

**State Energy Advisory Board
Teleconference Minutes
November 28, 2007 2 p.m. – 3 p.m. EST**

Attendees:

- Chris Benson, Director, Arkansas Energy Office (Chair)
 - JamesEtta Reed, Director, Center for Community Empowerment, Dept. of Community and Economic Development, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
 - John Davies, Director, Division of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency, Kentucky Office of Energy Policy,
 - Duane Hauck, Director, Extension Service, North Dakota State University,
 - Jim Ploger, Energy Manager, Kansas Energy Office
 - Jim Nolan, Weatherization Director, Department of Public Health & Human Services, Montana
 - David Terry, Executive Director, Association of State Energy Research and Technology Transfer Institutions (ASERTTI), Virginia
 - Steve Vincent, Avista Utilities, Oregon
 - Alexander Mack, Manager, State Energy Program, Florida Energy Office
 - Janet Streff, Manager, Minnesota State Energy Office
 - Robert Hoppie, Administrator, Energy Division, Department of Water Resources, Idaho
 - Paul Gutierrez, Vice Provost for Outreach Services, Associate Dean and Director, Cooperative Extension Service, College of Agriculture and Home Economics, New Mexico State University

 - Gary Burch, STEAB Designated Federal Officer
 - Pat Malone, TMS, Inc.
 - David Rathbun, TMS, Inc.
 - Matt Stamatoff, Contractual Services Specialist, Florida Energy Office
-

Agenda Items:

- **October Meeting Re-Cap.**
- **Discussion of the Revised LBNL Subject Matter for Webinars.**
- **Discussion/Adoption of the DRAFT Commercialization and Deployment Resolution.**
- **Discussion of the Proposed Resolution, “States as Agents in the Dissemination of Energy-Education Materials.”**
- **Discussion of the Proposed Resolution, “EERE/Cooperative Extension Collaboration.”**
- **Follow-up Discussion/Adoption of the STEAB FY 2007 Annual Report Executive Summary.**
- **October Meeting Action Item: Identification of an EPA-equivalent FACA Board (ENERGY STAR).**
- **Discussion of April Meeting (N.M., 2008).**
- **Open Forum/Next Conference Call.**

October Meeting Re-Cap

Chris Benson began the conference call by summarizing the discussions that took place during the October STEAB meeting. He explained that he was able to read the first draft of the October meeting minutes, and found them to be very well written and that they adequately captured the discussion and dialogue exchanged. He further explained that he felt the October meeting produced a lot of good discussions and that several potential Board Resolutions and Recommendations are in the process of being developed as a result. In conclusion, he recommended that everyone take a moment to read over the minutes to refresh themselves with the discussion content.

Discussion of the Revised LBNL Subject Matter for Webinars

Gary Burch began this discussion by providing some background on the Board's recent activity in facilitating future webinar presentations for the National Laboratories. He explained that after the August meeting in Berkeley, CA, the LBNL provided the Board with a few proposed topics for review and consideration. After reviewing the information provided by LBNL, the Board initially thought that the topics were too broad-based. During the October meeting, the Board determined that Gary Burch and Julie Riel (EERE Project Management Center – Golden Field Office) should contact LBNL and recommended that they revise their proposed topics in order to focus on more specific areas of research – technologies that are near market readiness, etc. The Lab responded and provided the Board with four topical areas for discussion: 1) Aerosol Duct Sealing – for residential and Commercial Buildings; 2) Cool Roofing Materials, Cool Communities; 3) Dimmable Ballasts for Daylighting Control and Demand Response and/or Smart Shading Systems; and 4) High Performance Relocatable Classrooms – Improving Air Quality and Saving Energy.

Gary Burch explained that the Board should have received the most recent update from the Lab, and then polled the Board for suggestions to determine which of the fore mentioned topic areas would be the most logical to present during the pilot webinar. He further stated that since the Board – and the PMC – has yet to conduct a previous webinar, then perhaps it may be prudent to select only 1 or 2 topics to present.

Gary Burch explained that during the August meeting he was intrigued by Lab's presentation on their aerosol duct sealing research. He further stated that he recently learned that there is a firm in Denver, CO, that provides this service, and according to their statistics the national average of energy loss from traditional duct sealing is projected at 30 percent annually. He added that based on this firm's projections, the installation of the first unit would normally cost about \$1000, with a second unit being in the neighborhood of \$600 – the break even for a return on investment is about 5 or 6 years. He explained that most consumers may not see the immediate future benefits of this, but the technology is available for use in the commercial sector and promoting this to similar audiences may be something of interest to the Board. Chris Benson explained that he too found the aerosol duct sealing research to be interesting, and commented that the 30 percent "efficiency loss" is consistent with a similar study that was conducted in Arkansas. He explained that the "30 percent figure" generally represented a "worst case scenario," and that significantly newer homes may have a smaller "efficiency loss figure" – something in the neighborhood of 5-to-6 percent annually.

Gary Burch also commented on the Lab's focus in the area of improving energy efficiency in relocatable (portable) classrooms. He explained that one of the biggest problems with current models is that the HVAC system will often be cut off because it is too noisy. However, the lab has developed a retro fit that is environmentally conscious and reduces noise that would normally conflict with teaching. He explained that such a technology would likely be point of interest in most states.

Chris Benson stated that energy loss from conventional duct sealings is an ubiquitous issue for many states, and commented that Arkansas is currently working with utilities to do duct sealing training. He added that since utilities seem to support this technology/process, then perhaps the aerosol duct sealing option may be very appealing to states and stakeholders as it is a topic area with an already established degree of interest.

John Davies inquired if the webinar format would take the form of "discussions," or would they simply point out potential "solutions." Gary Burch stated that the purpose of the STEAB's involvement in the webinar process would be to assist the Labs with identifying products or technologies that can be relayed to the most appropriate audiences in respective states and regions with an established "commercial interest" with specific technologies – identify a process at or near

commercial readiness, show what it can do, and help facilitate market enhancement within a state or region. John Davies inquired if there were any potential licensing issues with any of the proposed LBNL technologies and also whether or not they could be resolved and/or identified in advance of any future webinar broadcasts. Gary Burch explained that the Labs have a function for when they develop a new technology in that they typically hand it off to two or three entities that can license the technology. Dub Taylor stated that after looking into the background of aerosol duct sealing, he noticed that in 2005 the Carrier Corporation basically secured a license from the LBNL for an “aero seal machine.” He explained that he is not certain if this is an exclusive license or if one needs to be a Carrier affiliate to offer this technology. He added that information about licensing should be identified in advance of promoting technologies to different entities, commenting that “it is one thing to want to disseminate a new technology, but if it is steered to any one company, that is “a slippery slope.”

Gary Burch explained that he is not aware of what licensing or franchising structures may already be in place. Duane Hauck stated that if the major focus of the webinars is to help encourage the deployment of new technologies, then perhaps those technologies that may already have some type of commercialization process that is well underway should probably fall “further down on the list as opposed to technologies that need a home.” Steve Vincent agreed with Duane’s comments, suggesting that the Board attempt to promote technologies that do not have exclusive licensing agreements. Gary Burch suggested that perhaps he and Chris Benson could contact the LBNL to gain more information about the licensing restrictions (if any) for any of these proposed technologies, and with that new information he may be able to provide an explanation to the Board via e-mail so that the group may take a vote. Sue Brown explained that this may be helpful as it will assist the Board with being able to recognize what participants may be the most receptive for a respective state/region, etc.

Discussion/Adoption of the DRAFT Commercialization and Deployment Resolution

Jim Nolan explained that during the October meeting, Michael Bruce, a Senior Advisor to the Assistant Secretary for EERE, provided a discussion to the Board that highlighted EERE’s Commercialization and Deployment initiative. He explained that Board applauded the effort and that it was suggested that a Resolution be developed that supports the initiative.

Gary Burch said that he looked at the DRAFT Resolution again and made a few minor changes that he summarized for the Board.

Adoption of the “Commercialization and Deployment” Resolution

Jim Nolan moved to adopt the Resolution with Gary Burch’s recommended changes and JamesEtta Reed seconded the motion.

Resolution 08-01 is adopted with no objections or abstentions.

Discussion of the Proposed Resolution, “States as Agents in the Dissemination of Energy-Education Materials”

Alexander Mack introduced Mr. Matt Stamatoff, a Contractual Services Specialist within the Florida Energy Office, who explained that he has been examining some preliminary data on employment trends in the electricity industry, specifically on-line training for engineers that focuses on preparing them for future electrical demand. Mr. Mack said that could send out a preliminary straw man to see

if the current direction of the proposed Resolution meets with Board expectations. Gary Burch explained that the Board could look at the straw man to see if it captures a “common interest,” but noted that the ad-hoc team working on this potential Resolution should be allowed to view it first. John Davies inquired if the dissemination of proposed “energy-educational materials” would target utility employees. Alexander Mack explained that they are looking “across the board” at the labor pool of the entire energy industry. Duane Hauck stated that during the October meeting, a discussion was raised as to how boxes of materials would show up at state energy offices with no information as to how or where to disseminate them. He suggested that collaboration with educational institutions may help to address similar problems in the future.

The development of the Resolution is still in its beginning stages, and it was decided that the group would continue to develop data for the document’s background and also provide an update on their progress during the next monthly conference call (1/16/2008).

Discussion of the Proposed Resolution, “EERE/Cooperative Extension Collaboration”

John Davies and Duane Hauck explained that they are preparing to hold a small, ad-hoc conference call next month to discuss their progress to date. They explained that there is still some discussion as to how the document should be structured – whether the document should be more general in terms of recommending that the DOE engage in more collaborative efforts, or whether it should be more specific in regards to the Rebuild America Program in that the DOE look to the Cooperative Extension to disseminate information regarding that program. They stated that it may be prudent to approach someone at DOE/EERE HQ in order to learn more about the background of the “Rebuild Program” (i.e. “where it went; how and why it died out; and, how may it look if it were to be resurrected and what would be the role of the “extension collaborative” in terms of assistance, etc.”). John and Duane explained that they will brief the Board on the team’s progress during the next conference call (1/16/2008).

Follow-up Discussion/Adoption of the STEAB FY 2007 Annual Report Executive Summary

Gary Burch explained that the STEAB Annual Report Executive Summary serves as a good basis for how the remainder of the report will be structured/written, and polled the Board for suggestions. He explained that the approval of the Executive Summary is not a “vote-necessary item,” but a general consensus would allow Pat Malone and David Rathbun to begin putting the final DRAFT product together for consideration. He explained that if anyone has any input to add to the Executive Summary, that they send it to David Rathbun as soon as possible.

October Meeting Action Item: Identification of an EPA-equivalent FACA Board (ENERGY STAR)

Chris Benson explained that Elliott Jacobson was going to do some research on this matter but was unable to attend today’s call. It was decided that this agenda item will be moved to the next conference call (1/16/2008).

Discussion of April Meeting (N.M., 2008)

Gary Burch explained that he has been in touch with the Sandia National Laboratory and confirmed that they do have time to meet with the Board. The meeting will take place from Tuesday, April 8, 2008 through Thursday, April 10, 2008 with a laboratory tour scheduled for the afternoon of Tuesday the 8th.

David Rathbun explained that he is still working with a local hotel to secure meeting space and lodgings and that he expects this to be settled soon. Information and instructions for booking hotel accommodations and airfare will be made available as soon as possible.

Open Forum/Next Conference Call

Gary Burch explained that with the holidays approaching he would leave it up to the Board as to when they would like to schedule the next conference call. The Board decided to forego a December call – the next call is scheduled for Wednesday, January 16, 2007 from 2:00 – 3:00 p.m. EST.