

Commissioners Present

Robert B. Weisenmiller, Chair
James D. Boyd, Vice Chair
Karen Douglas
Carla J. Peterman

Staff Present:

Melissa Jones, Executive Director
Michael Levy, Chief Counsel
Jennifer Jennings, Public Advisor
Harriet Kallemeyn, Secretariat

Agenda Item

Christina Snow	2, 3, 13
Joseph Hughs	2
Mark Hutchison	4
Larry Rillera	5
Kristen Driscoll	5
Ron Yasny	6, 7
Malachi Wend-Gutierrez	8
Marcia Smith	9
Jacob Orenberg	9
Amir Ehyai	10, 11
Karen Perrin	12
Dustin Davis	14

Also Present

Interested Parties

Carter Brown, BEV	5
-------------------	---

I N D E X

	Page
Proceedings	8
Items	
1. CONSENT CALENDAR.	
a. TOWN OF LOOMIS. Possible approval of Amendment 1 to Agreement CBG-09-115 with the Town of Loomis to change the scope of work and reallocate \$6,835 of the operating expense budget. (FED funding.)	
b. CITY OF CHULA VISTA. Possible approval of Amendment 1 to Agreement 006 09-ECE ARRA to change the scope of work for a streetlight retrofit and extend the term of the loan to March 31, 2012.	
c. STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE. Possible approval of Amendment 1 to Contract 200-08-002 with the State Controller's Office. (CalATERS)	
2. MIDWAY SUNSET COGENERATION PROJECT (85-AFC-3C). Possible approval of a petition to amend the Midway Sunset Cogeneration project to allow the replacement of Unit B's DLN-9 (dry low nitrogen oxide combustor) system with a DLN-1+ combustion system, and to revise applicable air quality conditions of certification.	8
3. GILROY COGENERATION POWER PROJECT (84-AFC-4C). Possible approval of a petition to amend the Gilroy Cogeneration project to allow for the installation of a dry low nitrogen oxide combustor unit, and to update air quality conditions of certification to meet recent changes in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Rules and Regulations.	12
4. CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT. Possible approval of Contract 200-10-006 with the Regents of the University of California, Berkeley, California Institute of Energy and Environment (CIEE) for a tenant agreement and reimbursement of rental fees in the amount of \$23,170.	14

I N D E X

	Page
Items	
5. BOULDER ELECTRIC VEHICLE, INC. Possible approval of Agreement ARV-10-039 for a grant of \$3 million to Boulder Electric Vehicle, Inc. to retrofit and retool a manufacturing facility for mass production of electric vehicles in Los Angeles. (ARFVTF funding.)	17
6. ARCHITECTURAL ENERGY CORPORATION. Possible approval of Amendment 1 to Contract 400-09-002 with Architectural Energy Corporation to add \$250,000 for additional work within the scope required for the 2013 Nonresidential Buildings Energy Efficiency Standards Update. (ERPA funding.)	23
7. BRUCE A. WILCOX, P. E. Possible approval of Amendment 1 to Contract 400-09-001 for \$250,000 with Bruce A. Wilcox, P.E. for additional work within the work scope required for the 2013 Residential Building Energy Efficiency Standards Update. (ERPA funding.)	25
8. STANFIELD SYSTEMS, INC. Possible approval of Purchase Order 10-409.00-004 for \$299,148 with Stanfield Systems, Inc. to provide software model maintenance, support, enhancements and modifications to the Fossil Fuels Office modeling tools. (ERPA funding.)	26
9. SOLOPOWER, INC. Possible approval of Agreement 010-10-30 CEB for a loan of \$4,997,169 to SoloPower, Inc. to expand the manufacture of flexible thin film solar modules at its San Jose manufacturing facility. The project will expand capacity by nine megawatts per year and is estimated to create or retain 50 full-time equivalent jobs. (ARRA funding.)	30
10. CITY OF CLOVIS. Possible approval of Agreement 008-10-ECE ARRA for a loan of \$953,239 to the City of Clovis to install photovoltaic panels at the Public Safety Building and two fire stations. These projects will reduce the city's annual energy expenditures by \$86,658. (ARRA funding.)	35

I N D E X

Items	Page
11. CITY OF LOS ANGELES. Possible approval of Agreement 007-10-ECD for a loan of \$882,987 to the City of Los Angeles to retrofit interior lighting systems and controls at multiple city-owned buildings. This project will save the city approximately 600,000 kilowatt hours in energy consumption, 220 kilowatts in demand savings, or \$81,376 annually. Based on the loan amount, the simple payback is 10.8 years. (ECAA funding.)	37
12. CITY OF PITTSBURG. Possible approval of Agreement 008-10-ECD for a loan of \$425,000 to the City of Pittsburg to change 491 of the City's decorative streetlight fixtures from high pressure sodium (HPS) to light emitting diode (LED) fixtures, and eliminate 134 HPS fixtures and poles. This project will save the city approximately 342,900 kilowatt hours or \$42,000 annually. Based on the loan amount, the simple payback is 10.1 years. (ECAA funding.)	39
13. CALPINE CORPORATION. Possible approval of Agreement PIR-10-060 for a grant of \$410,000 to Calpine Corporation to develop a reservoir model and reopen three wells in the Caldwell Ranch area of the northwest Geysers to characterize geothermal reservoir capacity and explore redeveloping the area. (PIER electricity funding.)	Postponed
14. APPLIED MATERIALS, INC. Possible approval of Agreement PIR-10-055 with Applied Materials, Inc. for a cost-share grant of \$500,000 to conduct research and develop a new, more cost effective process for manufacturing light-emitting diodes. (PIER electricity funding.)	41
15. Minutes:	43
a. Possible approval of the March 17, 2011, Business Meeting Minutes.	
b. Possible approval of the March 23, 2011, Business Meeting Minutes.	

I N D E X

Items	Page
16. Commission Committee Presentations and Discussion.	44
17. Chief Counsel's Report:	56
a. California Communities Against Toxics et al v. South Coast Air Quality Management District (Los Angeles County Superior Court, BS124624);	
b. Western Riverside Council of Governments v. Department of General Services (Riverside County Superior Court RIC10005849);	
c. In the Matter of U.S. Department of Energy (High Level Waste Repository), (Atomic Safety Licensing Board, CAB-04, 63-001-HLW);	
d. Public Utilities Commission of California (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket No. EL10-64- 000); and Southern California Edison Company, et al. (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket No. EL10-66-000).	
e. California Energy Commission v. Superior Court(WRCOG) (California Court of Appeal E052018).	
f. California Unions for Reliable Energy and William Perez v. California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (California Supreme Court, S189402);	
g. Sierra Club v. State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, et al (California Supreme Court, S189387);	
h. BNSF Railway Company v. US Department of Interior, California Energy Commission (U.S. District Court Central District of California-Riverside, CV 10-10057 SVW (PJWx));	
i. WRCOG v. CEC, (WRCOG II - the Bagley Keene Matter) (Riverside County Superior Court No. 10021694).	

I N D E X

	Page
Items	
17. Executive Director's Report.	56
18. Public Adviser's Report.	56
19. Public Comment.	56
Adjournment	56
Certificate of Reporter	57

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

APRIL 6, 2011 10:07 a.m.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Good morning, let's start with the Consent Calendar, Item 1.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Move consent.

VICE CHAIR BOYD: Second.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All in favor?

(Ayes.) It's been passed unanimously.

Let's go on to Item 2. Midway Sunset Cogeneration Project (85-AFC-3C). Possible approval of a petition to amend the Midway Sunset Cogeneration project to allow the replacement of Unit B's DLN-9 (dry low nitrogen oxide combustor) system with a DLN-1+ combustion system, and to revise applicable air quality conditions of certification. Christina.

MS. SNOW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and fellow Commissioners, and good morning. I'm Christina Snow and I've been managing the amendment process for the Midway Sunset Cogeneration Project. The Midway Sunset Cogeneration Project is a 225 megawatt cogeneration power plant located in the community of Fellows in Kern County. The project uses cogeneration steam to aid an enhanced oil recovery process. The project was certified by the Energy Commission in May 1987 and has been in operation since

1 1989. It is owned by the Midway Sunset Cogeneration
2 Company.

3 On October 25th, 2010, the Midway Sunset
4 Cogeneration Company filed a petition with the
5 California Energy Commission requesting to modify the
6 Midway Sunset Cogeneration Project. Staff performed
7 an initial review and requested a modified petition to
8 address the required edits to air quality Condition of
9 Certification AQ18. A modified petition was received
10 and docketed on November 19th, 2010, and proposed to
11 replace Unit B's dry low nitrogen oxide 9 combustion
12 system with the DLN-1+ system, revise the equipment
13 description for each combustion turbine generator,
14 revise the compliance test submittal timeframe from 30
15 days to 60 days, consistent with the authority to
16 construct permit from the San Joaquin Valley Air
17 Pollution Control District, and to modify air quality
18 Condition of Certification AQ-18 to reflect allowed
19 emission limits.

20 The proposed petition to amend will allow
21 Unit B to operate as either a co-generation unit, or a
22 simple cycle unit, due to the declining demands of the
23 steam generated by the facility, and meet their
24 emission limits as required by San Joaquin Air
25 Pollution Control District.

1 Staff analyzed the petition and determined
2 there will be no increase in the permitted emissions,
3 or create significant impacts as a result of the
4 proposed amendment. The modified Petition to Amend
5 was posted to the Web on November 19th, 2010, the
6 Notice of Receipt was mailed to the Post-Certification
7 mailing list, docketed on December 1st, 2010, and
8 posted on the website on December 7th, 2010.

9 Staff received one request from an
10 interested party requesting a copy of the Petition to
11 Amend, Staff Analysis, and the Commission Order. The
12 Staff Analysis was docketed on January 20th, 2011, and
13 posted on the Energy Commission website on January
14 25th, 2011, for a 30-day public review. No comments
15 have been received.

16 Staff recommends that the Energy Commission
17 approve the Petition to Amend based upon staff's
18 findings and subject to the revised Condition of
19 Certification. I would be happy to answer any
20 questions.

21 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Commissioners, any
22 questions or comments?

23 VICE CHAIR BOYD: A quick question, please.
24 You indicated and the material indicates, and our
25 criteria requires no net increase in emissions from

1 this substitution of technology. And that's good. My
2 question, I had trouble digging it out of this, is
3 there possibly a net decrease in air quality emissions
4 as a result of this technology?

5 MS. SNOW: I have Joseph Hughs from Air
6 Quality staff here to address that question.

7 MR. HUGHS: We actually just analyzed it on
8 a permitted basis level, but we would expect that
9 there could be a decrease because of the newer
10 combustion technology, so when it's running in a
11 combined cycle, the SER would still be intact and so
12 we would assume that it might be slightly lower. When
13 it's operated in a simple cycle mode, we didn't
14 analyze whether there would be a decrease or increase,
15 the permit emissions would still be the same, however,
16 there wouldn't be the ammonia injection, so there
17 would be a decrease from the ammonia in the SER.

18 VICE CHAIR BOYD: Okay, thank you. I
19 inferred the same, but I wanted my inference
20 corroborated by an expert, so thank you. No
21 questions.

22 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: I will move approval.

23 VICE CHAIR BOYD: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All in favor?

25 (Ayes.) Passed unanimously. Thank you.

1 So the next item is the Gilroy Cogeneration
2 Power Project (84-AFC-4C). Possible approval of a
3 petition to amend the Gilroy Cogeneration project to
4 allow for the installation of a dry low nitrogen oxide
5 combustor unit, and to update air quality conditions
6 of certification to meet recent changes in the Bay
7 Area Air Quality Management District Rules and
8 Regulations. And, again, it's Christina Snow.

9 MS. SNOW: Thank you. I am also handling
10 the Calpine Amendment. This Calpine Gilroy Cogen
11 Project is a 115 megawatt natural gas powered
12 cogeneration power plant located in Santa Clara County
13 in the City of Gilroy. The project was certified by
14 the Energy Commission in 1985 and began commercial
15 operation in 1988. On September 13th, 2010, Calpine
16 Gilroy Cogen LP filed a petition with the California
17 Energy Commission requesting to modify the project's
18 1985 decision for the installation of a dryer low
19 nitrogen oxide combustor unit on the project's gas
20 turbine generator. The proposed modification is a
21 result of recent changes in the Bay Area Quality
22 Management District Regulation 9, Rule 9 requirements,
23 which lowers nitrogen oxide emission limits from
24 stationary gas turbines. The Gilroy Cogen Project
25 must comply with this lower NOx emission limit by

1 their next scheduled major maintenance, or January
2 1st, 2012, whichever is earlier. The equipment changes
3 results in revisions to the Air Quality Conditions of
4 Certification in the 1985 California Energy Commission
5 Decision. Staff analyzed the petition and determined
6 that there will be no significant impacts as a result
7 of the proposed amendment.

8 The petition to modify the project was filed
9 and docketed on September 16th, 2010, and posted on the
10 Commission's website on September 20th, 2010. The
11 Notice of Receipt was mailed to the post-certification
12 mailing list and docketed on October 13th, 2010, and
13 was posted on the website on October 19th, 2010. Staff
14 analysis was docketed and posted on the Commission
15 website on February 25th, 2011 for a 30-day public
16 review. No comments have been received.

17 Staff is recommending revisions to Air
18 Quality Conditions of Certification 1-1, 1-8 and 1-9
19 to reflect the decrease of the NOx emission limits
20 from 25 PPM to 5 PPM, and to reflect the new
21 equipment. In addition, staff is recommending that
22 four air quality conditions of certification be
23 deleted as they no longer apply.

24 And I just want to make note, there is a
25 minor revision that came to our attention this morning

1 on the Staff Analysis, on the Condition that is being
2 revised, 1-9B, there is a statement that was added
3 that said "this part shall apply until installation of
4 the dry low NOx combustor," it should be "this part
5 shall apply after installation of the dry low NOx
6 combustor."

7 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you. Any
8 questions or comments?

9 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: I'll just say that
10 the Siting Committee reviewed this item and found it
11 to be something to recommend to the full Commission
12 for their support.

13 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: I move the item.

14 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All in favor?

16 (Ayes.) This also passes unanimously.

17 Thank you.

18 MS. SNOW: Thank you.

19 VICE CHAIR BOYD: We do have the Applicant
20 here, he might want to say a word. We're moving fast!
21 Go ahead.

22 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Oh, sorry. Well,
23 again, certainly the Applicant, we'll be happy to hear
24 from you. Let's go on to Item 4, then. California
25 Institute For Energy And Environment. Possible

1 approval of Contract 200-10-006 with the Regents of
2 the University of California, Berkeley, California
3 Institute of Energy and Environment (CIEE) for a
4 tenant agreement and reimbursement of rental fees in
5 the amount of \$23,170. CIEE will sublet 1,550 square
6 feet of space leased by the Energy Commission at 1500
7 Fifth Street in Sacramento, while working with the
8 Energy Research and Development Division on various
9 agreements. And the contact is Mark Hutchison.

10 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: Excuse me, before
11 you start, Mark, Chairman, I'm going to recues myself
12 from this vote. I receive tuition and research
13 support from an Energy Institute at U.C. Berkeley that
14 has some associations with CIEE, so I'll step out now.
15 Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you. Now,
17 Mark.

18 MR. HUTCHISON: Thank you and good morning,
19 Commissioners. Mark Hutchison, Deputy Director for
20 Administration. As you mentioned, this contract
21 before you is with the California Institute of Energy
22 and Environment at University of California, and it is
23 a sublease agreement whereby CIEE will be renting
24 Energy Commission space at 1500 Fifth Street. The
25 monthly rent will be \$2,896.00, and this agreement

1 will run through November 30th, 2011. They will be
2 located in a building that is also occupied by R&D
3 staff, however, it is a separate floor, it is
4 segregated by firewalls, as well as locked doors, so
5 we were careful to make sure that the staff did not
6 have any access, either way, to maintain and to avoid
7 any conflict of interest. And with that, your
8 approval is requested of this agreement and I am
9 available to answer any questions.

10 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Any questions or
11 comments?

12 VICE CHAIR BOYD: Well, I guess my only
13 comment would be that taking per Mr. Hutchison that
14 adequate firewalls have been provided for will
15 hopefully avoid any of the problems that our Executive
16 Director certainly is familiar with, in the past, with
17 regard to seemingly too close relationship between
18 Commission staff and staff of various universities,
19 but this one, in particular. I don't know, Melissa,
20 if you want to say - well, obviously, you're totally
21 comfortable with this or you would not be recommending
22 it to us.

23 MS. JONES: Yes, we work with the attorneys,
24 it is a separate space, it is accessed by separate
25 key, and as Mark said, it's not only software

1 firewalls, there is actually a firewall, a physical
2 firewall, between the spaces, and on a different
3 floor. Thank you.

4 VICE CHAIR BOYD: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: I was going to say,
6 I agree that's very important, we certainly don't want
7 to be in a situation of their staff and our staff
8 comingling, particularly when our staff are working on
9 various proposals and stuff, so I think it is very
10 appropriate to put in place these firewalls. Any
11 other questions or comments?

12 VICE CHAIR BOYD: I will move approval.

13 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All in favor?

15 (Ayes.) This also passed 3 to 0.

16 Okay, so let's go to Item 5. Boulder
17 Electric Vehicle, Inc. Possible approval of Agreement
18 ARV-10-039 for a grant of \$3 million to Boulder
19 Electric Vehicle, Inc. to retrofit and retool a
20 manufacturing facility for mass production of electric
21 vehicles in Los Angeles. (ARFVTF Funding). And the
22 contact is Larry, please.

23 MR. RILLERA: Good morning, Chairman and
24 Commissioners. My name is Larry Rillera with the
25 Division of Fuels and Transportation. In April of

1 2010, the Commission released Program Opportunity
2 Notice 9-605 for Vehicle Manufacturing. Boulder
3 Electric Vehicle, or BEV, submitted an application
4 that was recommended to receive a Notice of Award. In
5 June of 2009, BEV released its prototype all electric
6 drive truck, which to date has been driven over 10,000
7 miles in a variety of environmental conditions.
8 Boulder Electric Vehicle proposes to design and locate
9 a 20,000+ square foot manufacturing facility within
10 the City of Los Angeles limits to mass produce medium-
11 and heavy-duty all electric drive trucks and buses.
12 This manufacturing line facility will also take
13 advantage of its existing supply network and to also
14 be closer to its customers, as well. BEV estimates
15 that it will be able to produce up to 6,000 trucks
16 and/or 6,000 buses per year, with an annual savings of
17 over one billion pounds of CO₂ based upon figures for
18 direct replacement vehicles for diesel power.

19 Boulder Electric Vehicle estimates that 15
20 jobs will be created during the plant facility
21 retrofit improvements and up to 300 jobs created when
22 the plant is fully functioning. Under this item, the
23 Commission will consider approval of a \$3 million
24 agreement with Boulder for the development of this
25 pilot line manufacturing. Staff would ask for

1 Commission support for this item and to approve an
2 agreement with Boulder Electric Vehicle. Carter
3 Brown, CEO of Boulder Electric Vehicle is also here to
4 field questions if there are any. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: That's great. Hi.

6 MS. DRISCOLL: Thank you. This is Kristin
7 Driscoll with the Energy Commission's Chief Counsel's
8 Office. We review all of the AB 118 projects to
9 determine compliance with the California Environmental
10 Quality Act. Based on my review of this project and
11 further due diligence, we recommend that the
12 Commission include a finding if it approves this
13 project that the project is categorically exempt as an
14 existing facility.

15 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you. Mr.
16 Brown, do you want to address us? Thank you for
17 coming.

18 MR. BROWN: Commissioners, I'd like to thank
19 you very much for the preliminary approval of this
20 award. We're very excited, we've been speaking with
21 the Mayor's Office of Economic Development in Los
22 Angeles for about the last two years. We have pilot
23 programs starting with FedEx, the United States Postal
24 Service, and UPS, and we have initial orders from the
25 Port of Los Angeles, and we have a great view on how

1 this can create additional California jobs and reduce
2 emissions, both NOx, Sox, and CO₂ in Southern
3 California, particularly, but throughout the State of
4 California, and we are very happy to have some of our
5 key suppliers of axles and batteries and battery
6 management systems actually located in the State of
7 California, so that this will also be creating Tier 1
8 jobs, subsidiary jobs, in addition to our own
9 manufacturing facility in Los Angeles. So, I'd just
10 like to thank you all for your support of this and we
11 look forward to working with Larry Rillera of the
12 Energy Commission as Project Management, and moving
13 forward. Thank you very much.

14 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you.
15 Commissioners, do you have any questions or comments?

16 VICE CHAIR BOYD: A comment, if I might.
17 This, I see, is a real positive event today. This is
18 the AB 118 program delivering a project that fulfills
19 the legislative goals and objectives, as well as our
20 own goals and objectives, for this program in terms of
21 having in California, bringing to California, an
22 actual production facility that is a facility aimed at
23 advancing the technology of vehicle mobility, and
24 California ought to be the locust of that kind of
25 activity. And I want to commend both the manufacturer

1 and the staff for this project in that it is medium-
2 and heavy-duty electric drive trucks and buses, there
3 is an overabundance of interest and attention given to
4 light-duty vehicles, with too many people forgetting
5 the role that medium-duty and heavy-duty plays in the
6 movement of goods, services, and people through our
7 California economy, and this is a real plus in terms
8 of offering technologies and that obviously are of
9 interest to the companies that the gentleman indicated
10 that they're working with. So, I commend both Boulder
11 and our staff for a job well done on this project and
12 welcome you to California, and look forward to seeing
13 more and more of your products on the road in the not
14 too distant, I hope, future. And I'm prepared to
15 recommend approval of this project, it was reviewed by
16 the Transportation Committee and I recommended it for
17 consideration on today's agenda. So I will move
18 approval.

19 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: I'd like to just join
20 Commissioner Boyd in commending the project. I thank
21 you for being here, it's great to put a face to a
22 name, but I was very pleased to learn about your
23 company, the Boulder Electric Vehicle, and to learn
24 about the work you're doing, it's tremendously
25 important to bring these products to market, to help

1 us clean the air in Los Angeles, push for
2 electrification, and to do so much of the
3 manufacturing and getting supplies from California is
4 a great thing to see. So, thank you. I will second
5 the motion.

6 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: I move - oh, sorry.

7 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Okay -

8 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: No questions, I
9 support it, as well.

10 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Okay, so all in
11 favor?

12 (Ayes.) This passes unanimously. Thank
13 you.

14 MR. BROWN: Thank you very much,
15 Commissioners. And I'd just like to add one thing,
16 although Larry warned me about not going over - giving
17 you a 10-minute diatribe, the substantial energy
18 storage, 80 kilowatts up to 120 kilowatts that are in
19 the battery packs of our electric vehicles, the
20 substantial amount of energy storage, when connected
21 with the Grid on a frequency regulating basis, can
22 greatly further the frequency regulation and the
23 California Grid stabilization when these products are
24 rolled out on a mass basis, and can greatly reduce
25 emissions and the number of power plants that have to

1 be built when they're put forward on a large basis
2 throughout the State of California. So, I think our
3 missions are very much applicable to the 118 program
4 and the CEC's goals, overall. So, thank you very much
5 for letting us be a part of this.

6 COMMISSIONER WEISENMILLER: Thank you.

7 VICE CHAIR BOYD: Well, thank you for that
8 comment. Many of us up here, I know, are anxious to
9 see the vehicle to Grid reality some day; we do have
10 to wait and get the Grid capable of handling this, but
11 there are a lot of people working on that, so, thanks.

12 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Let's look at Item
13 6. Architectural Energy Corporation. Possible
14 approval of Amendment 1 to Contract 400-09-002 with
15 Architectural Energy Corporation to add \$250,000 for
16 additional work within the scope required for the 2013
17 Nonresidential Buildings Energy Efficiency Standards
18 Update. (ERPA funding.) And this is Ron Yasny.

19 MR. YASNY: Yes. Good morning,
20 Commissioners. Ron Yasny with the High Performance
21 Buildings and Standards Development Office, Efficiency
22 Division. Our office has two technical assistance
23 contracts, one is for non-residential buildings, and
24 the other is for residential buildings. This
25 amendment relates to the non-residential contract. In

1 order to coordinate the adoption of the Building
2 Energy Efficiency Standards Update, with the Building
3 Standards Commission, adoption of the complete
4 California Building Code, we have roughly added a year
5 to the cycle, which has allowed us to consider
6 additional improvements to the 2013 Standards Update.
7 This additional money will fund that extra effort.
8 And I seek your approval.

9 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Commissioners, any
10 questions or comments?

11 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: The Efficiency
12 Committee was briefed on this work, it's important
13 work and, you know, in this time when we are looking
14 for ways to cut expenses and to reduce the amount of
15 contract work that we do, we take a closer look at
16 these proposals when they come before us, but this is
17 important work that is being proposed here.

18 VICE CHAIR BOYD: Well, since the Climate
19 Action Program in the State of California predicates
20 so much of its progress, in the early years, in
21 particular, on the work this Commission has to do in
22 the areas of efficiency of all kinds, this is a
23 significant effort to move that along, so I'm very
24 glad to see this and I'm very supportive of it.

25 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: I'll move approval.

1 VICE CHAIR BOYD: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All in favor?

3 (Ayes.) This passes unanimously. Thank
4 you.

5 MR. YASNY: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: The next contract is
7 Item 7, this is for Bruce A. Wilcox, P.E. Possible
8 approval of Amendment 1 to Contract 400-09-001 for
9 \$250,000 with Bruce A. Wilcox, P.E. for additional
10 work within the work scope required for the 2013
11 Residential Building Energy Efficiency Standards
12 Update. (ERPA funding.) The contact is again Ron.
13 Thank you.

14 MR. YASNY: And this Amendment relates to
15 the Residential Contract and everything stated prior
16 relates to this, as well, and I seek your approval.

17 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thanks.
18 Commissioners, any questions or comments?

19 VICE CHAIR BOYD: Ditto, I guess.

20 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Is there a motion?

21 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: I move.

22 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Okay, all in favor?

24 (Ayes.) This passes unanimously. Thank
25 you, Ron.

1 MR. YASNY: Thank you, Commissioners.

2 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Item 8. Stanfield
3 Systems, Inc. Possible approval of Purchase Order 10-
4 409.00-004 for \$299,148 with Stanfield Systems, Inc.
5 to provide software model maintenance, support,
6 enhancements and modifications to the Fossil Fuels
7 Office modeling tools. These modeling tools will be
8 used to support the 2011 and future Integrated Energy
9 Policy Reports. (ERPA funding.) The contact is
10 Malachi. Hi.

11 MR. WENG-GUTIERREZ: Good morning, Chairman
12 and Commissioners. It's Malachi Weng-Gutierrez. I
13 work in the Fuels and Transportation Division and the
14 contract before you deals with the first round of
15 support and maintenance for this new demand model that
16 we're going to be using for the upcoming IEPR. The
17 Fuels and Transportation Division, in general,
18 produces a Demand Forecast and a set of scenarios and
19 policy evaluations every two years as a part of the
20 Integrated Energy Policy Report, and the models that
21 we use are a set of sector based demand models of
22 varying complexity. These sectors include such
23 sectors as the personal and commercial light-duty
24 vehicles, transit sectors, and freight sector of an
25 aviation sector. In our forecast, as well, we

1 evaluate other sectors which are not necessarily
2 modeled with the more complicated models that we use
3 for the main foundational work that we perform. The
4 new and improved model will integrate the past models
5 and they're integrating them into a single modeling
6 framework. The outputs from this model will be used
7 as the foundation of our analysis of all the policies
8 and for the IEPR 2011.

9 The current development contract will expire
10 at the end of April, and the software support and
11 maintenance contract, which is before you, will
12 provide the next phase of support needed for the tool.
13 Energy Commission staff will be responsible for
14 maintaining and managing some of the elements of the
15 tool, but we do require that the more complicated or
16 more programming oriented components will be handled
17 by a contractor, and that is what this contract is
18 supposed to provide us with, those services.

19 The contract itself is a two-year contract,
20 spread out over three fiscal years, and is described
21 in the supporting documentation. The purpose of
22 having a two-year contract is that it allows staff
23 time to evaluate the needs for support on an ongoing
24 basis, and then use that information as the basis for
25 future support contracts. We anticipate that a 12-

1 month time period would be adequate to evaluate the
2 needs for the ongoing support and maintenance and that
3 that information would be used in the future to again
4 create future procurement requirements for support.

5 And with that, I would be happy to address any
6 questions you have regarding this contract or the
7 DynaSim modeling framework that we've developed.

8 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you.

9 Commissioners, any questions or comments?

10 VICE CHAIR BOYD: No questions. I'll make a
11 comment if my fellow Commissioners don't have
12 questions. First, I would just indicate that this
13 project and this proposal did come before the
14 Transportation Committee and it reviewed and approved
15 and recommended it for consideration here today.
16 Secondly, I'll say that, for the majority of my tenure
17 here at the Commission, we've been working diligently
18 to create this kind of modeling tool capability and
19 there was quite a debate early on between taking an
20 off the shelf modeling approach, or creating a model.
21 The staff prevailed on the subject of creating a model
22 now known to us as Dynasim, and is actually making it
23 work just before my second term ends, so I commend the
24 staff for their diligent work. This is a tool
25 desperately needed by this agency in this modern age

1 of dealing with energy and the transportation fuel
2 component thereof, since California isn't exactly the
3 magnet it used to be for any and all transportation
4 fuel we would ever need, and we are competing on a
5 world scale now and we really need tools to inform
6 this Commission of where we see supply, demand, and
7 various type of fuel opportunities to present
8 themselves, so I am very supportive of what it is that
9 Malachi has been doing here and the requested
10 provision of some more resources to finally execute
11 this operation, so I will move its approval, and
12 hopefully will never have to talk about it again in
13 this forum, other than its results.

14 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: I have to say,
15 Commissioner Boyd, I think my first briefing as a
16 Commissioner was on the DynaSim model, so I am
17 definitely eagerly awaiting the results and final
18 product.

19 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: I second.

20 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Okay. All in favor?

21 (Ayes.) This passes unanimously.

22 MR. WENG-GUTIERREZ: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Item 9. SoloPower,
24 Inc. Possible approval of Agreement 010-10-CEB for a
25 loan of \$4,997,169 to SoloPower, Inc. to expand the

1 manufacture of flexible thin film solar modules at its
2 San Jose manufacturing facility. The project will
3 expand capacity by nine megawatts per year and is
4 estimated to create or retain 50 full-time equivalent
5 jobs. (ARRA funding.) The contact is Marcia.

6 MS. SMITH: Good morning, Chairman and
7 Commissioners. My name is Marcia Smith and I work in
8 the Energy Commission's Fuels and Transportation
9 Division on the Clean Energy Business Financing
10 Program. With me is my team member, Jacob Orenberg,
11 and Michael Doughton from the Legal Office.

12 The Commission allocated \$30.6 million of
13 the \$226 million of ARRA State Energy Program budget
14 to the Clean Energy Business Financing Program. In
15 July 2010, the Commission released a Notice of
16 Proposed Awards, or NOPA, that identified CEBFP
17 projects that were proposed to be funded. The NOPA
18 also identified all of the compliance documentation
19 needed to assure funding. This notice was amended
20 four times due to awardee status changes. The last
21 update was February 28th, 2011. At the August 25th,
22 2010 Business Meeting, the Commission approved the
23 first CEBFP loan. Today, the Commission will take
24 action on the loan request, which would bring the
25 total amount of CEBFP loans to nearly \$29 million.

1 SoloPower, and I should note that SoloPower is one
2 word, not two words, Inc., seeks a loan for \$4,997,169
3 to purchase production and metrology equipment,
4 including tools, a laminator, a shingle cell tester,
5 and a module tester, to expand the manufacture of
6 light-weight flexible solar modules at its San Jose
7 manufacturing facility. The expansion will increase
8 production output by 9 megawatts. The project is to
9 be completed by December of 2011. It will create and
10 retain an estimated 50 full-time equivalent jobs and,
11 by staff estimate, offset 4,658 tons of carbon dioxide
12 per year. The total project cost is approximately
13 \$12.3 million, of which SoloPower, Inc. will provide
14 \$7.3 million in leveraged financing.

15 Staff requests the Commission support
16 approval of Agenda Item 9 for a loan agreement with
17 SoloPower, Inc. in the amount of \$4,997,169. Thank
18 you.

19 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you.

20 Commissioners, any questions or comments?

21 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: I have a comment and
22 a question. Happy to see us supporting green
23 manufacturing, green business. One thing - I was also
24 happy to see that you noted one of the areas of
25 evaluation was job creation and retention?

1 MS. SMITH: Correct.

2 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: Because one of the
3 concerns I have is that we have experience in the
4 state and nationwide, the loans, as well as loan
5 guarantees for solar panel manufacturers who have then
6 gone on to relocate in other parts of the world,
7 China, specifically. And so we really do want to make
8 sure that there is that retention aspect. And so,
9 then, my follow-up question related to that is, are
10 there any provisions with the loan that, during the 84
11 months that they're repaying it back, or going
12 forward, that they will continue to stay in the State
13 of California?

14 MS. SMITH: It is required that they remain
15 in California during the entire period - oh, you mean
16 the actual employees?

17 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: The manufacturing
18 facility and then the employees, accordingly.

19 MS. SMITH: The facility, yes.

20 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: Okay, so at least
21 for the seven years of the loan term.

22 MS. SMITH: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: And would you also
24 give a bit more color on retention evaluation aspect,
25 what types of screens there are, what types of

1 questions there are related to that issue?

2 MS. SMITH: Specifically in our application
3 announcement, we ask them to identify the number of
4 jobs that would be retained and be created, and I
5 don't have the specific breakdown for this particular
6 facility. Do you have that?

7 MR. ORENBERG: Jacob Orenberg. In the
8 application, as well, there was a section that
9 described what pieces of equipment the funds will be
10 used to purchase, and in that section it asks you to
11 describe what job would be associated with the use of
12 that equipment.

13 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: Thank you. This is
14 a relatively new company, I think 2006, and if they're
15 listening, I hope they stay in California.

16 MS. SMITH: Thank you.

17 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Just a brief comment.
18 On behalf of the ARRA committee, in all of the work
19 that the Energy Commission did last year in ARRA, this
20 is the one program that was targeted directly to the
21 private sector and, of the programs that we have, you
22 know, this is one that will create a very significant
23 number of private sector jobs. So, I'm excited about
24 the program, I also wanted to recognize staff because
25 it has not been easy, it has not been - this kind of

1 loan program is a first for us, and so we've had to
2 sort of find our way forward through situations that,
3 you know, as State employees and not bankers, staff
4 has at times struggled to come to terms with, and I
5 say that, although we do have one person who has
6 helped us on this who is a former commercial banker,
7 and so we were certainly fortunate to have had his
8 help. So, I just want to recognize staff, I think
9 this sounds like a great program, a great project. I
10 am briefed on it and I'm glad to see it coming to a
11 Business Meeting. It's taken a long time, but it also
12 just hasn't been easy, and I hope we'll see a number
13 of these coming forward very quickly now in the near
14 future.

15 VICE CHAIR BOYD: No comments, I'm very
16 pleased with this and prepared to support it.

17 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: I will move approval.

18 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: I second.

19 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All in favor?

20 (Ayes.) This passes unanimously. Thank
21 you.

22 MS. SMITH: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: The next item 10,
24 City Of Clovis. Possible approval of Agreement 008-
25 10-ECE ARRA for a loan of \$953,239 to the City of

1 Clovis to install photovoltaic panels at the Public
2 Safety Building and two fire stations. These projects
3 will reduce the city's annual energy expenditures by
4 \$86,658. (ARRA funding.) The contact is Amir.
5 Please.

6 MR. EHYAI: Thank you, Chairman. Good
7 morning, Commissioners. My name is Amir Ehyai and I'm
8 with the Special Projects Office. With this loan, the
9 City of Clovis will install photovoltaic panels at
10 their three facilities. The three facilities, as you
11 mentioned, are the public safety building, Fire
12 Station No. One, and Fire Station No. Five. The
13 combined total capacity will be 386 KWAC which will
14 annually produce an estimated 695,000 kWh of
15 electricity. The total project cost is estimated to
16 be \$3.4 million, of which \$953,239 will be funded by
17 the Energy Commission at an interest rate of three
18 percent. Funding for this loan will come from the
19 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The City has
20 secured a private loan for the remainder of the
21 project cost. As background, the city was awarded an
22 Energy Commission loan in December of 2009 to fund
23 energy efficiency upgrades at the public safety
24 building Fire Station No. One and Fire Station No.
25 Five. The 2009 loan helped fund the replacement of

1 inefficient boilers, chillers, pumps, as well as
2 funding to upgrade the lighting systems, install
3 variable frequency drives, and computer controls to
4 reduce plug load energy use.

5 These projects were completed within one
6 year of the loan award and the City is now benefitting
7 from the energy savings, estimated at nearly 900,000
8 kWh annually.

9 The City is now ready to install the PV
10 panels on these same three facilities and, with the
11 approval of this loan, they anticipate completing the
12 project within five months. The staff recommends
13 approval of this item and I would be happy to answer
14 any questions you have.

15 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Any questions or
16 comments?

17 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: No questions. I will
18 move approval if you don't have additional questions
19 or comments.

20 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: I will just comment
21 that it is good to see the cost-sharing with the City
22 and that the City will be able to finance this,
23 hopefully, with a Bond. It's good to see Cities
24 financing energy efficiency and having local
25 involvement with this, as well as at the State level.

1 VICE CHAIR BOYD: I would just comment, it
2 is good to see the City has had a prior experience
3 that was positive, and thus has returned for more
4 success, let's just say. So, I'm supportive of the
5 project.

6 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Do we have a second?

7 VICE CHAIR BOYD: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All in favor?

9 (Ayes.) This also passes unanimously.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. EHYAI: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Item 11. City Of
13 Los Angeles. Possible approval of Agreement 007-10-
14 ECD for a loan of \$882,987 to the City of Los Angeles
15 to retrofit interior lighting systems and controls at
16 multiple city-owned buildings. This project will save
17 the city approximately 600,000 kilowatt hours in
18 energy consumption, 220 kilowatts in demand savings,
19 or \$81,376 annually. Based on the loan amount, the
20 simple payback is 10.8 years. (ECAA funding.) The
21 contact is, again, Amir.

22 MR. EHYAI: Yes. The Project Manager for
23 this loan is Adel Suleiman, however, he's out of the
24 office today, and so I'm going to be presenting this
25 item on his behalf.

1 With this loan, the City of Los Angeles will
2 retrofit over 6,200 interior light fixtures throughout
3 42 of their buildings. The majority of these fixtures
4 current use T-12 fluorescent lamps, and these will be
5 retrofitted with low wattage T-8 lamps, and reduced
6 power electronic ballasts. This loan will also
7 provide funding to replace incandescent exit signs
8 with LED, replacement of incandescent flood lamps with
9 CFLs, and provide funding for the installation of
10 occupancy sensor controls. All told, the projects
11 will annually save an estimated \$600,000 kWh of
12 electricity and reduce the City's expense by \$81,376.
13 The total project cost is \$886,987, of which \$882,987
14 will be funded with the Energy Commission loan at an
15 interest rate of three percent.

16 The City is eager to begin this work and has
17 expressed interest in applying for additional CEC
18 funding to further improve the efficiency of their
19 many other facilities. Energy Commission staff has
20 been working closely with the City to achieve these
21 goals, for example, back in 2006 and 2009, the
22 Commission awarded the City two separate loans
23 totaling \$6 million for the installation of LED and
24 induction lamps and their street lights. Staff
25 recommends approval of this item and I'm happy to

1 answer any questions you have.

2 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Commissioners, any
3 questions or comments?

4 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: No questions. Again,
5 as Commissioner Boyd said, glad to hear that the City
6 is having a good experience and interested in possibly
7 coming back again.

8 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: I move.

9 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All in favor?

11 (Ayes.) This item also is unanimous. Thank
12 you.

13 Item 12. City Of Pittsburg. Possible
14 approval of Agreement 008-10-ECD for a loan of
15 \$425,000 to the City of Pittsburg to change 491 of the
16 City's decorative streetlight fixtures from high
17 pressure sodium (HPS) to light emitting diode (LED)
18 fixtures, and eliminate 134 HPS fixtures and poles.
19 This project will save the city approximately 342,900
20 kilowatt hours or \$42,000 annually. Based on the loan
21 amount, the simple payback is 10.1 years. (ECAA
22 funding.) The contact is Karen. Thank you.

23 MS. PERRIN: Good morning, Commissioners.
24 I'm Karen Perrin with the Fuels and Transportation
25 Division. This is a request from the City of

1 Pittsburgh for a \$425,000 loan to retrofit the City
2 streetlights. They plan to retrofit their existing
3 streetlights to more energy efficient LED lamps and
4 they're going to be replacing 491 street lights and
5 poles, as well as eliminating some lamps and poles
6 that they've deemed unnecessary. They have already
7 performed a pilot project to test the lighting and the
8 City is very excited to begin this project.

9 It is expected to save the City \$42,000 a
10 year, and they are also leveraging a PG&E utility
11 rebate for \$47,000. And staff requests your approval.

12 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you. Any
13 questions or comments?

14 VICE CHAIR BOYD: Move approval.

15 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: I second.

16 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Okay, all in favor?

17 (Ayes.) This also passes unanimously.

18 Thank you.

19 Item 13. Calpine Corporation. Possible
20 approval of Agreement PIR-10-060 for a grant of
21 \$410,000 to Calpine Corporation to develop a reservoir
22 model and reopen three wells in the Caldwell Ranch
23 area of the northwest Geysers to characterize
24 geothermal reservoir capacity and explore redeveloping
25 the area. (PIER electricity funding.) The contact is

1 John.

2 MS. JONES: Mr. Chairman, an issue just came
3 to my attention and we need some additional
4 documentation for this contract. I request that we
5 pull the item and place it on our next Business
6 Meeting Agenda.

7 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Okay, sure.

8 MS. JONES: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Item 14. Applied
10 Materials, Inc. Possible approval of Agreement PIR-
11 10-055 with Applied Materials, Inc. for a cost-share
12 grant of \$500,000 to conduct research and develop a
13 new, more cost effective process for manufacturing
14 light-emitting diodes. (PIER electricity funding.)
15 The contact is Dustin.

16 MR. DAVIS: Good morning, Commissioners.
17 I'm Dustin Davis from the PIER Buildings Team. This
18 Agenda Item seeks your approval with Applied Materials
19 in the amount of \$500,000 to cost-share the
20 contractor's 2010 American Recovery and Reinvestment
21 Act Award. Under the Solid State Lighting U.S.
22 Manufacturing DOE solicitation, eight projects
23 received awards totaling \$23.5 million in January
24 2010. Of that amount, Applied Materials was awarded
25 about \$4 million and is also contributing just over \$4

41

1 million in additional match funds, so PIER's cost-
2 share would leverage a project that totals over \$8
3 million.

4 Researchers have made significant progress
5 to reduce the cost and to improve the performance of
6 LED devices, but the equipment in use today for
7 manufacturing has been cobbled together from tools and
8 processes that were not necessarily designed for
9 volume manufacturing.

10 The key step in LED manufacturing is the
11 Metal Organic Chemical Vapor Deposition, or MOCVD
12 process, which is a chemical process used to produce
13 high performance semiconductor products such as LEDs.
14 Applied Materials will develop an improved MOCVD
15 process, which will decrease operating costs, increase
16 the efficiency of LEDs, and improve binning yields, or
17 the number of LEDs that meet target specs to reduce
18 manufacturing waste. Developing improved LED
19 manufacturing process equipment will enable LED
20 manufacturers to fabricate higher quality LED devices
21 at a lower cost, which will ultimate increase the
22 widespread adoption of this energy saving technology.

23 The research team is based out of Santa
24 Clara, California, and anticipates the creation of
25 1,500 jobs in California by 2015, directly resulting

1 from this project. This project will be completed by
2 July 2012. This grant agreement has been approved by
3 the RD&D Committee, and I will gladly answer any
4 questions at this time. Thanks.

5 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Commissioners, any
6 questions or comments?

7 VICE CHAIR BOYD: I have no questions. But,
8 as indicated, it did come before the RD&D Committee
9 and I'm prepared to move approval.

10 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All in favor?

12 (Ayes.) This goes unanimously. Thank you.

13 MR. DAVIS: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Item 15. Minutes.

15 VICE CHAIR BOYD: Move approval, Minutes of
16 March 17th.

17 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All in favor?

19 (Ayes.) The Minutes for Item B?

20 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Move approval of Item
21 15B, March 23rd.

22 VICE CHAIR BOYD: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All in favor?

24 (Ayes.) The Minutes are approved. Item 16.

25 Commission Committee Presentations and Discussions.

1 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: I have a brief
2 announcement, Chairman. Next month, May, is Bike
3 Month, which is to promote bicycling for recreation
4 and errands, as well as a viable alternative to the
5 automobile for commuting to work and to school. Bike
6 Month covers the entire Sacramento Region and in 2010,
7 over 369,000 miles were logged. As of this morning,
8 the Energy Commission joins 84 other employers by
9 officially registering as a club for May is Bike
10 Month. Participants will pledge miles that they'll
11 ride and will later log actual miles ridden. You
12 don't have to be a *Hero D'Italia* winner to
13 participate, and there will be no anti-doping tests,
14 although I have to say that doping is definitely not
15 recommended. Modest rides of a few miles to and from
16 work, or two and from other errands will get the job
17 done, save energy, and improve your health. The
18 official website, [Http://www.MayIsBikeMonth.com](http://www.MayIsBikeMonth.com) can
19 help you make routes to and from work. There is also
20 a Facebook fan page for May Is Bike Month. The Energy
21 Commission has for many years participated in the
22 Employer Bike Challenge with riders logging anywhere
23 from 25 miles to more than 1,000 miles for the month
24 of May. Last year, Commissioner Eggert created even
25 more interest in the event in the Energy Commission by

1 offering to buy a drink of one's choice to each rider
2 who logged more miles than he did; ultimately, only
3 six people logged more miles than Commissioner Eggert
4 and not everyone claimed their drink. I actually,
5 when he made that announcement, rather rashly
6 announced that I would join the competition, even
7 though at the time I had fairly heavy job
8 responsibilities, two kids under 4, and I actually
9 didn't even get around to registering, even though I
10 did occasionally ride and tooled around Davis. I also
11 didn't get around to ever making the ride from Davis
12 to Sacramento, so I'm attempting to do a little better
13 this year and I hope to inspire others in the Energy
14 Commission to do a little better this year by renewing
15 Commissioner Eggert's challenge, but with a twist.
16 Commissioner Eggert has offered to come back in and,
17 so, again, for those of you long time and hard core
18 riders who are regular participants in May is Bike
19 Month, you know, let's see if we can get more than six
20 to exceed his miles. My challenge is going to be to
21 Energy Commission employees who have not registered
22 ever, or at least recently, in May is Bike Month,
23 probably have to go in your garage, dust off your bike
24 like I did, and get it fixed up, in order to be road
25 ready. And so, if you ride more miles than me, and

1 that's probably not such a high bar, so, come on, then
2 I will buy you a drink, and Commissioner Eggert and I
3 will coordinate the Happy Hour and we'll share the
4 financial liability together of these two challenges.
5 So, I hope that my fellow Commissioners consider
6 registering, I hope that staff considers registering,
7 I hope that first timers dust off their bikes and come
8 on out and at least ride more miles than me, and we've
9 also extended an invitation to some other appointees
10 to join us, and so we'll see if appointees in other
11 agencies, or other appointees in the Governor's
12 Office, where Commissioner Eggert now is, would like
13 to join our competition. Thank you.

14 VICE CHAIR BOYD: Well, now that I've heard
15 the magnitude of the challenge from Commissioner
16 Douglas, based on past performance, I might even be
17 willing to accept the challenge. I would say, and I
18 will do better this year, that for years I always led
19 the ARB's annual bike trek and bike to work day, and
20 what have you, I've gotten a little lazy and a lot
21 older, but weather permitting, I'm tempted this year
22 to try a few commutes to work. I've moved recently,
23 which affords me the opportunity to spend more time on
24 the bike trail and less time on the city streets, and
25 I might feel a little bit better about that in terms

1 of getting to work. But I think it's a very worthy
2 thing and, yes, I've been impressed with this agency's
3 performance in the past. We've got some very diligent
4 bike riders -- long distance bike riders -- so I don't
5 even hope to come anywhere close to their mileage, but
6 to log more than I did last year, zero, shouldn't be
7 too hard a challenge. So I'll hope to see you on the
8 streets.

9 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: And I will say, I
10 will sign up, although I learned how to ride a bicycle
11 in October, and I have a 25-year-old PT Cruiser, and
12 so I won't be taking it to work, but I will attempt to
13 take it out of my apartment.

14 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Excellent, well, I do
15 remember that Commissioner Eggert, after the month of
16 May, had dragged about half-way through, or more, and
17 I hadn't yet registered, and at one point said to me,
18 "Well, at least register and log a couple miles and
19 I'll buy you a drink anyway," so I hope that we all
20 manage to rise to the occasion here.

21 VICE CHAIR BOYD: But would you share that
22 registration site with us in an email, so I --

23 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: I will.

24 VICE CHAIR BOYD: -- I don't forget to do
25 it? Thank you. If no one else has anything else,

1 I'll jump in and report on a couple of items, one, the
2 Chairman and I last week, as the Research Committee
3 participated in the PIER Advisory Committee Meeting,
4 well, the first meeting of this year, but a follow-on
5 meeting to a very productive meeting late last year,
6 and I would just say that this meeting also was
7 impressive and productive, it was a very good meeting.
8 Staff did an excellent job in agenda preparation and
9 materials preparation, and it made for a lengthy
10 discussion on a host of research issues and issues
11 affecting the way we operate the research program and
12 the projects we pursue. While, of course, the major
13 objective of the meeting and the agenda was structured
14 in a way to talk about research needs, strategic plan
15 needs, and the operation of the research program,
16 there was no getting away from the issue hanging over
17 the head of the program of its reauthorization and the
18 Legislature's hearings to date, and what have you.
19 And so, the staff and, I think, the two Commissioners
20 adeptly modified the agenda at noon time to facilitate
21 a roundtable discussion on that topic. It proved to
22 be very helpful and actually facilitated our ability
23 to finish the agenda where there was some question
24 whether we could return to the agenda, so all in all,
25 I thought it was a very helpful and productive day.

1 And it puts us on a path to continue a very active
2 interchange with our advisory committee, certainly a
3 minimum of two meetings a year, but a lot of
4 willingness on the part of advisory committee members
5 if summoned to come together even more often and come
6 together sooner rather than later with regard to the
7 issues confronting the future of the program at the
8 present time. So, it probably - well, the last two
9 meetings have been extremely good and we're on a very
10 good track and we've made a lot of commitments and
11 followed through on those commitments, which I think
12 was recognized by committee members. We had for the
13 morning session participation from representatives of
14 - staff representatives of the Legislature, we had for
15 the entire meeting a staff person from another
16 Assembly member's office, and it was a Science Advisor
17 who made some very good contributions and, at the end
18 of the meeting, was quite impressed with the whole
19 operation. So, I think it worked out quite well and
20 the staff invested a tremendous amount into it and
21 they got a return on that investment in terms of
22 appreciation of the members for the material that they
23 had seen, and it was evident to me that they had given
24 instructions last fall - or suggestions - that the
25 staff followed and, as they heard the discussion about

1 and the consequences of some of those discussions,
2 they modified their view in some areas to a slightly
3 different position with regard to the way we should
4 proceed, which was evidence to me of the fact that
5 they absorbed everything they heard, took it into
6 consideration, and had very positive comments to make.
7 So, I think it was very positive and I sure look
8 forward to the ability of this Commission to continue
9 active interface with this advisory committee, it's a
10 very energized group of people. I would say the
11 gauntlet was thrown down to some of them to use this
12 forum as a forum to discuss their concerns, rather
13 than us hearing about them in other ways, even in
14 hearings in front of the Legislature, and not getting
15 caught off guard. Anyway, I think we're making some
16 good progress and, of course, we all hope there is a
17 program next year for there to be an advisory
18 committee to advise us on, so we look forward to
19 success in that arena.

20 Secondly, I would just mention that this is
21 U.C. Davis' Energy Week, they have a series of forums.
22 I know at least one other Commissioner and I were
23 featured speakers in a couple of the different forums,
24 and I know there is staff in participation and I know
25 I spoke yesterday at the Bioenergy Forum and it

1 continues today, and my Advisor and staff, I know, are
2 there today, as well. And Commissioner Douglas spoke
3 the previous day. And I've honestly forgotten your
4 forum, or your topic, and you can remind us all, but
5 it was good to see this activity and it was good to
6 see the very significant turnout of people who were
7 participants and members of the audience and the
8 interchange that takes place, and that we as an agency
9 have invested a fair amount of money in U.C. Davis'
10 multiple offices and collaboratives and research
11 activities, and it has invested again in these kinds
12 of very public forums where there is a very positive
13 exchange of ideas and kind of progress reports on
14 where certain subjects stand. And, quite selfishly,
15 it provided yet another opportunity to give a
16 commercial about the PIER Program and the need to
17 support the PIER Program in the future.

18 Thirdly and lastly, I'll mention, as the
19 Chairman knows, the evening before my last, my office
20 received an email from the U.S. Senate Environment of
21 Public Works Committee, asking me to come testify next
22 Tuesday on a special hearing they have scheduled on
23 Nuclear and Earthquake issues precipitated by the
24 events in Japan, the Chairman was very supportive of
25 my attempting to participate, but we recognize on such

1 short notice, it is hard to get approval to do things
2 like that. I am very pleased to report that, in a
3 period of four hours yesterday, and all done verbally,
4 the State system received and approved all the way up
5 to and including the Governor's Office, this travel
6 request. So I'm actually - Marlena is struggling to
7 even find any vacancies on airplanes to get me there
8 and back on such short notice, but it's cause for a
9 lot of work on our part, but it's a cause for
10 recognition, we didn't solicit this. I guess we are
11 represented on the panel with Ms. Lisa Jackson, head
12 of EPA, and with Mr. Jaczko, who is head of the
13 Nuclear Regulatory Commission, so California's
14 interest in this subject, somehow or another, gains
15 some visibility, and I am aware that the Senate Energy
16 Committee is holding a hearing next week on this
17 topic, but as of this moment we don't know if the
18 Energy Commission has a role in that hearing, so more
19 to follow. In any event, I will be going to
20 Washington Monday and going to the hearing Tuesday and
21 attempting to get back Tuesday night - attempting is
22 the way we last left it when I left my office this
23 morning. So, there's my report, Mr. Chairman.

24 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Mr. Chairman, I guess I

1 should follow-up on Commissioner Boyd's report by
2 saying that I did speak, as well, at the U.C. Davis
3 Energy Week and I was on a panel that was responding
4 to a report put out by - I'm trying to remember now -
5 but Jeffrey Greenblatt and a number of other
6 contributors on pathways to not only our 2020, but our
7 2050 greenhouse gas targets. And the report is going
8 to be available in a couple of weeks, we were
9 responding to a presentation of what the report would
10 say. It was also at least partially PIER funded and
11 it was very interesting. I think that former
12 Commissioner Geesman was on the panel with me and he
13 made the point that, when you look out beyond, say,
14 seven to 10 years, it becomes very difficult to
15 project, and yet it's helpful, obviously, to look at
16 least one well analyzed vision of what it could look
17 like, getting to 2050, in order to help us understand
18 the scale of the challenge, and the types of measures
19 that in some combination we're going to have to take.
20 Interestingly, it probably won't be a surprise to this
21 Commission, but the themes that I took away from the
22 report are the importance of energy efficiency, and
23 the importance of electrification, as well as other
24 alternative fuel possibilities in getting to these
25 goals.

1 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you. Carla?

2 COMMISSIONER PETERMAN: Nah, I won't report
3 anything, thanks. Okay, I'll report that. I spoke
4 last week at the California Municipal Utilities
5 Association's annual conference in the Palm Springs
6 Area, and that was a great opportunity to share with
7 them what's going on at the CEC, the work we're doing
8 with public utilities, as well as a good opportunity
9 for me to get up to speed about the work we're doing
10 with them, and I believe it was well received,
11 including my jokes. So, looking forward to more
12 collaboration with those utilities.

13 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Yes, so, I'll
14 conclude. As per Vice Chair Boyd about the PIER
15 Committee, that was my first opportunity to attend one
16 of those and I thought, again, it was a very
17 thoughtful discussion and, certainly, the staff
18 demonstrated that they listened to the first committee
19 and I think the advisory committee comments, sort of
20 moving forward, it left in a better position. And in
21 terms of what I was going to mention was I went to the
22 IEP spring planning meeting and talked to them last
23 Friday on affirmative need stuff, I think certainly
24 Commissioner Douglas remembers the workshop we had on
25 the staff's paper and that certainly, actually the

1 first workshop I don't think there were any
2 supporters, frankly, but certainly among the most
3 vociferous opponents was IEP and a concern that we
4 were somehow, you know, returning to the middle '80s
5 in terms of need assessment. Now, frankly, the
6 staff's choice of terminology of need assessment
7 probably led to some of those fears, but, you know,
8 trying to move forward from that with a dialogue, so
9 we had a good session on that. I sort of ended up
10 having to reschedule my flight back because the
11 session went about twice as long as anticipated, but
12 afterwards people were saying that they intended to
13 roll up their sleeves and work with us on the concept.
14 Certainly, I thought it was a successful trip.

15 Michael, Chief Counsel's Report?

16 MR. LEVY: Good morning, Commissioners, I
17 have nothing today.

18 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Executive Director?

19 MS. JONES: I have nothing to report today,
20 thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Public Advisor?

22 MS. JENNINGS: I have nothing to report,
23 thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Okay, any public
25 comment? Then this meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

1 (Whereupon, at 11:15 a.m., the business meeting was
2 adjourned.)

3 --o0o--

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25