

**State Energy Advisory Board
Teleconference Minutes
May 15, 2008 2 p.m. – 3 p.m. EST**

Attendees:

- Chris Benson, Director, Arkansas Energy Office (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
 - Jim Ploger, Energy Manager, Kansas Energy Office
 - Steve Vincent, Avista Utilities, OR
 - Janet Streff, Manager, Minnesota State Energy Office
 - Peter Johnston, Manager, Technology Development, Arizona Public Service, AZ
 - Daniel Zaweski, Director, Energy Efficiency & Distributed Generation, Long Island Power Authority
 - Sue Brown, Deputy Administrator, Wisconsin Division of Energy

 - Gary Burch, STEAB Designated Federal Officer.
 - David Rathbun, TMS, Inc.
 - Chuck Clinton, Sentech, Inc.
-

Agenda Items:

- **Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) Webinar recap – *lessons learned and possible next steps***
- **Discussion of the DRAFT Resolution: *STEAB support for the National Laboratory EIR Programs***
- **Follow-up discussion with James Wade (National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges)**
- **Follow-up discussion on the Executive Committee meeting in Washington, DC (June)**
- **New contractor Introduction**
- **Open Forum**

LBNL Webinar recap – *lessons learned and possible next steps*

Chris Benson said that he thought the webinar was successful, and added that the message he took away from it was that the STEAB should proceed with similar efforts. He further added that not everything was perfect and there is room for improvement; however, the webinar represented a “nice model to go by” and the follow-up surveys may be able to shed light on what could be improved upon in the future. He then opened the floor for comments.

Gary Burch agreed with Chris Benson’s comments and noted that the webinar did generate a lot of interest – there were 100 lines for both sessions; all of the lines were “sold” for the morning session and approximately 70 were occupied during the afternoon session. He then stated that as a “follow-on,” the duct-sealing presentation from the webinar is now available in PDF form on the STEAB Web site. In closing, he noted that a questionnaire was sent out to the webinar’s attendees, and that those responses are being processed and the results should be available in a few weeks’ time.

Chris Benson then inquired as to “what direction the STEAB should go from here,” and then polled the Board for input.

Gary Burch suggested that given the success of the webinar, the Board could contact the Sandia National Laboratory, the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), and the Oak Ridge National Laboratory to solicit ideas that would conform to the same concept used by LBNL in order to see “where their

responses would lead us.” Chris Benson agreed and inquired as to how many webinars the Board could feasibly sponsor per year. Gary Burch stated that now that the Board – and the EERE Project Management Center – “knows that the webinars can and do work,” the Board could look to schedule anywhere from two to three webinars per year. Chris Benson agreed, but commented that two webinars per year would be more manageable – the Board agreed.

Chris Benson commented that the Entrepreneur in Residence (EIR) Program would be a good compliment to the webinars in terms of bringing more outside focus and attention to the National Labs. Gary Burch agreed and explained that the three Labs previously mentioned all have the EIR Program in place. Janet Streff suggested that as the Board moves forward, it may be beneficial to keep track of who the webinar participants are so that there is less overlap – the Board should be cognizant to the fact that they continue to “reach the audiences that they are trying to reach.”

Discussion of the DRAFT Resolution: STEAB support for the National Laboratory EIR Programs

Chris Benson explained that this topic was born out of the discussions that took place during the STEAB meeting in New Mexico (April, 2008), and turned the floor over to Steve Vincent to provide some clarification on the DRAFT Resolution.

Steve Vincent stated that after last month’s EIR presentation, he spoke to Gary Burch over dinner and the idea came up to develop a Resolution that would show the Board’s support for the continuation of the EIR Program. He further added that he is still working to make the wording of the Resolution “just right,” and that he is not quite there yet. He then read the proposed Resolution aloud for the Board.

Gary Burch said that is appropriate for the STEAB to speak in support of the EIR effort. However, he urged that the Board exercise caution at this point and recommended that the closing statement be modified – the initial DRAFT requests that the DOE conduct an evaluation of the EIR Program and that they share their results with the Board.

Steve Vincent then suggested that he could modify the closing segment to suggest that the DOE “please provide the Board with a copy of any evaluation results should be they be conducted.” Gary Burch countered by stating that any evaluation that the DOE may or may not conduct would probably not be “officially disclosed” or made available outside the agency – he recommended that the request/suggestion be removed.

Janet Streff stated that she can understand not being able to get a copy of any future evaluation; however, she did not think that the notion should preclude the Board from requesting that they be informed of how the EIR is progressing since “bringing new technologies to the market is something that the Board is responsible for.” Chris Benson stated that if the Board is trying to make a “finer point” that emphasizes the Board’s interest in the EIR, then perhaps the message of the Resolution should be to show the “STEAB’s support for the program,” and also its “willingness and interest” to support the DOE in any way that it can. He further added that by virtue of the fact that the STEAB’s mission is to get technologies out of the Labs and into the market place, the Board has been actively taking steps to visit the labs in order to look for ways in which they can assist. In closing, he added that “this ought to be part of any statement of support.”

Chris Benson stated that since the STEAB has already listened to a presentation about Sandia’s EIR program (and will likely do the same when it visits NREL), it puts the Board in a better position to develop future Resolutions/Recommendations in support of the program. Steve Vincent agreed but stated that since the Board has to be “sensitive to the politics involved,” the Board may lose the ability to develop and deliver a timely and impactful statement of support. Gary Burch said that any show of

support for the EIR program would be consistent with “an objective of the Secretary of Energy,” and that it would be a “politically correct thing to do.”

Steve Vincent agreed to make some changes to the document, and explained that he will attempt to incorporate the feedback that was provided during the discussion and will forward a revised version to the Board in advance of the next conference call.

Follow-up discussion with James Wade (National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges)

Chris Benson referenced a discussion that took place during the April 2008 Meeting (NM) where Duane Hauck agreed to follow up with James Wade (NASULGC) in order to get more information as to the status of a proposal that they are putting together for the DOE to fund the eXtension program. He stated that Duane Hauck was not on the call, and recommended that this item be revisited unless anyone else had any additional information on the topic – no comments were made.

Follow-up discussion on the Executive Committee meeting in Washington, DC (June)

Chris Benson said that the STEAB Executive Committee is still planning to visit Washington, D.C. in early June to speak with representatives from EERE’s Commercialization and Deployment Office, as well as representatives of OMB and “the Hill.” Chris Benson stated that the initial discussions on the matter suggested that they would be targeting the 4th and 5th of June – Elliott Jacobson agreed.

Gary Burch explained that he was able to “open some dialogue” with Drew Bond and Michael Bruce (EERE Commercialization and Deployment Office) and that they have agreed to meet with the Board. He added, however, that he will need to be sure that the STEAB can “get on their calendars first,” and stated that now that he knows what dates the Executive Committee will be in Washington, he will contact them to make sure it’s possible. Chris Benson said that the morning of the 5th would be best time to meet with them – Gary Burch agreed to look into it. In closing, Chris Benson stated that they will have the whole afternoon of the 4th to meet with any other entities.

New contractor Introduction

Gary Burch explained that he has been working with David Rathbun (TMS, Inc.) and EERE headquarters to facilitate the Board’s transfer of administrative duties to the new support contractor, Sentech, Inc. He then stated that due to EERE policy, the new contractor cannot begin work supporting the Board until they can secure a task order, and that the STEAB’s source of funding is providing challenges that may affect the speed in which Sentech, Inc. can get online – he noted that a brief break in service may be imminent and he apologized for the inconvenience.

Gary Burch then introduced Chuck Clinton (Sentech, Inc.) as the new STEAB support point of contact, and stated that he has personally worked with him in the past and that he finds him to be competent and professional. Elliott Jacobson also acknowledged Mr. Clinton’s expertise, stating that the two of them served together on the original STEAB Board. Chuck Clinton stated that he has very much appreciated the help that he has received from David Rathbun and Gary Burch, and that he will work very hard to make certain that the Board’s support transition goes as smoothly as possible.

Open Forum:

Chris Benson opened the floor to Board for any additional comments or items of interest.

Gary Burch explained that the Board currently has two packages being circulated at headquarters: the STEAB Charter renewal package; and, a nomination package that would appoint two new members. He further added that due to Elizabeth Robertson's retirement, the Board is now one State Energy Office (SEO) Representative short of its statutory requirement – until a new SEO is brought on Board, the STEAB cannot pursue any “official actions.” He further added that there have been some difficulties “pushing the package through at the front office,” and that he will keep the Board abreast of any updates, etc.

Gary Burch then explained that he was able to contact NREL and they have agreed to host a STEAB visit during the second week of August. He further added that the Board would be well served to take advantage of their recent interface with representatives from Sandia's EIR Program, and suggested that the Board use this opportunity to dialogue with NREL's EIR contingent.

Elliott Jacobson said that while he was looking over the minutes from the April meeting, he noticed that the STEAB designated a small group to develop plans and processes for how the Board can better interact with “the Hill.” He then suggested that Board's Executive Committee attempt to open a dialogue with Rep. Ed Markey (D-MA), Chairman of the new House Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming, and volunteered to contact the Congressman's office to see if that would be a possibility. Chris Benson said that it would be advantageous for the Board to make some “Hill visits” when the Executive Committee convened in Washington (June), and recommended that Elliott Jacobson follow up with Rep. Markey's office to see if that would be a possibility.