

BUSINESS MEETING
BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

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

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

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2005

10:07 A.M.

Reported by:
Peter Petty
Contract No. 150-04-001

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Joseph Desmond, Chairperson

Arthur Rosenfeld

James D. Boyd

John L. Geesman

Jackalyne Pfannenstiel, Vice Chairperson

STAFF PRESENT

B.B. Blevins, Executive Director

Jonathan Bles, for Chief Counsel

Tony Goncalves

Gabriel Herrera

Jamie Patterson

David Chambers

Michael Lozano

Mark Hutchinson

Michael Seaman

PUBLIC ADVISER

Nick Bartsch for Margret Kim

I N D E X

	Page
Proceedings	1
Items	1
1 Consent Calendar	1
2 Existing Renewable Facilities Program Guidebook	5
3 TIAX, LLC (moved to next meeting)	1
4 Department of Energy, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory	9
5 University of Southern California	12
6 Gas Technology Institute	14
7 The Regents of the University of California, Merced	17
8 The Regents of the University of California, Davis (moved to next meeting)	1
9 Amerit Consulting, Inc.	18
10 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	22
11 Minutes	22
12 Commission Committee and Oversight	22
13 Chief Counsel's Report	25
14 Executive Director's Report	25
15 Legislative Director's Report	27
16 Public Adviser's Report	27
17 Public Comment	27
Adjournment	27
Certificate of Reporter	28

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 10:07 a.m.

3 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: I'd like to
4 welcome everyone here today. Please rise and join
5 me in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

8 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: I'd like to
9 welcome everyone here today and if we have anyone
10 on the phone.

11 A number of agenda changes. Agenda
12 items number 3, which is the TIAX work
13 authorization for UC and agenda item number 8,
14 which is the Regents of the University of
15 California, Davis, will be held to the next
16 business meeting.

17 So, with that we'll begin by taking up
18 the consent calendar, item number 1.

19 VICE CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Mr.
20 Chairman, I move the consent calendar.

21 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: Second.

22 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: All those in
23 favor?

24 (Ayes.)

25 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Opposed? So

1 moved.

2 Next item, number 2, Existing Renewable
3 Facilities Program Guidebook. And possible
4 approval of recommended changes to the existing
5 program guidebook, Target Price and Cap for Tier 1
6 Biomass Facilities. Go ahead.

7 MR. GONCALVES: Thank you, Chairman,
8 Commissioners. The existing renewable facilities
9 program is designed to improve the competitiveness
10 of existing instate renewable generating
11 facilities, as well as secure for California the
12 environmental, economic and reliability benefits
13 these facilities provide by continuing to operate.

14 The program provides funding in the form
15 of a cent per kilowatt hour production incentive
16 to eligible renewable facilities. The incentive
17 is based on the difference between the target
18 price, which is established by the Energy
19 Commission in its guidebooks and the energy price
20 the facility receives for their generation,
21 subject to a cap, which is also set in the
22 guidelines.

23 We are recommending to increase the
24 target price and the cap for tier 1 biomass
25 facilities for November 2005 through June 2006

1 generation to help offset the increased cost of
2 processing and transporting biomass fuels due to
3 the recent increases in diesel fuel prices; and to
4 allow the facility to build up their stockpiles of
5 biomass fuel before next summer.

6 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Thank you.

7 Discussion?

8 VICE CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Mr.
9 Chairman, this item has been discussed by the
10 Renewables Committee. We have some extensive
11 analysis and discussion, and thereby move the
12 item.

13 COMMISSIONER BOYD: Second.

14 MR. HERRERA: Chairman, before you rule
15 on that I need to make a couple comments for the
16 record concerning CEQA and its application to the
17 Energy Commission's adoption of guidelines.

18 As you know, any time the Commission
19 takes an act to adopt the renewable energy program
20 guidelines, the legal office does a CEQA
21 assessment to determine whether the act of
22 adoption is a project under CEQA. And if so,
23 whether that act is exempt because it is not a
24 project under CEQA, or because there's no
25 possibility of any significant environmental

1 effects as a result of the action.

2 The Energy Commission's legal office did
3 do that. I did it personally. Drafted a memo.
4 And we concluded that this activity is not a
5 project under several categorical exemptions. And
6 so therefore, CEQA does not apply; it's exempt.

7 COMMISSIONER BOYD: We have your memo,
8 and I assume it becomes part of the record of this
9 item, therefore.

10 MR. HERRERA: That's correct.

11 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Okay, thank you.
12 Further comments?

13 I just have one quick question here
14 before calling for the vote, and that was on the
15 analysis regarding the increase in diesel fuel
16 costs recently. And had noted that some of the
17 facilities were curtailing their production at
18 certain times of the day in response to these high
19 costs.

20 And I was just trying to get a better
21 sense of how the price of diesel was impacting the
22 time variant production costs.

23 MR. GONCALVES: Well, my understanding
24 is that during the offpeak and super-offpeak
25 periods, that the cost of production is greater

1 than the cost of transporting the fuels.
2 Typically the facilities use their lowest cost
3 fuels during the onpeak, which is the time that
4 they get most money for the generation. And use
5 some of the highest cost fuels during the offpeak
6 and super-offpeak.

7 And as they have to go out further and
8 further to collect the fuels, the cost gets higher
9 due to the transportation costs. And so there's a
10 point at which the facilities just decide that it
11 is not economically feasible to generate.

12 They typically at least during the
13 summer will generate during the onpeak and partial
14 peak because they collect the majority of their
15 capacity payments during that time period.

16 COMMISSIONER BOYD: It's the cost of
17 diesel to the haulers and the use in the trucks of
18 the haulers --

19 MR. GONCALVES: Correct.

20 COMMISSIONER BOYD: -- is the issue.

21 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Right, okay.

22 That's -- appreciate that, thank you.

23 Now, with that, then, I'll call for the
24 vote.

25 All those in favor?

1 (Ayes.)

2 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Opposed? So
3 moved. Thank you.

4 As previously mentioned, agenda item
5 number 3 has been held.

6 Item number 4. Department of Energy,
7 Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, and
8 possible approval of a \$2.5 million work
9 authorization under the UC master research
10 agreement with Lawrence Berkeley National Lab, and
11 in coordination with the California Independent
12 System Operator to develop and demonstrate two
13 sets of analytical tools, a real-time application
14 of phasers for monitoring, alarming and control;
15 and real-time voltage security assessment tool.
16 Mr. Patterson.

17 MR. PATTERSON: Thank you,
18 Commissioners. We are asking permission to
19 continue our work in phaser measurement unit that
20 we have under the transmission research program of
21 the PIER program.

22 We have budgeted -- this represents
23 basically a middle phase of continuing work in
24 that area for which we have budgeted approximately
25 \$5,495,000.

1 In our previous work we have developed
2 basically, we have actually developed quite a
3 number of tools in this area. And we've gained a
4 lot of experience working with the phaser. The
5 ISO considers them to be a very important area of
6 research for them, in that it will help them do
7 some quick assessments of the state of the system
8 as we move from doing state estimation to actual
9 real-time state determination.

10 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Do we have anyone
11 here from the ISO today? No.

12 Discussion? Questions?

13 VICE CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: I just
14 will make a point, and it really is not on this
15 project, itself.

16 But I would like to reiterate a request
17 that I've made previously to the PIER Staff, in
18 that as these individual projects come through,
19 it's difficult for the Commission to assess the
20 projects in terms of the amount we're being asked
21 to approve in the context of how these fit
22 relative to other uses of the PIER money.

23 And so I actually turn to Mr. Blevins
24 and request that we produce -- that staff produce
25 for the benefit of the Commissioners, some form of

1 information such that each of these projects that
2 come through, and I note that the original agenda
3 before these modifications we made on it this
4 morning, seven of the ten items were PIER project
5 items.

6 I would like to see for each of these
7 projects where they fit in the greater scope of
8 what's available under PIER funding, both in terms
9 of the priorities of the areas and the specific
10 areas that they represent.

11 So, perhaps by the next time we have
12 PIER projects in front of us for approval we'll
13 have that information.

14 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Commissioner.

15 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: I want to move
16 the item. I also would remark that since the R&D
17 Committee is responsible for this huge number of
18 items on the agenda, I understand Commissioner
19 Pfannenstiel's desire.

20 On the other hand, this particular one,
21 just to show my enthusiasm, is an example of PIER
22 working with the ISO, which is one of our
23 important jobs. So, I have no problem with where
24 this one fits.

25 So, I move the item.

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: And I'll
2 second, then.

3 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Very good. Let me
4 just simply add then, as well, Mr. Blevins, that I
5 don't think what Commissioner Pfannenstiel is
6 asking should be difficult, given that I have
7 requested in the past and have received a very
8 detailed breakdown of the program.

9 So I think, in terms of developing a
10 standard format to put these in context, would be
11 very beneficial for all the Commissioners as we go
12 forward.

13 MR. BLEVINS: Right. And we've begun
14 discussions in terms of what that format will look
15 like, and we'll be involved in the Commissioners'
16 offices directly in that process.

17 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Great, thank you.
18 With that, all those in favor?

19 (Ayes.)

20 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Opposed? So
21 moved. Thank you.

22 MR. PATTERSON: Thank you.

23 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Next item on the
24 agenda is number 5. University of Southern
25 California and possible approval of contract 500-

1 05-020 for \$100,000 with USC to determine the most
2 vulnerable scenarios for an interconnected
3 electric power grid failure precipitated by a
4 terrorist attack. Mr. Chambers.

5 MR. CHAMBERS: Good morning, Chairman
6 and Commissioners. My name is David Chambers; I
7 am with the PIER program in the energy system
8 integration group.

9 And I'm here before you for possible
10 approval of this item on the agenda for the
11 University of Southern California, possible
12 approval of a contract 500-05-020, for \$100,000, with
13 the University of Southern California to determine
14 the most vulnerable scenarios for an
15 interconnected electric grid power failure
16 precipitated by a terrorist attack.

17 With that, do you have questions?

18 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Questions?

19 VICE CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: I just
20 have one question. In the writeup there was not
21 assurance that the information that would be
22 derived from these scenarios would, in fact, be
23 held confidential.

24 I would assume this is not information
25 that we would want to have public. But there

1 wasn't a reference to that in the writeup.

2 MR. CHAMBERS: That is correct, that is
3 information that we don't want to have available
4 in general in the writeup. I did talk with our
5 legal department and they did draft language that
6 will show that we will not receive any
7 confidential information at all.

8 But we will have the ability to see
9 information, but not retain any of it.

10 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: If I understand
11 correctly the details, though, that flow from the
12 actual work under this contract, will be made
13 available to those representatives of the
14 participating utilities?

15 MR. CHAMBERS: That is correct.

16 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: And the ISO?

17 MR. CHAMBERS: Yes, sir.

18 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Okay. And this is
19 also consistent with previous executive orders --

20 MR. CHAMBERS: It is.

21 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: -- that have been
22 signed by the Governor?

23 MR. CHAMBERS: That is true.

24 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Very good. Okay.

25 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: I move the

1 item.

2 COMMISSIONER BOYD: Second.

3 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: All those in
4 favor?

5 (Ayes.)

6 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Opposed? So
7 moved. Thank you.

8 MR. CHAMBERS: Thank you.

9 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Agenda item 6.
10 Gas Technology Institute and possible approval of
11 contract 500-05-019 for \$239,969 with GTI to
12 demonstrate a first-generation, very high
13 efficiency, low emissions, natural gas-fired super
14 boiler. Potential of 90 percent efficiency. Mr.
15 Lozano.

16 MR. LOZANO: Good morning; my name is
17 Michael Lozano. I'm with the PIER --

18 (Pause - technical adjustment.)

19 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Very good, go
20 ahead, Mr. Lozano.

21 MR. LOZANO: Once again, good morning;
22 my name is Mike Lozano. I'm with the PIER
23 industrial -- water program area.

24 This project will develop super boilers
25 with improved efficiency and reduced emissions

1 compared to currently available equipment. This
2 research is a high priority because the current
3 based boilers is rapidly aging, some of them are
4 30, 40 years old, and are quite inefficient.

5 Currently, boilers represent about 42
6 percent of the end use natural gas consumption per
7 PG&E's recent study of 2003.

8 This project is proposed to be funded at
9 \$239,969 of PIER money over a period of two years.
10 Matched funding in the amount of \$343,000 has been
11 pledged by the partner. The \$239,000 will be
12 funded out of the '05 natural gas research program
13 budget of 12 million; 5 million of which was
14 allocated to the building end use efficiency part
15 of that.

16 Upon the approval of this project, the
17 remaining funds, as of Monday, would be
18 \$1,027,000.

19 I am recommending that this project be
20 adopted and I'm happy to answer any questions on
21 this project.

22 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Questions?
23 Commissioner.

24 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: This seems
25 almost too good to be true. I wish I understood

1 how you could do so well for so little money. I
2 certainly move this item.

3 VICE CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Second.

4 COMMISSIONER BOYD: Second.

5 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: We have a second
6 simultaneously.

7 COMMISSIONER BOYD: I defer to the Vice
8 Chair.

9 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: All right, very
10 well, then.

11 All those in favor?

12 (Ayes.)

13 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Opposed? So
14 moved.

15 Mr. Lozano, continuing with agenda item
16 number 7, which is with the Regents of the
17 University of California, Merced. Possible
18 approval of contract 500-05-021 for \$577,563 with
19 the University from PIER to demonstrating
20 nonracking solar collector for the generation of
21 high temperature steam, as a way of validating the
22 effectiveness of new lower cost solar systems that
23 do not require mechanical tracking of the sun. Go
24 ahead.

25 MR. LOZANO: Once again, good morning;

1 my name is Mike Lozano with PIER industrial light
2 water program.

3 This project addresses the need for cost
4 effective solar systems for industrial
5 applications. The research will result in reduced
6 cost and complexity of solar heating systems.

7 The design is expected to meet the
8 criteria of having an installed cost of no more
9 than \$15 per square foot in 2005 dollars, which is
10 considered to be a price barrier for the adoption
11 of this technology.

12 Solar heating systems are high priority.
13 Currently due to the difficulty in obtaining
14 adequate natural gas supplies in the -- boiler,
15 food processing, specifically in the Central
16 Valley of California.

17 As I mentioned before, indirect boilers
18 represent 42 percent of the end use manufacturing,
19 and I would assume to be a similar large portion
20 of the agricultural manufacturing operations in
21 California.

22 This project is proposed to be funded at
23 \$577,563 over a period of two years, and that's
24 PIER money. Matched funding in the amount of
25 \$816,000 has been pledged by the partners. The

1 577,000 will be funded out of the '05 natural gas
2 research program budget of 12 million. Two
3 million is allocated to the renewables program.

4 After approval of this project there
5 will be, as of Monday, \$22,437 remaining of that
6 full money.

7 I am recommending this project be
8 adopted. I'm happy to answer any questions on the
9 proposed project.

10 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Are there any
11 questions?

12 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: The R&D
13 Committee was also very happy with this project.
14 I move it.

15 COMMISSIONER BOYD: Second.

16 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: I just had a quick
17 question. The target price of \$15 a square foot,
18 do you know what it currently is?

19 MR. LOZANO: \$30 currently.

20 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: So this is a 50
21 percent reduction?

22 MR. LOZANO: Yes.

23 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Okay. Having seen
24 some demonstrations of the work coming out of UC
25 Merced, I've been very impressed, in fact, with

1 the technologies. And those, more than I think
2 most solar, we always think of -- generation.
3 This is clearly more as a gas substitute. So, as
4 well, very exciting project.

5 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: I think while
6 we're praising Merced, I will just say that it's
7 interesting, this business of concentrating
8 collectors indicating the use of more in particle
9 physics, and is one place where particle physic
10 research has had rather amazing implications.

11 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Okay. All those
12 in favor?

13 (Ayes.)

14 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Opposed? So
15 moved.

16 Agenda item number 8 has been held.
17 Agenda item number 9, Amerit Consulting. Possible
18 approval of contract 400-05-010 for \$99,950 to
19 provide temporary support services for the Energy
20 Commission's emerging renewables program regarding
21 the peak workload related to rebate applications.

22 MR. HUTCHINSON: Good morning,
23 Commissioners. Mark Hutchison with the efficiency
24 renewables and demand analysis division.

25 The item before you is a temp help peak

1 workload contract that will assist staff in
2 meeting workload demands for the emerging
3 renewables program.

4 We anticipate another application spike
5 in December due to the planned reduction of rebate
6 January 1, 2006.

7 These resources will assist the
8 Commission in processing these applications; and
9 will continue to reduce backlogs in the program.
10 The temporary staff will be primarily used for
11 initial application review to insure completeness
12 and in entering data into the database.

13 With that, thank you for your
14 consideration of this item. I'm open to any
15 questions if you have any.

16 VICE CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: I have
17 no questions, I'll move the item.

18 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: All those in
20 favor?

21 (Ayes.)

22 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Opposed? So
23 moved. Thank you.

24 Agenda item number 10, Rensselaer
25 Polytechnic Institute. Possible approval of

1 contract 500-05-018 for \$125,000 with the
2 Institute to participate in the National Lighting
3 Product Information Program. It is an accredited
4 testing and calibration laboratory that the
5 support of its participating government agencies,
6 public benefit organizations and electric
7 utilities disseminates objective, accurate,
8 timely, manufacturer-specific information about
9 energy efficiency lighting products.

10 And I would also note here that this
11 contract term is for 2.75 years, not just one
12 year. So the average annual cost of that works
13 out to be about 50,000. Go ahead, Mr. Seaman.

14 MR. SEAMAN: Good morning,
15 Commissioners. I'm Michael Seaman from the PIER
16 buildings program.

17 This contract will continue our
18 relationship with the National Lighting Product
19 Information Program, or NLPIP, a collaborative
20 research program with other state and federal
21 agencies for testing and calibration of energy
22 efficiency lighting products.

23 The Commission has been participating
24 with NLPIP since 2003. This contract will renew
25 our role for another two and a half years, at

1 \$50,000 per year, for a total of \$125,000.

2 This \$50,000 will be from the current
3 fiscal year of PIER lighting budget of 2.5
4 million, or 2 percent of the budget, within the
5 buildings' electrical budget of 12 million.

6 The balance will be funded in future
7 fiscal years providing flexibility for the
8 Commission.

9 NLPIP supports the loading order of
10 efficiency and demand response by testing lighting
11 efficiency and controls such as load shed ballast
12 and lighting circuit power producers. It's the
13 only program of its kind.

14 This contract has direct benefits to
15 California. Our funds leverage other dollars at a
16 one-to-five ratio. California is by far the
17 highest user of NLPIP data. The program provides
18 information our utilities need.

19 The contract requires specific outreach
20 for California energy efficiency audiences through
21 an annual workshop and publications. The contract
22 has been reviewed by the R&D Committee and it's
23 recommended that the Commission approve it.

24 I'm happy to answer your questions as to
25 the proposed contract.

1 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Thank you.

2 Questions?

3 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: No questions.

4 I move it.

5 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: I have one
6 question. I know that in the past NLPIP has
7 produced these reports and then has sold them or
8 charged fees. Is that still the practice? Or is
9 this information made available freely?

10 MR. SEAMAN: The information is
11 currently available for free, and this specific
12 issue was discussed at the NLPIP recent board
13 meeting. The other members had a problem with
14 nonpayers getting information for free. And the
15 staff was required to come back with a
16 recommendation on how to fix that at the next
17 board meeting which will be held roughly March.

18 I think the central proposal is to make
19 the data available to direct participants
20 immediately. And in our case that would include
21 the utilities. And then the balance of the
22 nonpayers would get the information after it was
23 stale.

24 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Okay. Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER BOYD: In spite of that,

1 I'll second it.

2 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: All those in
3 favor?

4 (Ayes.)

5 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Opposed? So
6 moved. Thank you.

7 Item number 11, the minutes of November
8 16th business meeting.

9 COMMISSIONER BOYD: Move approval.

10 COMMISSIONER ROSENFELD: Second.

11 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: All those in
12 favor?

13 (Ayes.)

14 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Opposed? So
15 moved.

16 Number 12, Commission Committee and
17 Oversight. I don't think there are any issues.

18 COMMISSIONER BOYD: Mr. Chairman, I
19 would bring one item to your attention.

20 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Yes.

21 COMMISSIONER BOYD: We don't make a
22 practice normally of just reporting on meetings we
23 attended and what-have-you. But this past Monday
24 I spent the day with the head of the U.S. Forest
25 Service and his program -- visiting all the

1 regions of their organization throughout the
2 United States.

3 And I have been asked to give a
4 presentation on our research activities. And the
5 Director of Forestry and Parks folks and the
6 Conservation Corps did the same.

7 I was invited to spend the day, and I
8 chose to do that. And participate in a very
9 interesting discussion of issues. Of course, the
10 biggest issue, from my perspective, was biomass,
11 forest fuel and what-have-you. But we got into
12 issues of renewables in general, the use of Forest
13 Service lands, transmission lines and transmission
14 corridors. And a strong urging on my parting for
15 them to study the recently released IEPR.

16 And I think it proved to be -- I
17 questioned the wisdom of spending the entire day,
18 based on our time schedule. But I think it proved
19 to be very valuable because a lot of these people
20 are from inside the beltway, don't get enough
21 exposure to dealing with the states. Admitted
22 several times at the end of the day that they had
23 learned a lot about California. And I very
24 strongly encouraged a direct relationship, instead
25 of maybe laundering the relationship through the

1 Department of Energy. Which they admitted seemed
2 to be interested only in corn.

3 And so I expect perhaps some positive
4 results from that in terms of them understanding
5 our needs and working together and maybe some
6 funding help and what-have-you, in that arena.

7 So, anyway, it proved to be very
8 valuable to both of us, the state agencies as well
9 as the Forest Service. I mean they're used to
10 working with CDF, they're used to working with
11 Parks and Recreation and the Conservation Corps.
12 They realize that we're investing a lot of money
13 in research and climate change and other areas
14 that makes us a real big partner. And I
15 encouraged work with unorthodox departments, such
16 as our own.

17 And so anyway, I think it was a very
18 valuable experience and I believe will pay some
19 dividends.

20 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Great. Well,
21 Commissioner, I want to thank you. That's quite
22 helpful and useful information at an opportune
23 time, considering that we're having our state
24 working group on biomass --

25 COMMISSIONER BOYD: Right.

1 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: -- and the
2 Governor has directed us to prepare a report for
3 March. So, I believe the last item you mentioned
4 on that is their willingness to contribute
5 financially in such a way also -- thank you.

6 Anything else?

7 Chief Counsel's report, Mr. Blee.

8 MR. BLEES: Well, speaking of
9 (inaudible) activities, Mr. Chamberlain is at the
10 meeting of the Board of Directors of the Western
11 Electricity Coordinating Council today and has
12 informed us of the meeting. But I have nothing
13 further.

14 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Okay, very good.
15 Mr. Blevins.

16 MR. BLEVINS: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to
17 provide a brief update in terms of the processes
18 associated with the Governor's Climate Action
19 Team. I think, as this Commission is aware, the
20 Commission Staff has been going beyond the call of
21 duty in this effort to provide some analytical
22 backup for this effort. And to specifically
23 analyze the measures that might be included as
24 part of the implementation plan.

25 On December 6th it is scheduled that the

1 Climate Action Team's draft report will be made
2 available to the public. On December 13th there
3 will be a public hearing in Sacramento to receive
4 comments on that proposed plan.

5 I think when the draft report comes out
6 the Commission will recognize some of the policy
7 directions. The report relies heavily on the 2005
8 IEPR in some areas, and also with regard to the
9 scenario work has been done in support of the
10 effort. A lot of the Commission's work there is
11 clearly there.

12 And at that point public comment will be
13 received. And I think, as the Commission is
14 aware, the schedule is to have that report
15 delivered by the Team to the Governor and the
16 Legislature in January of 2006.

17 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Thank you.

18 MR. BLEVINS: Briefly let me add after
19 December 6th, the degree to which Commissioners
20 would like individual briefings or Committee
21 briefings, I am certainly available to participate
22 in that, and go over the comments of the report in
23 detail with you.

24 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: All right. Well,
25 Mr. Blevins, let me personally also acknowledge

1 your contribution to that. I know you personally
2 have been engaged for many months now in making
3 that a successful effort. So I want to thank you,
4 and the staff has been supporting that effort, as
5 well.

6 MR. BLEVINS: Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: I don't see any on
8 the Legislative Director's report.

9 Public Adviser's report.

10 MR. BARTSCH: Mr. Chairman, Members;
11 Nick Bartsch representing Margret Kim. I do not
12 have anything new to report at this time.

13 CHAIRPERSON DESMOND: Thank you.

14 Number 17, public comment. Do we have
15 anyone on the phone? Anyone here in the audience
16 who would like to speak on any of these issues?

17 Very well, then. That being the case,
18 this meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.

19 (Whereupon, at 10:35 a.m., the business
20 meeting was adjourned.)

21 --o0o--

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, PETER PETTY, an Electronic Reporter, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the foregoing California Energy Commission Business Meeting; 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 outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 6th day of December, 2005.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345