Thursday, April 17th, 2014 3:30 - 4:17 PM Eastern Time

TELECONFERENCE ATTENDEES

Designated Federal Officer (DFO):

• Julie Hughes, DFO, Sr. Advisor, EERE, DOE.

STEAB TELECONFERENCE ATTENDANCE			
BOARD MEMBERS	Present	Absent	
Jeff Ackermann, Director, Colorado Energy Office	X		
Roger Berliner, Council President, Montgomery County Council		X	
Tom Carey, Director, Energy and Rehabilitation Programs, New York	X		
State Division of Housing and Community Renewal	Λ		
William Vaughn Clark, Director, Office of Community Development,	X		
Oklahoma Department of Commerce	71		
David Gipson, Director, Energy Services Division, Georgia	X		
Environmental Facilities Authority			
Philip Giudice, Chief Executive Officer, Ambri	X		
Marion Gold, Commissioner of Energy, Rhode Island Office of	X		
Energy Resources	Λ		
Paul Gutierrez, Vice Provost for Outreach Services, Associate Dean			
and Director, Cooperative Extension Service, College of Agriculture		X	
and Home Economics, New Mexico State University			
Robert Jackson, Deputy Director, Michigan Economic Development	X		
Corporation, Michigan Energy Office			
Elliott Jacobson, Vice President for Energy Services, Action Energy	X		
Maurice Kaya, Hawaii Renewable Energy Development Venture	X		
Ashlie Lancaster, Director, South Carolina Energy Office	X		
Katrina Metzler, Section Supervisor, Weatherization Office of	X		
Community Assistance, Ohio Development Services Agency	Λ		
Lou Moore, Chief, Energy and Pollution Prevention Bureau, Montana		X	
Frank Murray, former President and CEO, New York State Energy	N/		
Research and Development Authority	X		
Steve Payne, Managing Director, Housing Improvements &		v	
Preservation, Department of Commerce		X	
William "Dub" Taylor, Director, Texas State Energy Conservation		v	
Office		X	
David Terry, Executive Director, ASERTTI	X		
Malcolm Woolf, Sr. Vice President, Policy and Government Affairs,	X		
Advanced Energy Economy	Λ		
Daniel Zaweski, Assistant Vice President - Energy Efficiency and			
Distributed Generation Program, Public Service Electric and Gas		X	
Company, Long Island.			

Contractor Support & Other DOE Staff:

• Emily Zuccaro, SRA, International Inc.

Thursday, April 17th, 2014 3:30 - 4:17 PM Eastern Time

AGENDA		
March Meeting Follow-up on Outstanding Items	Julie Hughes	
STEAB Task Force Updates: - Review Membership by Task Force - Task Force Updates and proposed deliverables	Frank Murray	
Technical Assistance and State Needs (Topic Suggested During the March Meeting) - What do states need? - What does DOE already have in terms of support? - How can we improve TA offerings?	Frank Murray and Julie Hughes	
Public Comment	Frank Murray	
Other/New Business - August 2014 Meeting Details - Future calls with DOE staff to gain insight or continue dialogue begun in March. Who do we want to engage with? Frank Murray Frank Murray		

- Julie Hughes (JH), Designated Federal Officer (DFO) of the STEAB, opened the meeting by reviewing the first agenda topic. She provided background which elaborated for the Board that the main follow-up from the March live meeting was to determine the areas of focus for each of the STEAB's Task Forces. She then asked all the Task Force Chairs to provide their comments and suggested goals as determined by the Task Forces on the calls which were held during the weeks between the live meeting and this call.
- The Weatherization Task Force Chair, Elliott Jacobson (EJ), provided the first update. He noted the Task Force wants to engage directly on monthly calls with a Department of Energy (DOE) representative from the Weatherization Program. That is currently being addressed but hopefully a representative will join soon. The Task Force is still working on how to stabilize the different state programs that need to adhere to aggressive new standards and requirements as outlined by Congress. The changes affect the way the programs are run and each state is facing different challenges and the states are still looking to DOE for guidance.
- Tom Carey (TC) added to this summary that the Task Force had a call to discuss additional areas of focus aside from the new requirements and funding issues. The areas the group discussed addressing were as follows:
 - 1. Building on the results of the National Weatherization Evaluation and lessons-learned from activities undertaken during the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)
 - 2. Reinventing Weatherization as a program so it remains viable and effective
 - 3. Addressing and reviewing certifications and the new quality requirements
 - 4. Looking at how technological innovation affects the program

Thursday, April 17th, 2014 3:30 - 4:17 PM Eastern Time

- 5. Increasing and improving communication between states and DOE
- JH added that these items were discussed at the March meeting, but the fifth item came out of the Weatherization Task Force call. These objectives are also included in the document which JH provided to the STEAB as a "follow-up" from the meeting. The document outlined all the different Task Forces, and the ideas and concepts which were brought-up during Board discussion at the March meeting. She went on to remind each member of the Board to review the paper and use it as a working document to track the focus areas of each Task Force. The next steps for the Weatherization Task Force will be to review the five areas noted previously and create a write-up and explanation of each area and present that to DOE. JH finished her comments by saying she mentioned these Weatherization focus areas to Dr. Kathleen Hogan at DOE and Dr. Hogan was positive about the direction and focus of the Task Force moving forward.
- Frank Murray (FM) reiterated the importance of continuing to address funding issues, but was excited that the group is also taking a broader approach to Weatherization. FM knows Dr. David Danielson, Assistant Secretary for the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE), wants to see how STEAB can advise on the actual running of the program, not just the funding concerns.
- The next Task Force update came from Malcolm Woolf (MW) the Chair of the Quadrennial Energy Review (QER) Task Force. The Task Force had a call earlier in the week to discuss how STEAB would assist the QER team to identify vulnerabilities related to transmission, storage and distribution. The Task Force discussed vulnerabilities as propane, affordability, infrastructure, and others. The group will recommend things DOE can do to make the QER outcomes actionable. One question raised was how recommendations that will be made in the QER (e.g., for things states can do to move the country toward a clean energy future) will inform DOE's work with the states. The Task Force will be pointing out one particular issue of concern: states often lack the capacity (staff, resources, knowledge, authority) to do what is required to move towards a clean energy economy. The QER process could identify where such capacity gaps exist to ensure all critical roles are covered. One of the suggestions of how to take an initial cut and determining the capacity gaps is to survey Governors about issues such as that. From those surveys DOE could extrapolate areas where there is a capacity gap, and then flag these as areas where action are needed to remedy the deficiencies.
- Additionally, MW went on to say that the DOE QER team has been hosting a series of regional stakeholder meetings to talk about the process and to solicit questions and concerns from different regions. It was noted that there were no state representatives present at the first regional meeting and that is an area the Task Force will address with DOE to reinforce the need for state-level investment in this stakeholder process. These regional meetings help to highlight regional issues associated with the QER and state input is vital to that process. In developing the second and third QER meetings to be held in Rhode Island and Connecticut, the DOE QER team has been liaising with Marion Gold; she has been advising them on state and local representation, which will be reflected in the agenda.
- Finally MW noted that it is important for STEAB not only to highlight issues of state and local importance, but also to help DOE determine how to implement recommendations of the QER. The Task Force is interested in the metrics that will measure how well the recommendations are implemented by the states as well as federal government. The QER will make vital recommendations about transmission, storage and distribution but it would be helpful for DOE to track the implementation and follow-through on the findings it reports.
- David Terry (DT) commented on how the National Association of State Energy Officials (NASEO) is sensitive to the lack of state representation at these regional meetings and they are working with the host states to make sure at least the State Energy Offices (SEO) are invited and plugged-in to these meetings.

Thursday, April 17th, 2014 3:30 - 4:17 PM Eastern Time

- JH added that John Richards, who works for Karen Wayland and the office heading up the QER, wanted STEAB to send him information on the names of the individuals who are the big-picture thinkers in the transmission, storage and distribution areas who also have a deep regional knowledge of how these issues are addressed and viewed at the state level. This is an open invitation for STEAB to recommend which state-level individuals should be invited to attend these regional meetings. JH asked Board members to send the names to her directly and she would coordinate with Mr. Richards on the invitations.
- JH noted that DOE has recommended to the White House that instead of a few regional meetings they hold maybe 15 16 sessions to make sure DOE receives adequate input.
- Marion Gold (MG) continued by saying the northeast states are well represented at the upcoming meeting and she will be there along with the Chair of the Rhode Island Public Utility Commission. There will also be representatives there from Connecticut and Massachusetts and other New England states. She went on to say the issue is getting Weatherization representatives and asked if EJ would be able to come to the regional meeting and provide his and the Weatherization perspective. MG finished her comments noting it is important to provide DOE with constructive comments on how to proceed with the QER. Additionally, one of the big issues of the meeting will be if the states do or do not have the capacity to deal the complicated issues related to transmission and distribution.
- FM thanked MG for her comments but made the point that while discussions of infrastructure are important there also needs to be a discussion about funding. The point needs to be made that with minimal funding states can then leverage investments and provide even greater outcomes because of the existing infrastructure.
- MW thanked the Board for their input and noted that the Task Force would convey its input to the QER team, as discussed, in a letter from the STEAB.
- Robert Jackson (RJ) spoke next about the US Energy Productivity and Economic Competitiveness Task Force. The Task Force had a call to focus on responding to the DOE Voucher Program discussed during the March meeting. Ashlie Lancaster (AL) provided the group with thoughts on the design elements of the program and summarized the ideas Dr. Danielson laid-out. The Task Force will propose to DOE that they operate this as a pilot program within a few key regions. The Task Force looked at aspects of the program such as whether the pilot program should include all the labs in the country or just the labs in the regions of the pilot; or whether the program should be directed at only small or mid-sized businesses with early stage technology development. Also the group discussed the program flowing through the SEOs, but did not discuss potential barriers to the program or how to measure success. Funding was discussed briefly and the Task Force still needs to determine what the typical cost would be to get the program to be successful at the pilot stage. RJ then asked the STEAB about their thoughts on this program noting there are other issues that need to be addressed but what are the Board's preliminary comments on what the Task Force has been discussion. RJ finalized his comments saying the group's next steps are to update the document originally circulated by AL. From there the Task Force will edit and provide the revised document to the full Board for their thoughts and consensus comments and then transmit a final document to DOE. The goal is to have the document into DOE officially by early May.
- JH thanked RJ and the Task Forces for their feedback and also for coming and participating at the March meeting in Golden, CO. The meeting was very successful and that was due to the level of participation by the STEAB and she wanted to thank everyone for taking the time to participate.
- FM suggested the members of the Board all make sure they are volunteering on at least one of the STEAB's Task Forces. If any members want to join additional Task Forces they should feel free as the more participation the better for DOE.

Thursday, April 17th, 2014 3:30 - 4:17 PM Eastern Time

- JH commented that the third agenda item regarding technical assistance may be an area better suited for offline discussion as it is a big topic. She suggested one option would be for Board members to email her directly with ideas for emerging issues where technical assistance from DOE could be useful to discuss on future calls.
- FM turned to the Public Comment portion of the call. He asked if there were any members of the public on the phone or any members of the public who wished to make comments. Seeing as there were no public comments FM moved on to provide details on the dates and location of the August STEAB meeting. Details of the meeting are being sent out to the Board for booking rooms and information on booking flights will be forthcoming from the Board's contractor support.
- EJ thanked FM for the information and asked JH if a Weatherization Stakeholder Meeting could be held in August in conjunction with the full Board meeting. JH suggested a survey be sent to the members who participated in the previous meetings to determine if that timing works for the group and a decision could be made based on the survey results.
- JH and FM asked if there was any additional or new business and seeing as there was none, the April teleconference concluded.

Teleconference minutes were scribed by STEAB contractor support, Emily Zuccaro