

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, AUGUST 15, 2007

10:03 A.M.

Reported by:
Peter Petty
Contract Number: 150-07-001

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Jackalyne Pfannenstiel, Chairperson

James D. Boyd, Vice Chairperson

John L. Geesman

Jeffrey D. Byron

STAFF and CONTRACTORS PRESENT

B.B. Blevins, Executive Director

William Chamberlain, Chief Counsel

Mike Smith, Legislative Director

Harriet Kallymeyn, Secretariat

Chris Graillat

Derek Davis

Chris Scruton

Dave Michel

Guido Franco

PUBLIC ADVISER

Nicholas Bartsch

ALSO PRESENT

Shyamal Buch
California State Science Fair Award Recipient

Pete Fonda, (via teleconference)
Meruit, Inc.

I N D E X

	Page
Proceedings	1
Presentation by Shyamal Buch, California State Science Fair Award Recipient	1
Items	9
1 Consent Calendar	9
2 California Resources Agency (moved to future meeting)	9
3 Shandam Consulting	10
4 University of California, Berkeley - Center For the Built Environment	12
5 Trustees of the California State University	15
6 Trustees of the California State University	18
7 University of California, Davis	19
8 Minutes	21
9 Commission Committee Presentations/ Discussion	22
10 Chief Counsel's Report	26
11 Executive Director's Report	26
12 Legislative Director's Report	26
13 Public Adviser's Report	27
14 Public Comment	27
Adjournment	27
Certificate of Reporter	28

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

2 10:03 a.m.

3 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: This is the
4 Energy Commission's biweekly business meeting.
5 Please join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

8 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Before we
9 begin with the usual business meeting agenda we
10 have a special treat today.

11 MS. GRAILLAT: Good morning, everyone.
12 I'd like to introduce Shyamal Buch. He is one of
13 our energy and science award winners. These
14 awards are sponsored by the Commission at the
15 California State Fair back in May. Shyamal was in
16 the junior division. He received a \$250 reward.

17 We also gave awards to three other
18 students in the junior division and one in the
19 senior division.

20 So, we're lucky that he is the only
21 northern California winner, so we are fortunate to
22 have him visit with us today and tell us about his
23 project. Shyamal.

24 MASTER BUCH: Hello, everyone.

25 (Applause.)

1 MASTER BUCH: Who here knows what a
2 motor is?

3 (Laughter.)

4 MASTER BUCH: Great. How about a
5 generator? Okay. Then you'll basically
6 understand my project.

7 Okay, my project is, "Got Motor? Got
8 Generator? Can a Motor Act Like a Generator, and
9 How Efficiently?"

10 You know how motors uses electricity in
11 order to turn. Well, my question was can a motor
12 generate electricity by turning. Also, how
13 efficiently. My hypothesis was that the
14 efficiency would be 60 or 75 percent.

15 For my research I learned about
16 Faraday's Law of Induction, Ohm's Law, Lenz's Law,
17 and about how a motor and generator work. I also
18 learned why energy efficiency is so important.

19 Fossil fuels are a major source of
20 electric power generation; they're nonrenewable;
21 and they lead to global warming because of their
22 greenhouse gases.

23 Now, the most important fact I learned
24 was that the U.S. power generation system has an
25 efficiency of only 35 percent. So there's a lot

1 of room to grow. Millions of dollars worth of
2 electrical power are consumed every year. So
3 putting all this together we can derive that just
4 1 percent improvement in efficiency can save us
5 billions of dollars and reduce greenhouse gas
6 emissions.

7 I visited the Cal-ISO, California
8 Independent System Operator, in order to learn
9 about the state's power grid.

10 Following the procedure I came up with a
11 new approach to measure energy efficiency using a
12 micro-computer and motors from my robotics kit.
13 This is a lot less expensive than using the lab
14 equipment needed to measure efficiency, which I
15 thought was a plus.

16 (Laughter.)

17 MASTER BUCH: Step one. I started off
18 with one motor and I found out that when you turn
19 it, it produces electricity just like a generator.
20 And that I could use this electricity to drive a
21 second motor. And then my criteria for
22 efficiency, right here in step two, would be
23 counting deriving the rotations out and dividing
24 it by the rotations in. Because efficiency is
25 useful output divided by total input.

1 I wanted to measure the efficiency very
2 accurately. I didn't want to do it manually, so I
3 added a third motor and connected it to the second
4 motor. And this motor would act like a rotation
5 sensor because the motors had built-in rotation
6 sensors. And then it would send the data to the
7 microcomputer, which would then collect and
8 display. I'll be giving a demonstration of that a
9 little later on.

10 Here in step four I added a fourth motor
11 because I wanted to, as you see right here in step
12 three, I started off with a hand-crank so I could
13 manually count how many rotations I did, how many
14 rotations in. But with the microcomputer I could
15 also -- I could accurately count it, and I could
16 also vary the speed of the generator.

17 So, in order for the microcomputer to do
18 its job I provided this program right over here.
19 And it was a program that varies speed and
20 rotations of the generator.

21 My first set of results that I got
22 showed that the efficiency was 67.4 percent. I
23 derived that from the slope of the line with all
24 the points that I copied on the graph, and with a
25 trend line drawn through it.

1 My error was small because my R-squared
2 was close to 1, which means that it was almost
3 exactly linear.

4 Now, for my third graph right over here,
5 it shows how efficiency increases with generator
6 speed. I found out something really interesting
7 about this one. And that was that below the stall
8 speed the motor stalls, obviously, and it doesn't
9 run anymore. Therefore, efficiency is zero
10 according to my criteria.

11 Now, I had to -- I was sure that the
12 generator actually produced some electricity, so I
13 decided to measure the voltage. I had to do some
14 soldering and I wrote this second program right
15 over here, a program to measure time to complete a
16 certain amount of rotations. That way I could
17 measure the rotation speed and angular velocity.

18 When I plotted the graph of output
19 voltage versus the angle of velocity I found out
20 that the results were linear, and that the
21 relationship was linear.

22 Now, I did some more research and saw,
23 you know how Faraday's Law says that the -- TTA is
24 proportional to the number of turns in a coil, and
25 the rate of change of the magnetic flux. Well,

1 for a generator the equation is $EA = KMF$, which is
2 basically the EMF coefficient of the generator
3 multiplied by Omega, which is the angle of
4 velocity.

5 And at steady state the circuit equation
6 of my generator is $V = EA$, -- and where I_A is the
7 armature current, R_A is the armature resistance
8 and B is the output voltage.

9 And so comparing when we combine these
10 two equations and then put it together with the
11 equation of the line, you can derive a KMF EMF
12 coefficient.

13 The reason this is so important is that
14 it's a mathematical model of my generator. And
15 you can give me any given speed and I can tell how
16 much voltage my generator will produce, which is
17 great because I don't have to keep on doing
18 experiments.

19 So, in conclusion, I learned that a
20 motor can act like a generator; and my results
21 supported my hypothesis because 67.4 percent is in
22 the range I hypothesized.

23 I also found out the relationship of
24 output voltage and angular velocity, found out
25 that it was linear. And that I could derive the

1 mathematical model of my generator from the slope
2 of the line. And errors were small because of the
3 R-squared for both of these linear graphs was so
4 close to 1. It was 0.9992 or 1 - yeah. It was
5 very close to 1.

6 And so you may be wondering why is
7 energy efficiency so important. As I already told
8 you, even 1 percent improvement in efficiency can
9 save us billions of dollars. I actually
10 calculated it some time ago and it turned out to
11 be \$7 I estimated.

12 But in applications of a motor acting
13 like a generator, why it's so important is that in
14 hybrid cars, you know how a motor, when you apply
15 the brakes to the car, the motor -- it uses an
16 electric motor, and the momentum of the wheel
17 turns the motor, so that it acts like a generator,
18 and that charges the battery, which you can later
19 use to startup or extend battery life basically.
20 And that I think that NASA could use this
21 technique with their Mars rovers and with robots
22 which helps senior disabled people.

23 And before I wrap this all up, I'd like
24 to thank the Energy Commission for inviting me to
25 present my project to you guys; but, more

1 importantly, for supporting science fairs and for
2 supporting kids like me that like science.

3 So, thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 MS. GRAILLAT: I want to add that
6 Shyamal won this award as a sixth grader. He's
7 currently a seventh grader at Folsom Middle
8 School.

9 (Applause.)

10 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: I want to say
11 thank you, thank you not just for coming here and
12 presenting this, although it was very important
13 for us. But for the work you're doing. And if
14 there's anybody here who still doubts our ability
15 to match the challenges of global warming I think
16 you've demonstrated to us that your generation is
17 going to lead the way.

18 Are there questions or comments from the
19 Commissioners?

20 COMMISSIONER GEESMAN: I'd just comment
21 that I doubt this dude is a seventh grader. I
22 just --

23 (Laughter.)

24 COMMISSIONER GEESMAN: -- seventh year
25 of post-graduate studies.

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON BOYD: My only comment
2 would be that it's a shame that Commissioner
3 Rosenfeld isn't here today. Commissioner
4 Rosenfeld is the acknowledged father of electrical
5 efficiency in this country, if not on this planet.
6 And I would like to have seen him meet his
7 successor.

8 (Laughter.)

9 COMMISSIONER BYRON: And I'll add,
10 Shyamal, cool. Thanks for being here.

11 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Great job.
12 Thanks so much.

13 (Applause.)

14 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: I think we
15 should move on to the rest of our agenda. I don't
16 think there's anything as interesting or as
17 exciting, but certainly some challenges.

18 One change to the published agenda.
19 Item number 2 will be held for future meeting.

20 We'll start with the consent calendar.
21 Is there a motion for the consent calendar?

22 VICE CHAIRPERSON BOYD: I'll move the
23 consent calendar.

24 COMMISSIONER GEESMAN: Second.

25 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: All in favor?

1 (Ayes.)

2 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: The consent
3 calendar is approved.

4 Item number 3, possible approval of
5 purchase order 07-409.00-003 for \$200,000 to
6 Shandam Consulting for information technology
7 network engineering and architecture services that
8 are highly specialized where the knowledge and
9 expertise is not available within the Energy
10 Commission. Good morning.

11 MR. DAVIS: Good morning. My name is
12 Derek Davis. I work in the information technology
13 services branch. I'm asking for approval of a
14 purchase order for \$200,000 for Shandam
15 Consulting.

16 This is to provide network engineering
17 and architectural services for the enterprise for
18 security performance and reliability. The
19 Commission's network is complex and highly
20 specialized. Shandam Consulting will provide
21 architectural services to insure best
22 configuration of the physical network, e.g. Cisco
23 equipment and other firewalls and et cetera, for
24 replacement or upgrade as the Commission's need
25 for performance, stability and security.

1 It will also identify and recommend
2 alternative technologies to improve performance,
3 stability and security.

4 Finally, they will provide a value
5 insight to industry best practices to complement
6 Commission Staff research on emerging network
7 technologies and issues.

8 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Thank you.
9 Questions?

10 VICE CHAIRPERSON BOYD: I had a question
11 as to -- because there wasn't enough information
12 in the material that I received in the agenda.
13 Did we bid this, did we put out an RFP for these
14 services?

15 MR. DAVIS: Yes, sir, back in July; and
16 received all results July 30th.

17 VICE CHAIRPERSON BOYD: So this is the
18 winning bidder?

19 MR. DAVIS: Yes, sir.

20 VICE CHAIRPERSON BOYD: Thank you.

21 COMMISSIONER BYRON: Just one brief
22 comment, and it's not -- I mean I'm certainly in
23 favor of approving this, and it's not in the way
24 of reward, but I'd just like to say that the year
25 that I've been here I've been extremely impressed

1 with the reliability of the systems that I have in
2 my possession. I take it for granted, but I think
3 it's all worked very well. So if this helps
4 support, continue to support them, I'm glad to
5 hear it.

6 MR. DAVIS: Thank you, sir.

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON BOYD: Move approval.

8 COMMISSIONER GEESMAN: Second.

9 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: All in favor?

10 (Ayes.)

11 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Approved,
12 thank you.

13 Item number 4, possible approval of
14 contract 500-06-049 for \$600,000 with the UC
15 Center for the Built Environment. Good morning.

16 MR. SCRUTON: Good morning,
17 Commissioners. I'm Chris Scruton with the PIER
18 buildings program.

19 And this proposed research program would
20 fund the UC Berkeley Center for the Built
21 Environment to work with leading commercial
22 designers, manufacturers and owners to improve
23 guidelines and technology for designing,
24 commissioning and operating underfloor air
25 distribution systems.

1 It would also begin to develop
2 guidelines and comfort analysis tools relevant to
3 radiant cooling systems.

4 Both of these system types offer
5 inherent benefits for energy efficiency and peak
6 electric power reductions, especially in the
7 California climate. And both type of systems are
8 currently being implemented by innovative
9 designers.

10 The Center for the Built Environment,
11 through this research funding, will be able to
12 offer design assistance, analytical services and
13 develop information resources to make sure these
14 systems work as well as possible.

15 The PIER Staff recommends approval of
16 this contract. And I'll try to answer any
17 questions you might have.

18 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Thank you. I
19 noticed in the writeup there's a reference to
20 using this project for 2008 building standards,
21 Title 24?

22 MR. SCRUTON: Yes.

23 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: When will
24 this be available to the building standards staff?

25 MR. SCRUTON: Actually, the information

1 that was developed in the previous round of
2 research with this Center for the Built
3 Environment on underfloor air distribution systems
4 has already been used to make proposals into the
5 2008 standards.

6 And I think there may be some
7 outstanding questions that this research would
8 help to answer. Although, frankly, the timing may
9 be an issue with the 2008 standards. When this
10 proposal was initially proposed that might have
11 been possible. It may no longer be possible to
12 affect the current round of standards.

13 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: It shows that
14 100,000 of the 600,000 would be used for the 2008
15 building standards. So is that money not going to
16 be spent, then, because it's too late for the
17 building standards, or what's the relationship --

18 MR. SCRUTON: Well, as I say, the timing
19 could be an issue. But if they miss the 2008
20 standards then I guess they'll be hitting the 2011
21 standards.

22 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Thanks.

23 COMMISSIONER GEESMAN: That's not
24 exactly the crispness or discipline to schedule
25 that one wants to encourage in government

1 contracting. And I don't think this issue was
2 quite as well discovered in the consideration of
3 the contract at the R&D Committee.

4 So I would suggest that we refer it back
5 to the R&D Committee for closer scrutiny.

6 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: That's fine
7 with me. Further discussions or questions? Why
8 don't you go back to the R&D Committee and then
9 come back with that.

10 MR. SCRUTON: Okay. Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Thank you.

12 Item 5, possible approval of seven grant
13 applications totaling \$619,913 in response to
14 solicitation cycle 06-01G of the Energy
15 Innovations Small Grant Program. And for those
16 who didn't understand that from just reading, the
17 G at the end of that means that this is natural
18 gas. Correct?

19 MR. MICHEL: Correct.

20 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Thank you.

21 MR. MICHEL: Good morning,
22 Commissioners. My name's Dave Michel. I'm the
23 Program Manager of the PIER Energy Innovations
24 Small Grant Program.

25 This is our first solicitation in this

1 program for natural gas research. And I bring
2 eight competitively selected small grant projects
3 that have been approved for Commission
4 consideration by the RD&D Committee.

5 One applicant declined funding after
6 receiving other prime funding. The projects were
7 selected from 30 grant applications received from
8 natural gas solicitation 06-01G.

9 Nineteen passed initial screening and
10 advanced to technical review; 15 exceeded the
11 minimum required score in technical review to then
12 advance to the program and technical review
13 board. And that's where the eight were
14 considered for consideration.

15 In terms of the PIER areas which this
16 research is targeting, three are in advanced
17 generation technology area, three in the
18 renewable, and one in the natural gas
19 environmental impact area.

20 In terms of applicants we received four
21 technologies that are offered by the academic
22 community, and three by small businesses.

23 The total funding request for the seven
24 projects is \$619,913. I recommend the seven
25 projects for Commission consideration and

1 approval.

2 I'll answer questions. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: I would also
4 say that I think there's somebody on the phone, is
5 that correct, Harriet, who would like to speak to
6 item 5.c.

7 MR. FONDA: No, I don't want to speak to
8 it if not asked to.

9 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Okay, thank
10 you. Are there questions on any of these items?
11 Or discussion?

12 COMMISSIONER GEESMAN: I'll move the
13 item.

14 VICE CHAIRPERSON BOYD: I'll second the
15 item; it was presented to the Natural Gas
16 Committee, as well, and we appreciate the review
17 opportunity we were given.

18 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: All in favor?
19 (Ayes.)

20 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: So those
21 eight projects -- are approved.

22 MR. MICHEL: Seven.

23 VICE CHAIRPERSON BOYD: Seven.

24 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Seven, sorry.
25 I wasn't reading correctly.

1 And then you will present item 6,
2 possible approval of nine grant applications
3 totaling \$853,675 in response to solicitation
4 cycle 06-03 of the Energy Innovations Small Grant
5 Program. These are all electric, correct?

6 MR. MICHEL: Correct. Good morning,
7 again. This happens to be our 26th solicitation
8 in the electricity small grant area. And we
9 recommend nine projects that were selected from 64
10 applications received from solicitation 06-03.

11 Twenty-three passed initial screening
12 and advanced to technical review; 15 exceeded the
13 minimum required score in technical review and
14 then advanced to the program and technical review
15 board.

16 In terms of PIER areas, four in the
17 building end-use technologies, two in the
18 environmental, one renewable and one
19 environmentally preferred advance generation, and
20 one industrial/agriculture and water.

21 In terms of applicants, five
22 technologies were offered by small businesses;
23 three in the academic community; and one by a
24 nonprofit.

25 The total funding request for the nine

1 projects is 953,675 (sic), which is well within
2 our budget. I recommend the nine projects for
3 Commission consideration and approval.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Thank you.

6 Questions, discussion?

7 COMMISSIONER GEESMAN: Just to make
8 certain I heard Dave correctly, the amount is
9 853,675?

10 MR. MICHEL: Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER GEESMAN: Okay. I'll move
12 the item.

13 COMMISSIONER BYRON: I'll second.

14 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: All in favor?
15 (Ayes.)

16 MR. MICHEL: Thank you for both.

17 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Thank you.

18 Item 7, possible approval of contract
19 500-07-004 for \$114,996 with the University of
20 California Davis to investigate climate-induced
21 range shifts of commercially and ecologically
22 important tree species in the Sierra Nevada. Good
23 morning.

24 MR. FRANCO: Good morning,
25 Commissioners. My name is Guido Franco; I'm with

1 the environmental area in the PIER program.

2 Prior PIER research demonstrated that
3 Ponderosa Pine has moved in California about 26
4 kilometer to the east and about 450 meters up
5 slope. This is -- the conclusion is that this is
6 the warming climate in California.

7 This is a very important finding and
8 what we're proposing to do is to study ten more
9 species in California. The study will be
10 conducted in area east of Yosemite to see how the
11 lower boundaries of these species are moving, if
12 they're moving due to climate change.

13 At the same time the scientists believe
14 that temperature may be one of the factors, but
15 the main factor may be the drying of the soil. So
16 because of that they will be installing soil
17 moisture probes to measure how long -- the
18 extended summer season that we're experiencing,
19 what effect it's having on soil moisture in these
20 areas.

21 So, in general, this project would help
22 us understand the potential impacts of climate
23 change in forest ecosystems. Again, this is a
24 very important project that would complement other
25 ongoing projects that we're funding.

1 I'm asking you to consider this project;
2 and if you consider that this project is
3 worthwhile, to approve it. I'm ready to answer
4 any questions that you may have.

5 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Thank you.
6 Are there questions?

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON BOYD: Only a comment
8 that I know the precursor research project that
9 was noted in the writeup was a major hit, I guess
10 I would say, at last year's research conference,
11 which I did attend and heard the discussion of
12 these findings.

13 So I'm pleased to see that we're
14 continuing our work in this arena, because it
15 really was interesting and intriguing to the
16 scientific community, and will be very relevant to
17 our California climate change program.

18 COMMISSIONER GEESMAN: I'll move the
19 item.

20 VICE CHAIRPERSON BOYD: I'll second it.

21 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: In favor?

22 (Ayes.)

23 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Approved,
24 thank you.

25 Approval of the minutes. And I need

1 Harriet to affirm that we'll have a quorum of
2 people who can approve minutes for the June 20th
3 business meeting? Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER BYRON: I believe I was not
5 here for the meeting on the 20th.

6 COMMISSIONER GEESMAN: I'm afraid I
7 wasn't, either. At least according to the
8 minutes. It's Pfannenstiel, Boyd and Rosenfeld.

9 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: No quorum for
10 the --

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON BOYD: I noticed this
12 last night. We weren't going to be able to move
13 this item.

14 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: August 1st I
15 was not in attendance.

16 VICE CHAIRPERSON BOYD: I'll move
17 approval of August 1st.

18 COMMISSIONER GEESMAN: I'll second.

19 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Recusing
20 myself. But, all those who were here?

21 (Ayes.)

22 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Those minutes
23 are approved.

24 Commissioner presentations? Any?

25 VICE CHAIRPERSON BOYD: Yes, I have one

1 item I'd like to reference for the Commission's
2 information.

3 Yesterday Commissioner Byron and myself
4 were briefed by the petroleum industry on the fact
5 that they have submitted a petition to the Air
6 Resources Board, which is fairly unique, but has
7 been done on rare occasions before.

8 A petition to ask the Board to
9 reconsider its action on the so-called -- what am
10 I trying to say -- predictive model, excuse me. I
11 know it so well --

12 The Air Board in June took an action at
13 which this Commission Staff participated. They
14 both reviewed and took an action to approve
15 changes to the predictive model and changes to
16 their regulations such that more or less the oil,
17 petroleum industry has to produce E10 in
18 California. And a very novel mitigation strategy
19 was also put in place.

20 The industry -- and a very short
21 timeframe -- the industry has appealed the item to
22 the new Chair of the Air Resources Board, asking
23 they reconsider the time schedule. They're not
24 questioning the decision with regard to the use of
25 ethanol, but they are questioning the time

1 schedule which they think was unusually short.

2 And the so-called novel mitigation
3 strategy has the industry paying to mitigate the
4 increase of emissions were they not able to,
5 within two years, provide the fuel supplies
6 required.

7 In any event I bring this to your
8 attention only in that we were, through staff, a
9 participant in the public hearing. Staff did
10 testify as to the timeframe that the ARB Staff had
11 proposed. And our staff took exception to the
12 short timeframe, and suggested that additional
13 time would be needed.

14 Therefore, it's fairly clear that we and
15 our staff will be involved in the event this
16 petition is granted. Now that has not been done
17 as of yet. But if it were to be granted, and I
18 have no idea if it will or won't, we will have to
19 reenter the process and probably be a little
20 higher profile to our testimony that took place at
21 the time. Which, although heard by the Board, was
22 not taken into consideration with regard to
23 changing any of the timeframe that was ultimately
24 approved by the Board.

25 So, we'll have to watch this issue.

1 COMMISSIONER GEESMAN: You know, I would
2 observe that one of the things we need to be
3 prepared to reconcile, or the staff needs to be
4 prepared to address, is that in the 2005 IEPR we
5 recommended that the E10 blend requirement go into
6 effect in 2010.

7 So I think that before we get too
8 engrossed, we need to recognize that either we
9 didn't know what we were recommending, or
10 conditions have changed, or we may have forgotten
11 that we recommended it.

12 Because I think, to the credit of the
13 Air Resources Board, they recognized the urgency
14 which this Commission had attached to petroleum
15 displacement. I believe they recognized the
16 criticisms which we had focused on the predictive
17 model, and attempted to be responsive.

18 VICE CHAIRPERSON BOYD: That's a good
19 point, and Commissioner Byron can recall, I
20 pointed out to the folks just yesterday that,
21 indeed, we had taken a position in our IEPR on
22 this subject. And we -- and that had been very
23 prominent in our request that the predictive model
24 be opened up to accept -- to consider the
25 acceptance of additional blends of ethanol in the

1 state.

2 And furthermore, I do think that we, as
3 a body, are going to have to take a close look at
4 further testimony that we may make, as an agency,
5 on this subject to reconcile the various positions
6 of -- policy positions that the state has taken on
7 this subject. Good point.

8 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Further
9 Commission discussion?

10 Chief Counsel's report.

11 MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I have no report to
12 day, Madam Chairman.

13 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Thank you,
14 Mr. Chamberlain.

15 Executive Director's report.

16 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BLEVINS: I have no
17 report.

18 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Leg Director
19 report.

20 MR. SMITH: I also --

21 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Nothing going
22 on, Mike?

23 VICE CHAIRPERSON BOYD: He regrets to
24 say he has a report.

25 (Laughter.)

1 MR. SMITH: No, I have nothing specific
2 to report, but I'd be happy to answer any
3 questions.

4 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: When does the
5 Legislature reconvene?

6 MR. SMITH: Monday. The party's over.
7 (Laughter.)

8 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: And for how
9 long?

10 MR. SMITH: Three weeks, till September
11 14th. At least that's the published schedule.
12 Who knows with the budget situation.

13 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Thanks.
14 Public Adviser's report.

15 MR. BARTSCH: Madam Chair, Members, Nick
16 Bartsch, Public Adviser's Office. We don't have
17 anything to report. Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON PFANNENSTIEL: Thank you.
19 Any public comment?

20 Nobody on the phone.

21 We'll be adjourned.

22 (Whereupon, at 10:36 a.m., the business
23 meeting was adjourned.)

24 --oOo--

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 23rd day of August, 2007.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

(916) 362-2345