is well received, beneficial, and if it’s consistent with EERE’s “wants” and “needs.”

Gary Burch explained that the new administration is more geared toward soliciting “input” rather than providing aggressive feedback, and suggested that the Board take proactive measures to make sure that their work is aligned with the current Assistant Secretary’s objectives. He also reminded the Board that the STEAB is in a unique role in that it is a crosscutting committee and is not Program-centric – the STEAB has an audience in the “front office” and it is the responsibility of the Board to be flexible in terms of anticipating the movements of EERE. He then encouraged the STEAB not to lose momentum only because they do not receive aggressive feedback, suggesting that the Board select focus areas based on subject areas where they anticipate being able to provide the best and most timely assistance to EERE.

Pat Sobrero agreed with Gary Burch’s comments and then polled the room to see what suggestions the Board might have. She explained that there are no wrong suggestions, only that the Board would need to determine if certain goals are viable and attainable. She also recommended that the Board attempt to “vision” what some of EERE’s future needs would be as well.

Sue Brown stated that she is amazed at how rapidly things change at EERE headquarters, and although STEAB documents may not always be in complete alignment with EERE priorities, they are, however, presented in a manner which is non-confrontational – recommends that the submission process not be altered.

Duane Hauck stated that one thing he noticed was the Strategic Focus Area that listed the Board as being a “liaison between EERE and the States.” He explained that all indications suggest that renewables are moving at a good pace, but perhaps the STEAB could assist in providing a “push” to assist the slower-moving energy efficiency programs.

Robert Hoppie stated that he has noticed a lot of overlap with DOE Laboratory research in terms of in terms of duplication – more research and less deployment. He suggested that perhaps the Board set a goal for assisting the Labs with getting more of the Laboratory technologies deployed.

Alexander Mack explained that Step 12[§] of the Strategic Planning Process really leaps out, suggesting that the Board needs to consider energy programs from economical and political standpoints. He explained that in terms of energy efficiency programs, the Board needs to attempt to develop issued based on current “climates.” Steve Vincent suggested that the Board continue to understand priorities of EERE and determine how the STEAB can achieve its goals based on where headquarters “wants to go.” He also recommended that the Board continue its bi-annual STEAB Executive Committee meetings with EERE management to address just that.

STEAB Strategic Direction Brainstorming Results:

The following is the list of items contributed by Board members during the facilitated brainstorming session during the review and update of the STEAB Strategic Direction:

- Are EERE goals reflected in STEAB Strategic Direction current? Goals may be inoperable in current EERE Administration
- STEAB is being steered at meetings with EERE executives
- Feedback – may need more formal mechanism – should try, looking forward to next Administration
- Environment is highly dynamic with change occurring at State and other levels
- DOE is being pushed toward efficiency
- STEAB should look out further to influence client’s strategic thinking
- Board has become more effective in last several years
- Need to build/strengthen connection between Fed and States through effective STEAB liaison
- Renewables moving out; efficiency needs STEAB help
- Get more lab information deployed
- Address Lab duplication and overlap
- Focus on Economic Development
- Examine new situation prior to setting new direction
- Continue to understand and support EERE goals
- Lack of response to STEAB resolutions
- Address multitude of new initiatives – NGA, NAPEE, etc.
 - Prevent inadvertent conflicts
 - Distillation
- Renew contacts with OMB, Congress
- STEAB POC in EERE is Brad Barton who is focused on Deployment
- Assume EERE is listening
- Don’t insist on formal feedback
- Find ways to build on prior conversations with EERE
- Look for the next big thing
- Maintain STEAB flexibility to provide quick response to urgent issues
- Coordinate outreach with resources

[§] Step 12 of the STEAB Strategic Direction document’s Strategic Planning Process: *The Board conducts a one-day group strategic planning session every other year or sooner if changes in the economic, technological, and/or political situation warrant.*

After narrowing down the list of suggestions, the Board developed four distinct areas of focus in which the STEAB will consult when developing future Board Resolutions and Recommendations. These areas of focus are: **Accelerate Energy Efficiency; Facilitate Technology Commercialization / Deployment; Facilitate Renewable Energy Advancement; and, Enhance Federal / State Synergies.**

Once the new Strategic Focus Areas were developed, the Board separated into four groups to discuss and identify a few of the respective “EERE Strategic Goals,” “Expected Outcomes,” “Performance Indicators” and “Benchmarks” that will be used to measure the effectiveness of each of the fore mentioned focus areas.

Strategic Focus Area #1: Accelerate Energy Efficiency

(Alexander Mack, Elliott Jacobson, Bob Hoppie, Duane Hauck)

EERE Strategic Goals:

- Affordability
- Energy Efficiency as a Supply Resource
- Energy Efficiency Credits (EECs)
- Economic Development
- Consumer Education

Expected Outcomes:

- Improved communications and awareness of working with the EERE
- Improved deployment strategies and tactics implemented by EERE through follow-up reports to the STEAB
- Increased priority for energy efficiency programs among stakeholders

Performance Indicators:

- Number of recommended communications strategies implemented (i.e., webinars, e-Xtension, etc.)
- Number of recommended strategies and tactics implemented by EERE through follow-up reports to the STEAB

Benchmarks:

- Increased number of working relationships between stakeholders and National Laboratories
- Increased working relationships between the States and EERE’s PMC sites
- Documented use of technology transfer among and between partners
- Documented success in strengthening visibility of energy efficiency
- Number of stakeholders to join the Energy Secretary’s Energy Efficiency Campaign

Strategic Focus Area #2: Facilitate Technology Commercialization / Deployment

(Steve Vincent, Sue Brown, Dub Taylor)

EERE Strategic Goals:

- **Affordability**
- **Early Stage & Seed Capital for Emerging Technologies**
- **Economic Development**

Expected Outcomes:

- Transfer of knowledge
- Application of the technologies

Performance Indicators:

- Number of operational changes recommended that enhance the implementation of programming
- Number of program changes recommended that enhance deployment effectiveness with States and partners
- Number of recommended changes implemented by EERE through follow-up reports to the STEAB

Benchmarks:

- Stakeholder participation in beta testing
- Increased participants in webinars
- Proof of deployment

Strategic Focus Area #3: Facilitate Renewable Energy Advancement

(Peter Johnston, Jim Ploger, Paul Gutierrez)

EERE Strategic Goals:

- **Renewable Energy Credits (RECs)**
- **Economic Development**
- **Transmission Infrastructure**
- **Consumer education**

Expected Outcomes:

- Improve the information deployment of renewable energy information from National Labs and other sources

Performance Indicators:

- Number of deployment strategies and tactics that facilitate and enhance communication between Federal and State Government and other stakeholders

Benchmarks:

- Three nationally deployed distributed energy communication events from National Laboratories

Strategic Focus Area #4: Enhance Federal / State Synergies

(Janet Streff, Pat Sobrero, Jim Nolan)

EERE Strategic Goals:

- **Include Stakeholder Groups**

Expected Outcomes:

- Improved collaboration with all levels of government concerned with energy efficiency and renewable energy
- The assistance in the application of the National Action Plan for Energy Efficiency (NAPEE)
- Increased involvement with higher education research and outreach initiatives in energy efficiency and renewable energy

Performance Indicators:

- Number of issues studied and analyzed
- Number of recommendations resulting from study

Benchmarks:

- Increased engagement of involved governmental agencies and higher education representatives related to EERE issues
- Documented attendance of interested stakeholders in webinar broadcasts
- Active STEAB representation in NAPEE activities

It was determined that in the weeks following the meeting, each group will continue to work independently to finalize and/or refine the content of their respective focus area. Follow-up discussions will be held during the September 19, 2007 conference call to discuss any potential next steps, and to also discuss the timelines for amending the Strategic Direction Document to reflect these new areas of focus.

OPEN FORUM:

Jim Ploger announced that he recently developed a DRAFT Board Resolution for the STEAB to consider. He explained that North American Solar Challenge is an annual event that provides university students with the ability to design, build, and race electric cars powered by photovoltaics (PV) in a competitive atmosphere. He stated that such an event is an important cog in terms of promoting technology transfer and educational activities that result in the increased awareness and use of renewable energy technologies. The proposed Board Resolution recommends that the DOE continue its support for the North American Solar Challenge and provide financial support for the upcoming 2008 event that is scheduled for next summer (2008).

Gary Burch concluded that the Board appears to agree with the proposed Resolution in “concept,” and recommended that the Board consider it for adoption. He concluded, however, that in the days following the Board meeting that Jim Ploger attempt to slightly re-structure the Resolution to better reflect and justify how the DOE’s support for a 2008 North American Solar Challenge is consistent with the agency’s “mission” and “goals.” The Board agreed. Jim Ploger agreed to submit a second version of the Resolution for the Board to consider during the week of August 20th so that the Board could consider these changes and provide their own feedback as well.

Adoption of the “North American Solar Challenge” Resolution

Paul Gutierrez moved to adopt the Resolution and Dub Taylor seconded the motion.

Resolution 07 - 01 is adopted with no objections or abstentions.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 12:11p.m.on Thursday, August 16, 2007.

Actions (cont'd)	Responsible Party	Due Date	Status
<p>Next Meeting(s)</p> <p><i>Washington, D.C. (October 2007)</i></p> <p><i>Ad-hoc group and Executive Committee meetings on the day prior to the October Board meeting:</i></p>	TMS, Inc.	ASAP	Forward travel and hotel logistics to the Board.
	Steve Vincent / Elliott Jacobson	ASAP	In Progress: Contact representatives for Congressmen Ed Markey (D-MA) and Greg Walden (R-OR) to determine the feasibility of setting up a small meeting in advance of the October Board meeting (10/15).
	Gary Burch	ASAP	In Progress: Contact Brad Barton to see if his schedule will be able to accommodate a small, ad-hoc STEAB Executive Committee meeting (10/15) in addition to him speaking during the October Board meeting (8/16).
	Pat Sobrero	ASAP	Complete: Contact James Wade (NASULGC) to determine if he will be able to speak during the October STEAB meeting. Mr. Wade will attend the October Board meeting via conference call – October 17, 2007 at 8:30 a.m. EST.
	Chris Benson	ASAP	In Progress: Contact Robert Sandoli (OMB) to determine the feasibility of setting up a small, ad-hoc meeting in advance of the October Board meeting (10/15).
	Gary Burch	ASAP	In Progress: Gary Burch to contact various members of EERE management (Barton, Rodgers, Chalk, etc.) to determine the possibility of scheduling a post-October meeting (week of Nov. 5) with the STEAB Executive Committee to discuss action items identified during the October 2007 D.C. meeting.
<i>Albuquerque, NM (Sandia National Laboratory, March/April, 2008 - tentative)</i>	Gary Burch	ASAP	In Progress: Gary Burch to contact the Sandia National Laboratory to determine the feasibility of the Lab hosting a March/April 2008 meeting.

Actions (cont'd)	Responsible Party	Due Date	Status
<p>Determine the method/process in which the DOE submits the STEAB Annual Report to the Congress.</p>	<p>Gary Burch</p>	<p>ASAP</p>	<p>Update the Board with this information during the September 19, 2007 conference call.</p>
<p>EERE / Stakeholder Collaboration Roadmap</p>	<p>TMS, Inc. / Jim Ploger / Chris Benson</p>	<p>ASAP</p>	<p>Complete: Jim Ploger to develop a preliminary introduction sheet that will accompany the Roadmap and explain the tool's overall purpose and functionality. Dave Rathbun to submit the Roadmap in its "work-in-progress" form to Deputy Assistant Secretary Rodgers; Board to follow up with him to gauge his thoughts on the current progress/look of this task/product. Document will be submitted during the week of September 3.</p>
<p>Proposed Resolution (Resolution 07-01): STEAB North America Solar Challenge Action.</p>	<p>TMS, Inc. / Jim Ploger / Board</p>	<p>ASAP</p>	<p>Complete: The Board agreed to this proposed resolution in concept during the August meeting (8/16). It was determined that Jim Ploger rewrite the proposed resolution to better reflect the North America Solar Challenge's benefits and how it relates to the EERE mission. David Rathbun will then forward the document to the Board for final approval and will submit it to EERE HQ with a formal letter from the STEAB Chair. Document will be submitted during the week of September 3.</p>

Actions (cont'd)	Responsible Party	Due Date	Status
STEAB Strategic Direction Follow-Up	TMS, Inc./ Board	ASAP / In advance of the September 19, 2007 conference call	In Progress: David Rathbun forwarded the four separate Strategic Focus Areas and their respective benchmarks and performance indicators to the Board to review and comment on during the week of 8/27; each break-out group to provide additional comments on their respective focus area(s) for distribution to the rest of the Board in advance of the September 19, 2007 conference call.
STEAB to open dialogue with the PMC States Coordinators to discuss the possibility of working with the STEAB to assist the National Labs with transferring selected information to specific target audiences and other interested stakeholder groups.	<p>Gary Burch (Julie Riel – Golden Office)</p> <p>Janet Streff (Julie Riel – Golden Office)</p> <p>Alexander Mack (James Ferguson – NETL)</p>	ASAP / In advance of the September 19, 2007 conference call	<p>In Progress: Gary Burch will approach Julie Riel (PMC/GFO) to see how the GFO can facilitate the logistics for webinars. Gary and Julie will then open a dialogue with James Ferguson (PMC/NETL) to enlist his support / participation in the process. Once the preliminary background issues are researched and identified, the Board (via Janet and Alexander) will then begin to initiate discussions on "next steps"</p> <p>Once the above item has been addressed, the parties will attempt to open preliminary dialogue with the PMC.</p>

Motions Adopted During the Meeting:

- *Motion adopted to request that the PMC States Coordinators provide a link to transfer selected information from the National Laboratories to target audiences and other interested membership groups, and to nominate Janet Streff and Alexander Mack as the Board’s points of contact for the PMC.*
- *Motion adopted to present the DRAFT Roadmap to Mr. Rodgers with an accompanying introductory page that summarizes the purpose and the intent of the Roadmap, and that the legend at the bottom be removed and an entry for “Regional Governors’ Organizations” be added in addition to the entry for the “State Weatherization Directors.”*
- *Motion to Adopt Resolution 07-01: “North American Solar Challenge” Resolution*