

**State Energy Advisory Board
Teleconference Minutes
February 21, 2008 2 p.m. – 3 p.m. EST**

Attendees:

- Dr, Patricia Sobrero, Associate Vice Chancellor for Extension, Engagement, and Economic Development, North Carolina State University (Vice Chair)
 - Elliott Jacobson, Director, Action Energy, Inc., MA (Secretary)
 - 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
 - Peter Johnston, Manager, Technology Development, Arizona Public Service, AZ
 - Duane Hauck, Director, Extension Service, North Dakota State University
 - Jim Ploger, Energy Manager, Kansas Energy Office
 - Steve Vincent, Avista Utilities, OR
 - Janet Streff, Manager, Minnesota State Energy Office
 - Robert Hoppie, Administrator, Energy Division, Department of Water Resources, ID
 - David Terry, Executive Director, Association of State Energy Research & Technology Transfer Institutions (ASERTTI), VA

 - Gary Burch, STEAB Designated Federal Officer, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE)
 - Michelle New, Acting Executive Director and Director of Grants and Research, National Association of State Energy Officials (NASEO)
 - Julie Riel, EERE Project Management Center States Coordinator (DOE Golden, CO Office)
 - James Ferguson, EERE Project Management Center States Coordinator (DOE Pittsburgh/NETL Office)
 - Scott Miles, TMS, Inc.
-

Agenda Items:

- **LBNL Webinar Update / Details**
- **Follow-up discussion on the progress of the proposed Resolution, “States as Agents in the Dissemination of Energy-Education Materials”**
- **Follow-up discussion / adoption of the proposed Resolution, “DOE/Cooperative Extension Service/SEO Collaboration -- Rebuild America Program”**
- **Follow-up discussion / identification of an EPA-equivalent FACA Board (ENERGY STAR)**
- **Albuquerque Meeting (April 2008)**
- **Open Forum**
- **Next Conference Call**

Welcome and Introductions

Gary Burch began the meeting by informing the Board that Chris Benson (STEAB Chair) will not be able to attend today’s call. He then summarized the topical agenda for the Board – no comments were made.

LBNL Webinar Update / Details

Gary Burch explained that the March 11 pilot webinar will be approximately 90 minutes in length and will include a Q+A session for the attendees. He further added that the webinar will have separate a.m. and p.m. sessions to accommodate the participants – the a.m. session will include attendees from the Pacific and Mountain time zones; the p.m. session will include participants from the Central and Eastern time zones. The call-in/log-in lines will accommodate approximately 100 participants for each session.

Gary Burch then discussed how the webinar invitations will be sent out, and stated that one advantage of having so many STEAB members on the NASEO Board is that the STEAB can help to “get the word out.” In addition, it was suggested that STEAB State Energy Office (SEO) representatives would be responsible for contacting local industry partners to see if they would like to attend as well – the Board agreed that it would be best if SEO representatives were tasked with targeting interested parties within their respective state/region. Julie Riel, James Ferguson, Michelle New also agreed and explained that they too will assist in spreading the word.

Gary Burch then inquired as to whom else should be invited to attend the webinar(s) and polled the Board for suggestions. Pat Sobrero suggested that the Board extend invitations to the “Extension Service Community,” adding that SEOs representatives could contact and forward invitations to local “extension service directors” to solicit their support. Gary Burch agreed and suggested that there be 3 lines allocated per state, with SEOs regulating “who gets access to the lines.” He then added that Julie Riel and James Ferguson will take the lead in putting the webinar information packet together and will aim to get them out to the STEAB and the NASEO within the next few days.

Steve Vincent suggested that if there is a 100 line limit for the broadcast then it would make better sense to advertise this as a webcast. He further added that if the DOE conducts this as a webcast, then people can view the presentations even if they can’t contribute. That way, greater attendance and interest may be generated. Gary Burch agreed that this was a good point, and Julie Riel and James Ferguson stated that they would look into it.

James Ferguson stated that there will be instructions within the initial notification e-mail that will inform participants of their responsibility for registering for the broadcast. Pat Sobrero stated that since the webinar is scheduled to take place within the next three weeks, then it would be beneficial if the registration process was relatively easy. Julie Riel agreed and suggested that one approach could be to provide RSVP contact information so that participants wishing to contribute will have a point of contact to respond to. That way, the number of replies would allow them to develop a realistic number of how many participants to expect – the recipients will be required to take action. The Board agreed that this would be the best approach.

John Davies inquired if the “3 lines per state figure” was a “hard number,” and suggested that perhaps James Ferguson or someone else at NETL could serve as a “traffic cop” to distribute the lines. Gary Burch explained that the number of lines per state (3) is a “rough guess,” and stated that one of the biggest problems may be that there are more participants than actual call-in lines. John Davies agreed and inquired what would happen if there were more than 3 participants wishing to attend from one particular state when there are zero respondents from another. Julie Riel and agreed stated that they really do not want to limit lines and “cut anyone out.” However, she added, the responses generated from the invitations would provide them with the time and information necessary to devote additional lines (if necessary) and also provide the team with a good estimate of exactly how many people will participate.

John Davies inquired if there was a way to post the Weimar on the STEAB Web site, perhaps under the “activities section,” and added that the STEAB Web site may be able to generate “more hits” after the webinar. Gary Burch stated that he liked the idea and will look into what exactly can be stored on the Web site. In closing, the Board agreed that the invitation/registration approach previously mentioned by Julie Riel was a good one. Gary Burch stated that if there were any additional comments in regards to how the webinar invitations process and call-in line format should be handled, that they forward them no later than the following week.

Follow-up discussion on the progress of the proposed Resolution, “States as Agents in the Dissemination of Energy-Education Materials”

Peter Johnston explained that based on previous Board discussions, there seems to be a “misunderstanding” as to what the Board views as “education” in regards to this proposed Resolution. He then referenced page three of the January 23rd (2008) STEAB conference call minutes and added that from what he can recall, the Board was

identifying “education” with “workforce training” as opposed to “school education.” He further added that he has not heard anything further since the last call (1/23) and that nothing additional has been formally documented to date.

Gary Burch inquired if this is something that the Board would like to continue working toward and suggested that a white paper on “workforce development” may need to be developed to clarify some of the confusion surrounding the scope/purpose of the proposed Resolution – “education” or “workforce development” to be the focus. Pat Sobrero stated that the Board’s definition of “education” was never “narrowed down,” and that the Resolution’s scope provided an “umbrella of education.” Peter Johnston agreed and suggested that the document contained a lot of information and that it was not necessarily structured like a traditional Board Resolution. Pat Sobrero stated that it would be timely to take another look at this issue, citing that her university, NC State, recently held a statewide Issues Forum on Energy where the need for better education about renewable energy, energy efficiency, and audits were addressed. In addition, Gary Burch suggested that he will contact Alexander Mack and Chris Benson to confirm the direction that this Resolution will take.

Follow-up discussion / adoption of the proposed Resolution, “DOE/Cooperative Extension Service/SEO Collaboration -- Rebuild America Program”

Duane Hauck stated that the Board should have received the most recent version of the proposed Resolution (February 20) and explained that John Davies took the lead in re-writing the DRAFT. He added that the “changed focus” of the Resolution was to recommend that a “collaboration effort” be developed among the Cooperative Extension Services (CES), EERE, and the State Energy Offices to “reinvent the Rebuild America Program.

David Terry stated that he reviewed the recent document and thought it was quite good. He further added that the EERE Buildings Office has established 3 building applications centers to work within specific regions that are aimed at providing a connection with land-grant institutions. John Davies stated that he is unsure how the “Buildings Centers” would come into play. David Terry suggested that in addition to providing a connection to land-grant institutions, the DOE, should they choose to do so, may use these centers to implement this – and similar initiatives – and that he only wanted to make the group aware of them. Duane Hauck stated that the focus of the Resolution is to encourage EERE to work with State Energy Offices and the Extension Services to reinvent the program; however, the language is such that it doesn’t dictate how the DOE should “conduct its business” with the program – all agreed.

Motion to adopt the U.S. Department of Energy, Cooperative Extension System and State Energy Offices Collaboration on reinventing the “Rebuild America Program” Resolution:

Peter Johnston moved to adopt the fore mentioned Resolution and John Davies seconded the motion.

The Motion passed unanimously with no oppositions or abstentions.

Follow-up discussion / identification of an EPA-equivalent FACA Board (ENERGY STAR)

Elliott Jacobson explained that he spoke with a gentleman who is a member of an EPA Board; however, he is in the process of moving off the Board but agreed to facilitate a possible connection between the STEAB and the appropriate EPA FACA Board that would oversee/address issues related to the ENERGY STAR program. He further added that it may be opportune for the STEAB to engage him during our next D.C. meeting (late-summer or early fall), commenting that it would be best if the STEAB work with him while he is still on the Board.

Albuquerque Meeting (April 2008)

Gary Burch explained that the Albuquerque meeting will take place from April 8-10 and will include a Laboratory tour (Sandia) on the afternoon of the 8th. He then added that the Board meeting will adjourn at 12:00 p.m. on Thursday, April 10 and requested that any Board member wishing to depart the Albuquerque on that date attempt to seek travel accommodations after 2:00 p.m. so that a quorum can be established up until the meeting’s conclusion.

Steve Vincent offered a suggestion for the agenda. He explained that he is a member of Board for a venture capital (VC) fund that has operations in NM, and that this particular fund invests in technologies coming out of the Sandia National Laboratory. He further noted that someone from the fund may be able to meet with the STEAB, and added that it may be beneficial for the Board to engage with someone from the “VC community” in order to “see how they look at things.” Gary Burch agreed that this would be “very timely” and suggested that Steve Vincent arrange for a representative to speak at the Albuquerque meeting.

Steve Vincent also suggested that the Intel Corporation has a large presence in NM and that it may be interesting to hear about what “industry” is doing in regards to energy conservation (e.g., computer hardware energy conservation, etc.). Peter Johnston stated that the VC discussion seems exciting but he is unclear about the suggestion to invite Intel. He further added that he is unaware as to what the agenda may look like and whether or not the meeting has room to accommodate additional speakers. Gary Burch stated that the agenda will need to be developed, and recommended that the Board forward any suggestions to David Rathbun, Chris Benson, and Gary Burch so that the agenda may be finalized soon.

Meeting Format:

Tuesday, April 8	Wednesday, April 9	Thursday, April 10
Morning Session at the Hotel with laboratory presentations; Afternoon tour of the Sandia National Laboratory	8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. Board Meeting, Hotel Albuquerque	8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Board Meeting, Hotel Albuquerque

Hotel Albuquerque at Old Town
http://www.hhandr.com/alb_main.php
800 Rio Grande Boulevard NW
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87104
telephone 505-843-6300
toll-free 800-237-2133

Flights:

Please contact Natalie Alexander to book your flight to and from the Albuquerque area. Time is of the essence. Natalie can be reached at 202-554-4623, or at nalexander@tms-hq.com or Natalie.Alexander@ee.doe.gov

You may book your flight on your own and submit the expense with your reimbursement package; however, please be advised that the DOE will **ONLY** reimburse you up to their contract carrier rate(s) – check with Natalie for contract carrier rates.

Open Forum

Elliot Jacobson explained that he was not shocked by the President's budget in regards to the Weatherization Program being zeroed out. He further added that whenever a program is killed, it would be "irresponsible for STEAB not to comment on it," and suggested that the Board attempt to develop a strategy for sending the DOE formal letters whenever a program is killed. Janet Streff agreed.

Bob Hoppie inquired if the STEAB has any ability to lobby; moreover, what is the STEAB's role in regards to "lobbying?" Gary Burch explained that the STEAB Charter doesn't necessarily say "yes or no" to this. He stated, however, that he is not trying to influence the Board's direction in this regard, but added that given the recent history of the Board, the STEAB has moved away from discussing "specific budgetary aspects." Peter Johnston stated that in past communiqués the Board made a note not to comment on "specific dollars," and added that it should be "OK to comment in a general way" since advising the DOE on energy issues is part of the STEAB's Charter. Elliott Jacobson agreed and commented that any correspondence be as "simple as possible."

Gary Burch inquired if Elliott Jacobson and Janet Streff would circulate ideas on the topic – they both agreed and recommended that this topic be revisited during the next conference call (3/20).

Next Conference Call

The next STEAB conference call will take place on Thursday, March 20 from 2:00 – 3:00 p.m. EDT.