

**STATE ENERGY ADVISORY BOARD
TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
FEBRUARY 18, 2010, 1:00 PM – 1:51 PM EST**

TELECONFERENCE ATTENDEES

Designated Federal Officer (DFO):

- Gary Burch, STEAB DFO, Senior Management Technical Advisor, Intergovernmental Projects, Golden Field Office, Denver, Colorado

STEAB ATTENDANCE		
BOARD MEMBERS	Present	Absent
Jim Arwood , Director, State Energy Office, State of Arizona		✓
Susan S. Brown , Deputy Administrator, Wisconsin Division of Energy		✓
John Butler , Energy Commission Supervisor II, California Energy Commission	✓	
Dan Carol , Strategic Advisor/Organizational Consultant (OR)	✓	
William Vaughn Clark , Director, Office of Community Development, Oklahoma Department of Commerce	✓	
John H. Davies , Director, Division of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency, Kentucky Office of Energy Policy	✓	
Philip Giudice , Commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources	✓	
Ryan Gooch , Energy Policy Director, Tennessee Economic and Community Development		✓
Paul Gutierrez , Vice Provost for Outreach Services, Associate Dean and Director, Cooperative Extension Service, College of Agriculture and Home Economics, New Mexico State University	✓	
Duane Hauck , Director, Extension Services, North Dakota State University	✓	
Cecelia Johnson-Powell , Community Development Manager, Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority	✓	
Peter Johnston , Project Manager, Clean Energy Technologies, Burns & McDonnell (AZ)		✓
Neil Moseman , Director, Nebraska Department of Energy		✓
James Nolan , Weatherization Director, Department of Public, Health and Human Services (MT)		✓
Tom Plant , Director, Colorado Governor's Energy Office		✓
Larry Shirley , State Energy Office Director, North Carolina Department of Administration	✓	
Janet Streff , Manager, State Energy Office, Minnesota Department of Commerce	✓	
David Terry , Executive Director, ASERTTI (VA)		✓
Steve Vincent , Regional Business Manager, Avista Utilities (OR)	✓	

Contractor Support:

- Emily Lindenberg, SENTECH, Inc.

Public:

- No public representatives participated in this meeting.

STATE ENERGY ADVISORY BOARD
TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
FEBRUARY 18, 2010, 1:00 PM – 1:51 PM EST

Agenda Items:

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Updates on Delivery of Resolution 10-01,
and Discussions at NASEO | Janet Streff
Gary Burch |
| 2. Update on Partnership between DOE and HUD
with regard to weatherizing public housing units
and other goals of the formal collaboration | Cecelia Johnson-Powell |
| 3. Management Changes at Golden Field Office | Gary Burch |
| 4. NEPA Discussion with Golden Representative | Gary Burch
Robin Sweeney |
| 5. Discussion on “EPA and DOE Join States to Speed
Energy Efficiency Progress in the United States” | Janet Streff |
| 6. Discussion on Block Grant Subcommittee | Gary Burch |
| 7. Review of Agenda Items for March Meeting | Janet Streff
Gary Burch |
| 8. Public Comments | Janet Streff |
| 9. Other Issues and Board Status | Janet Streff
Gary Burch |
- Janet Streff (JS) welcomed the Board to the February call and asked that the Board please start with agenda item number four as the guest, Ms. Robin Sweeney, was on the call ready to discuss NEPA issues. Gary Burch (GB) introduced Ms. Sweeney as the new manager of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) section of the Golden Field Office. Her role on the call will be to discuss outstanding issues related to NEPA and also to answer any additional questions Board members may have.
 - Ms. Sweeney began by thanking the Board for this opportunity to discuss NEPA and address issues the Board has previously discussed. She noted she has only been with the Golden Field Office (GFO) for one month at this point and appreciates the challenge facing the office, specifically the challenge of having 2,200 actions and a staff of only four. She assured the Board that they are working as fast as possible and doing their best to release funds to States so that they can begin working. Due to the lack of staff, a cadre of contractors has been brought in and things are beginning to move more quickly with a hope to keep up this pace.
 - GB thanked Ms. Sweeney for the background and opened the floor to discussion and questions by the Board. Philip Giudice (PGD) asked what the current back-log in a dollar value is that the office needs to dig their way through. John Davis (JD) asked the question of what is the general timeline in which actions are processed.
 - Ms. Sweeney responded that the process of answering an action is not always easy or straightforward. The first order of business is to evaluate the action and determine if it falls into either one of many categorical exclusion or if an environmental assessment is needed. Depending on the potential environmental impact, there is a lot more information which needs to be gathered. If a full environmental assessment needs to be done, that could take months, and in the case of larger actions, sometimes years for a full study to be conducted. If the action seems to clearly fit one of DOE’s categorical exclusions, the

STATE ENERGY ADVISORY BOARD
TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
FEBRUARY 18, 2010, 1:00 PM – 1:51 PM EST

process can move fairly quickly (i.e., within 30 days). The challenge they face is that they do not always receive all the environmental information up front, which can lead to an investigation to figure out exactly where the action would fall – categorical exclusion, or the need for an environmental impact statement.

- JD followed-up by asking how long it takes NEPA to get a ‘first review’ of a project once it has been submitted, noting at one time the length was two to four months. Ms. Sweeney replied that at this point in her tenure she does not have that information, but hopes to be able to give the Board an answer in the coming weeks once the department gets up to speed with hiring and processing.
- JS mentioned it would be helpful for the States to understand the amount of attention NEPA is giving to get the Block Grant categorical exclusions and special conditions removed in order to help States move work forward. How much attention is given to that versus individual projects? Ms. Sweeney answered that everything coming through the office requires a NEPA review, and some of the conditions on the Block Grants are still there because the office does not have enough environmental information to determine whether they meet categorical exclusions, or if an environmental assessment is needed.
- John Butler (JB) inquired as to whether funds can be released and available to States once NEPA approval is received, or do the States have to wait for an official modification of the award. The response indicated that the main hold-up in awards was the NEPA determination; and once the actions were passed to a Jamie Harris (in charge of making the actual awards), the responsibility for the release of funds lays with his office. She mentioned she has discussed this with him previously, and Mr. Harris seemed poised and ready to accept the processing of awards as fast as possible.
- JS and PGD both shared their States’ experience with this scenario, and JS noted her State officially moved after the contract was modified, whereas PGD and the State of Massachusetts began planning, but not signing contracts, before conditions were lifted and modifications were finalized. Ms. Sweeney reiterated that this was not her area and that she would try to get an answer from Mr. Harris and respond to the Board in the coming weeks with a final answer.
- JS and GB thanked Ms. Sweeney for taking the time to speak with the Board. In response, Ms. Sweeney promised to get back to the members with answers to outstanding questions and thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak.
- In light of Cecelia Johnson-Powell (CJP) needing to exit the call a bit early, JS asked the Board if the next agenda item could be the update on partnership between DOE and HUD with regard to weatherizing public housing units. All members agreed and CHP spearheaded the discussion with good news about this topic.
- The discussion began with CJP updating the Board with news that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a final rule regarding the Weatherization eligibility of multi-unit buildings. These units can be funded either with US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Housing Service Multi-family Housing Programs, or through Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Additionally, if the building has received funding from either of those sources, the building is thus considered eligible for funding. This is a great step forward as the Weatherization Assistance Programs (WAP) will not have to spend time verifying the income of each tenant, and that allows for the weatherization of the units without delay. This new rule becomes effective as of February 24, 2010. Currently, DOE has to provide WAP grantees with a list of the current eligible buildings. Once that happens, grantees can start working with contractors to get these units and buildings weatherized. CJP finished her update noting that at this point she did not have an update on the partnerships between the housing authority and Agricultural Universities, but promised to provide an update at the March meeting in Washington, DC.

STATE ENERGY ADVISORY BOARD
TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
FEBRUARY 18, 2010, 1:00 PM – 1:51 PM EST

- PGD questioned the relationship of this program to Recovery Act funds, wondering if this program will be permanent. CJP answered that there is nothing to indicate that this program will dissolve once Recovery Act funds are gone, but believes this will stay effective throughout the Recovery process and beyond.
- JS thanked CJP for her time and the update, and asked the Board if there were any other questions. Seeing that there were none, JS closed this agenda item and CJP indicated that she would be leaving the call at this time but looked forward to seeing all the members in March.
- The meeting then turned back to the first item on the agenda, an update on the delivery of Board Resolution 10-01 to the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE). JS turned the discussion over to GB noting he was the one who hand-delivered the Resolution.
- GB mentioned that during his last trip to Washington, DC, he attempted to meet with Assistant Secretary Zoi, but was not able to accomplish that meeting. He did, however, hand-deliver three copies of the Resolution to the front office. Despite not yet hearing back from Ms. Zoi, GB did have a discussion with Steve Chalk while Mr. Chalk was out in Golden, Colorado, for meetings. In these talks with Mr. Chalk, Resolution 10-01 was discussed, along with other Board updates, and GB mentioned that Mr. Chalk said he would speak to Ms. Zoi about 10-01 and encourage her to reply to the Board in the affirmative with regard to this Resolution.
- DH asked GB if he thought the Board should try to bring a USDA official to the Board's live meeting in March to begin the conversation. GB believes any Board action would be premature and STEAB should wait until the Assistant Secretary responds to this Resolution before beginning discussion.
- Seeing there were no other comments or questions on Resolution 10-01, JS turned to the next agenda item of "Management changes at the Golden Field Office (GFO)."
- GB headed this topic by informing the Board that he and GFO received an email from Assistant Secretary Zoi indicating that GFO would immediately receive a new acting manager, Carol Battershell, who would be acting on-site. As background, GB spoke to Ms. Battershell's previous work as part of the Commercialization Team, as well as working with the DOE Automotive program. Dan Carol (DC) added that he knows Ms. Battershell; and that prior to coming to DOE, she worked for British Petroleum (BP).
- Moving on to the next agenda item, JS took time to speak about a media alert sent to the Board by GB about the State Energy Efficiency Action Network (SEE). This was a group announced at the recent National Association of State Energy Offices (NASEO) meeting by Kathleen Hogan, Deputy Assistant Secretary, and the purpose is to help with financing, policy and whatever else the States need in order to ramp-up their energy efficiency initiatives. JS asked PGD if he had any additional information as his name was tied to this new group by Ms. Hogan.
- PGD explained to the Board that he has participated in conversations with Ms. Zoi about what this new group should be and how it should move forward. This group really is the "next step" after the National Action Plan for Energy Efficiency rolled-out, which had great representation from a variety of stakeholders and succeeded in bringing together many parts of the country which had never before thought about the impact and goals of energy efficiency. PGD reiterated that it is clear that all stakeholders from the beginning of the process need to be involved, but first the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) needs to take ownership over this network and engage the States in a way that proves the most productive. There will be more clarity forthcoming, but as of this moment PGD noted he is providing any suggestions and inputs the folks involved in this find helpful.

STATE ENERGY ADVISORY BOARD
TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
FEBRUARY 18, 2010, 1:00 PM – 1:51 PM EST

- GB asked PGD if there was any action the STEAB could take, and PGD answered that at this point there was no action; however, he had mentioned to Assistant Secretary Zoi that the Board is in a position to take a role in this new program. According to PGD, the Assistant Secretary is taking this under advisement.
- JS thanked PGD for his elaboration on this topic and posed the question to the Board if this is something they would like to add to the March agenda. PGD suggested that there should be a place-holder in the March agenda because it all depends on what is able to happen with this process between now and March. He finished this idea by noting he feels the STEAB is an obvious choice to be in the mix with this program because of the Board's tight ties with the States and DOE.
- JS moved the discussion along by turning to the next topic of an Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) Sub-Committee within STEAB. According to JS, this was a conversation the Board had discussed once the Block Grants were funded and the Board felt STEAB would be able to be a good fit for the sub-committee required by the appropriations language.
- GB added that JS was correct in her recollection of a previous conversation and expanded by saying this came up over a year ago during talks with Office of Weatherization and Intergovernmental Programs (OWIP) managers. Several weeks ago, GB received a call from Mark Johnson who opened a dialogue to establish a Block Grant sub-committee under STEAB. The expectation is that during the upcoming STEAB March meeting, OWIP will submit a plan for the establishment a sub-committee to STEAB which focuses on Block Grants. Once this plan is submitted, the Board can then discuss during the March meeting and take official action if this plan is amenable to the Board.
- JD inquired if DOE had put money in the budget for FY 2010 for Block Grants. GB responded that he was not sure, but he did not believe that DOE had allocated money to that purpose. JS agreed, but noted that the US Conference of Mayors is currently working on the Hill to resolve funding issues related to Block Grants. GB replied that any sub-committee under STEAB would be for a limited term of around three years, and made up of a small number of people. The funding for the sub-committee would come out of EECBG funds and not out of the STEAB funds. Since the final plan is not yet outlined, this is something the Board will want to discuss during their March meeting, in order to solicit additional discussion from both staff within DOE and within the Board.
- JS agreed with GB and read part of the EECBG language which allowed for the creation of a committee, and many of the Board members agreed that the creation of any committee to advise on Block Grants should be formed under STEAB since the Board had a strong and diverse make-up of members from across the country and from within SEP, WAP and other programs.
- Moving forward with the teleconference, JS opened discussion up to the Board with regard to the proposed draft of the March meeting agenda. She noted that some changes had already been made, but asked the Board for their feedback.
- GB added that there were a few changes already, one with regard to Energy Education. Though Michelle Fox is willing to speak to this topic, both she and GB felt this was best tabled until the next live Board meeting. He noted there was now an open space on Thursday, but was trying to work with OWIP to fill that spot. GB asked the Board for general comments or feedback with regard to the proposed agenda with these amendments noted above.
- DH commented that the E-Extension Home Energy Community of Practice will be launched and wanted to see if the Board was interested in hearing about this project. GB said that this would be a great topic to

STATE ENERGY ADVISORY BOARD
TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
FEBRUARY 18, 2010, 1:00 PM – 1:51 PM EST

fit into one of the open discussion time-slots where the Board provided updates to each other and perhaps this would also be a good place for PGD to update the Board on any progress with SEE.

- JD suggested the Board spend time discussing how EERE is interfacing with National Laboratories with regard to technology transfer. GB informed the Board that the next live meeting would most likely take place at a National Lab, and perhaps this discussion could be tabled until that next live meeting. JS suggested that this topic could be briefly touched on by Wendolyn Holland, of the Commercialization Team, during her discussion because perhaps she has additional insight as to any policy changes.
- DC contributed that since a big Advanced Research Projects Agency – Energy (ARPA-E) conference takes place the week before the STEAB meeting, someone could come and provide an update to the Board about what took place at that conference, while at the same time perhaps providing an update with regard to the labs. Also, DOT, EPA and HUD got a new sustainable initiative, and are putting out \$100 million in planning grants to different regions. Perhaps the Board could work to get someone to talk to the Board about what the vision is of that initiative. According to DC, the formal announcement just came out about a month ago, and in the coming weeks there will be additional updates about national partnerships. GB asked DC to follow up on this and provide an update to the Board next month at the meeting, and DC agreed to spear-head that update.
- LS suggested that any openings in the agenda could potentially be filled by Program Managers from any of the 10 EERE programs in order to provide the Board with comprehensive updates. He would also like to hear from Managers of programs outside EERE to see if there are opportunities occurring within other programs that are applicable to those within EERE.
- JS finished up this agenda topic by reminding members that they needed to allow for sufficient time for the Board to discuss the Annual Report for FY 2009, as well as for the Board to review and discuss their strategic direction and focus areas.
- The Board came to the point in their teleconference where the meeting was opened up to public comments. GB noted that he was not contacted by any members of the public requesting to make comments, thus seeing as there were none, JS closed the teleconference to public comment.
- JS then turned to other Board issues and announced there were three Board members who were either leaving the Board, or were unable to accept their appointment from the most recent nomination package. GB elaborated by telling the Board that Roger Duncan, of Austin Energy in Texas, will retire as of March 1, 2010. Jim Arwood, of Arizona, will retire as of March 31, 2010. Finally, Mr. Nick Sunday was unable to accept his appointment to the Board due to an increase in workload at his current position. There are three openings on the Board and GB stated that he is currently working on a new Nomination Package to submit to the front office in order to fill these openings as soon as possible.
- Another topic under this agenda item turned to Board official action which needs to be taken during the March meeting. The Annual Report draft is currently with GB for review and drafts will be available to the members at the March meeting for a formal motion.
- JS asked the Board if there were any other comments or new business to discuss. Seeing as there were no additional comments, JS thanked all members for their participation and closed the meeting.

STEAB Teleconference Minutes Scribed by Emily Lindenberg, SENTECH contractor support.