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MS. de JONG: Welcome to the Public Lithium Valley Commission Meeting. We are going to go ahead and start off this meeting by announcing the fourteenth and final appointment of Lithium Valley Commissioner Castaneda. And I will go ahead and ask if he is able to go and introduce himself to the folks in the meeting.

COMMISSIONER CASTANEDA: Well, thank you, Elisabeth. I appreciate it.

Again, my name is Steve Castaneda and I'm very honored to be part of this organization, of this group. The work is extremely important. It's been something that I know has been near and dear not only to the folks in Sacramento's hearts but also the people in and around Imperial and Riverside Counties.

A little bit about myself, born and raised in San Diego. I moved to the City of Chula Vista and was, I think, you know, very fortunate to be a member of the Planning Commission there for eight years and then I served two terms in the City Council and currently I am an Elected Board Member of the Sweetwater Authority, which is the retail water agency that serves the City of Chula Vista, the City of National City, and parts of the County of San Diego and South San Diego.
And so kind of getting back to a little bit of my interest in this particular matter is that our family owned a business for many years in Brawley. And even before that, we, our family used to do a lot of fishing and we used to do a lot of camping out in the Salton Sea many, many years ago. And so, you know, the water and the shore and the environment around with the birds and the habitat and everything is very near and dear to us. And it's -- I know for everyone who is familiar with the area, it's been sort of painful to watch the degradation over the years. And everyone with a lot of anticipation, looking forward to the revitalization, the reinvigoration of the ecosystem there is something that is sorely needed and it needs to happen very quickly.

So when I was informed about this Commission and asked if I'd be interested in applying, I was very not only excited to do that but very heartened as well. So I'm glad to be part of it.

So my current business is I own PRM Consulting, Inc., and it is a marketing and public relations firm based out of Chula Vista. We have a number of clients. The Southern California Gas Company is one, but we also work for a number of cities and other local governments with respect to public relations.

I am partners with my wife Tanya and very, very
fortunate to have her as a partner. And so this is -- this is again a very, very exciting opportunity for me. And I just look forward to learning. As I said, I just learned about this meeting about a half an hour ago, so I will be a very attentive listener and will take some time, but I will assure you that I will -- I will be an active participant and appreciate the opportunity to serve with you all. Thank you.

MS. de JONG: Thank you so much.

And this meeting is going to be led by Vice Chair Ryan Kelley.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you, Elisabeth.

So hello, everyone, and welcome to the Lithium Valley Commission Meeting. And welcome, Mr. Castaneda. Great to have another Brawley native on the Commission.

I also want to wish Chairperson Paz blessings for her new family addition and a speedy return when she is able to.

So with that, I will turn it over to Elisabeth as we get started to go through some of our procedural housekeeping matters.

MS. de JONG: Thank you, Vice Chair.

So this meeting is being conducted entirely remotely via Zoom. That means that we are in separate locations and communicating only through electronic means.
We are meeting in this fashion consistent with Executive Orders N-25-20 and N-29-20, and the recommendations from the California Department of Public Health to encourage physical distancing in order to slow the spread of Covid-19.

This meeting is being recorded as well as transcribed by a court reporter. The transcript will be posted to the electronic docket. The recording of the meeting will be available on the Lithium Valley Commission webpage. Members of the public will be muted during the presentations, but there will be an opportunity for public comment on each agenda item and additional opportunity for public comment towards the end of the agenda.

To provide public comment, please use the raised hand feature in the Zoom application to be called on to speak. When you speak, please provide your name and affiliation. If you have called in by phone, you will need to dial star 9 to raise your hand and then star 6 to unmute yourself. Before speaking, please say and spell your name for the court reporter.

There is also a Q&A window in the Zoom application which you may type your questions. If you want to provide public comment but are unable to raise your hand in the Zoom application or by phone, then during the public comment portion of the meeting you may type your comment into the Q&A window so we can relay your comment.
We'll go over these instructions again during the times for public comment. Please remember to stay muted until you've been called on to speak.

We also have a chat function available for IT support. We ask that the Lithium Valley Commissioners use the chat for IT as well. Any other comments are considered substantive to the conversation and made publicly for B-K compliance.

I will go ahead and read off your roll call before handing it back to Vice Chair Kelley.

So we are going to go ahead and hold this roll call to determine a quorum. I will call your name, please respond if you are present and turn on your camera, if you can.

If you're still with us, Commissioner Castaneda? He may have had to step away.

Okay. Commissioner Rod Colwell.

COMMISSIONER COLWELL: Present.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Commissioner Roderic Dolega.

I do not hear a response.

Commissioner Miranda Flores.

COMMISSIONER FLORES: Present.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Commissioner Martha Guzman Aceves is not able to
attend the meeting today.

Commissioner James Hanks.

COMMISSIONER HANKS: Present.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Vice Chair Ryan Kelley.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Present.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Commissioner Arthur "Richie" Lopez.

COMMISSIONER LOPEZ: Present.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Commissioner Luis Olmedo.

COMMISSIONER OLMEDO: Present.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

As we heard, Chair Silvia Paz is not able to attend today.

Commissioner Frank Ruiz.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ: Present.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Commissioner Manfred Scott.

I do not hear a response.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Present.

MS. de JONG: Oh, okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Tom Soto.

COMMISSIONER SOTO: Here.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.
And we will have Commissioner Weisgall join us a little late for the meeting.

We have at least eight members, meaning we do have a quorum. And also in attendance today we have CEC Commissioner Douglas as well as advisors from both her office and Chair Hochschild's office.

I will now hand the meeting back to Vice Chair Kelley.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you, Elisabeth.

We'll review the agenda and its discussion. So I see that we have done a roll call and welcome. We'll come to the past meeting minutes. Information items, to be able to find out media and legislative updates; then the Commission update so the Commissioners will have an opportunity, I believe at three minutes each, to be able to tell what activities they've been performing since the last meeting; then our legislative report and discussion; determination of the agenda topics, speakers, and presentations for future meetings. And this will complete, I think, Terra's presentation that was cut short at the last month's meeting. And then public comment. And adjournment, which could not be -- maybe we could move up on the agenda, I don't know, I'm just joking.

So with that, let's go to the administrative item. And, Elisabeth.
MS. de JONG: Thank you. So I'm happy to share the minutes of the previous meeting, if any Commissioners request it. And if not, we can open it for a vote, turn to public comments, and then finalize that vote.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Do we have any comments or is there a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER SOTO: Move to approve. Soto.

COMMISSIONER COLWELL: I'll second.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: We have a motion by Commissioner Soto, seconded by Commissioner Colwell. Any discussion?

Okay, hearing none, I call for the vote.

MR. [SPEAKER]: I --

MS. de JONG: Thank you -- oh, sorry, before we call the vote, we want to turn to public comment for comment on the minutes -- I'm sorry -- the previous --

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Forgot about that, okay.

MS. de JONG: -- meeting minutes. So if anyone in the audience has any comments, please raise their hand. And if you called in, please dial star 9 to raise your hand and then star 6 to unmute your phones. And first we'll go through those hands raised on the Zoom application and then the phone.

I'm giving it just a second but not seeing any comments.
Okay, we do have one hand raised. You should be able to speak, Orlando Foote.

Okay. If you're able to, you should be able to unmute yourself.

We have a comment or a raised hand from Orlando Foote.

MR. FOOTE: Now can you hear me?

MS. de JONG: Yes.

MR. FOOTE: You can hear me?

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Yes.

MS. de JONG: Yes.

MR. FOOTE: Okay. Thank you. Just to -- if I wanted to review minutes of prior meetings, where would I do that?

MS. de JONG: Yeah. So we post them on the Lithium Valley Commission webpage. We can go ahead and post a link to that in the meeting chat and the opportunity --

MR. FOOTE: Now don't --

MS. de JONG: -- we do -- oh, go ahead.

MR. FOOTE: No, wait -- no, that would be a good idea.

MS. de JONG: Okay, great.

MR. FOOTE: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Are there any other public comments?
MS. de JONG: All right. Great. So I -- and maybe legal can step in, but I believe we can go ahead and move to the vote. We will provide that link to see the minutes in the -- in the chat.

MS. DYER: This is Deborah Dyer. That sounds fine, Elisabeth. You can provide the link when it's convenient on this, on the chat.

MS. de JONG: Great. Thank you.

We'll do a roll call vote. When I call your name, please let me know if you vote yes or no to approve the previous Meeting Action Minutes.

Commissioner Colwell.

COMMISSIONER COLWELL: Yes.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Commissioner Flores.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ: Yes.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Commissioner Hanks.

COMMISSIONER HANKS: Yes.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Vice Chair Kelley.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Yes.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Commissioner Lopez.

COMMISSIONER LOPEZ: Abstain.

Commissioner Olmedo.

COMMISSIONER OLMEDO: Yes.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Commissioner Ruiz.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ: Yes.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Commissioner Scott.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Abstain.

MS. de JONG: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Soto.

COMMISSIONER SOTO: Yes.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

So we have a majority vote yes, the motion passes.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: All right. Thank you, Elisabeth.

We now come to public comment, so before we go to the next agenda item we now open the floor to any public comment relating to the last meeting’s action items. And these are opportunity for public comment later in the agenda as well.

MS. de JONG: We don't see any additional public comments at this time.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Okay.

MS. de JONG: We can --
VICE CHAIR KELLEY: So a reminder that you will have a comment, as they appear on the agenda.

So then we will move onto the Media and Legislative Updates. And I believe, Elisabeth, we will be hearing from the Energy Commission staff.

MS. de JONG: We will. First up we'd like to hear from Richard Rojas.

MR. ROJAS: Yes. Good afternoon, everyone. Specially for Commissioner Castaneda. I am with the California Energy Commission, in the Office of Governmental and International Affairs. At each of these meetings we provide short legislative updates on bills that may be of interest to the Lithium Valley Commission. And we give you some dates on the -- in the Legislature that have passed and some important dates upcoming, as well as any other special communications with government.

In the weeks behind we had a couple of dates, June 4 was the last date for bills to pass out of their house of origin. So all bills that are still alive are now in the second house.

June 15, recently, the budget bill was signed and passed.

And weeks coming up, July 14 is the last day for the Policy Committees to meet and report bills to get out of their committee and go to Appropriations. And July 16,
summer recess begins, so they will adjourn until August 16.

There are three bills that we flag that the Lithium Valley Commission may be interested one. The key one is AB 983. That's Eduardo Garcia. And this is the bill that deals with community workforce agreements and authorizes public entities to utilize those agreements for construction projects relating to battery manufacturing and lithium-based technology. It amended on June 15 and the only amendment was a change in the specification. In the previous version, it said, "lithium-based technology," now it says, "lithium-based technology in Salton Sea Geothermal Resource Area," specifically.

There are no different supporters or opponents on this bill. The Western Electric Contractors Association thinks that it will cost more money to do the same work, so we'll see if they come off or stay on. And this bill has been referred to the Senate Governance and Finance Committee. There is no date yet set for that hearing. We will keep an eye on it and report to you at the next meeting on that bill.

The next two bills are both Henry Stern, AB -- excuse me -- SB 423, and this requires the Energy Commission to provide an assessment to the Legislature by December 31, 2022. And the assessment is to look at emerging renewable energy and zero carbon resources to support a green,
reliable, and resilient electric grid. And so we believe that this bill is seeking to get renewables -- increasing procurement of renewables in the CPUC procurement requirements.

And in the findings and declarations on that bill, it calls out that California is the global leader in solar energy and lithium ion battery storage deployment. So any time you look at the term lithium to flag certain bills, and this one came up.

SB 551, also Henry Stern. This creates the California Electric Vehicle Authority inside the Governor's Office. And their responsibility would be to corral all the different agencies and make sure everybody is on the same page relative to electric vehicle deployment -- infrastructure deployment. It also mentions that one of their responsibilities is to support an improved battery supply chain, including use of lithium from the Salton Sea specifically.

So those are the three bills that we're flagging. We'll look for anything that comes up either through a gut and amend or an amendment that brings lithium back in.

There is one other point that we would mention. Senator Hueso and Assemblymember Eduardo Garcia wrote a joint letter to President Biden on June 9 and it encourages investment in domestic battery supply chain. It's a three-
page letter. I think you may already have a copy of that.
We have not heard any feedback from the President, but we
will keep an ear to the ground and see if we can't learn his
reaction to that letter.

And with that, I am finished and can answer any
questions if you have any.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Are there any questions?
COMMISSIONER FLORES: I guess I have some
questions just regarding the letter and the actions that the
Biden Administration has taken, you know, to make sure that
we have a strengthened critical supply chain, and just kind
of maybe a thought for us to make sure that this is also
something the Commission is seeking forward as we move
forward, to make sure that we're in a line with the
administration.

MR. ROJAS: Thank you. Yeah, we'll keep an eye on
any reaction from President Biden.

COMMISSIONER SOTO: Hey, Richard, what happened
with the Garcia content, lithium content legislation?

MR. ROJAS: That is now a two-year bill, so --
COMMISSIONER SOTO: Okay.

MR. ROJAS: -- that could come up in January of
next year and it likely will.

COMMISSIONER SOTO: Okay. Good.

MR. ROJAS: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER SOTO: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you, Mr. Rojas.

Are there any other questions?

All right, seeing none, is the next speaker, Elisabeth?

MS. de JONG: Yes. Thank you. So we are going to defer the Media Update to the July meeting, so that should - that should finish the Media and Legislative Updates agenda item.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Okay. Then we will move on to the Commissioner Updates. Now we will ask each Commissioner to provide an update focusing on their sub-body topics for up to five minutes. Let's be sure to allow for all the Commissioners to give an update before opening up for any discussion and questions. And you don't have to take all five minutes if you don't want to. So I'll turn it over to by order, I guess, and, Elisabeth, do you have a listing by sub groups?

MS. de JONG: I do, yes. Actually if it's all right, we could go in alphabetical order if that suits everyone.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: It's good.

MS. de JONG: Okay. So, Commissioner Colwell.

COMMISSIONER COLWELL: Thank you, Elisabeth.

Boss Chair Kelley asked me to put together a short
presentation of the view of the alignment with the Green New Bill and just focusing on the points of alignment from the federal administration to what, how that aligns with Lithium Valley. So before I get started, though, and I think we just got the news that the CPUC just approved a carve-out for a thousand megawatts of new-built geothermal energy by -- delivered by 2026, right. These are ten-year projects. We've been eight years in our project. So very exciting news. I will let maybe Vice Chair Kelley expand on that later on, but it's wonderful news. That literally just came through 15 minutes ago, so really good stuff, so.

But thank you for your time. You know we have been extremely busy. This is focused on obviously related to our site, but this is the Lithium Valley as such, if you look at this in context. We'd like to walk through the government's plans, the federal government's plans, how to -- you know, plans to develop a domestic lithium supply chain. Next slide, please.

So I might read these word for word. This information available. Basically, this month the federal government released a national blueprint for lithium batteries. This blueprint was produced by the Department of Energy, Defense, Commerce, and State. The document outlines five main goals, which you will see here. On the left,
outlined with this very specific ask. Briefly, these are to secure domestic raw materials sustainably, support and the process of these materials which is currently zero in this country. There is very little lithium produced in the United States. Attract cathode and battery and subsequent industries to the United States and localize this supply chain. Support battery recycling. And create jobs and stimulate research and development.

Without reading the points, the sub points, these matching capabilities. And just to learn our site, the Lithium Valley as a whole obviously matches perfectly to these particular goals. So we try to spell this out and visualize this document so the fellow Commissioners and public in general can really hopefully understand how well this suits those goals.

You know as you can see, these details offered a very clear pathway to achieve these goals at the Salton Sea. So we knew this right now, with the right support. The next slide, please.

Yeah. This slide breaks down the production process of batteries through to EVs and energy-storage systems. You know, raw materials production. Materials processing and the opportunity, how it expands into cell manufacturing and actually pack manufacturing. So you can see that, you know, the entire lithium battery supply chain
can be supported here in the Imperial Valley. You know it can be supported with green STEM, green electricity, and a ready workforce, jobs ready. We're ready to go. Again, our development is eight years in the making to just about get to day one.

You know we are the most sustainable lithium recovery process in the world today. There's just no doubt about it. There are no byproducts to this. That's a very little footprint. So it's -- you know, it ticks a lot of boxes besides being -- also being a very competitive-priced product in the global stage. And when it comes to quartile cost, we're absolutely in the first quartile.

The process is a closed-loop system. You know, we'll obviously expand up to that resource capacity. CTI has a resource capacity of 300,000 tons of lithium per annum. So as this -- what's unique about, I guess, geothermal lithium extraction and its integration is basically its scalable nature. It's not an open-cut mine, it's not a salar, it's a situation where as the market demands more lithium, more green lithium, we can scale up along with that demand with an appropriate leading time to, you know, to match that supply. The next slide, please.

So that, you know, I think it goes without saying there is an extraordinary opportunity here. Let's say, you know, as Vice Chair Kelley put to me, let's just get to the
point, what's really required here, I mean on this approach, I mean what we really need is a collaborative effort from federal and state government, or more effort to streamline a process that's already been -- you know, the permitting process, obviously we're sticking with that, but a lot of the reports have been done so many times, you know, to the left, for example, that's an image of where our Hell's Kitchen Plant will be located. Obviously we still go through the process, but I think there's a lot that can be done with the right support.

And, you know, fundamentally there's a window here, this window is closing quite quickly and we don't want the Imperial Valley to miss out again with windows closing. You know it's a two-year window. 2024 is the inflection point, we believe. And there is a window opportunity that we can sort of take advantage of. So really commercial operations today, that's the ideal scenario, and that's really driven by commercial demand for onshore lithium production, contracts.

So if there is a way that we Commissioners can think about this and get this narrative to the feds, as you have previously seen, the match to the Green New Deal of the federal government and the great work the State of California is doing here with the Commission is just a wonderful opportunity overall. And with that, I thank you
so much for the opportunity.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you, Commissioner Colwell.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

And, Commissioner Flores.

COMMISSIONER FLORES: Yeah, I don't have any updates. But I'm definitely looking forward to a continued discussion and whatever. And I'll pass. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you.

MS. de JONG: Commissioner Hanks.

COMMISSIONER HANKS: Yes. I'd just like to show that those of us that are involved with the known drilled thermal resource, they're busy involved in negotiations on the parcels of land that -- that IAB currently has control of. And although we are under a nondisclosure agreement, I can just say this much, that things are moving quite rapidly. We still have issues with permitting and some issues with some of our geo save responsibilities; but along this same line we have interested parties that are making contacts with us weekly, wanting to know what resources may be available for development, whether private, public, or federal grounds. So we have tried to be as cooperative as we can.

It makes it very difficult to be under so many different nondisclosure agreements, but we're -- we're
making good headways. And I'd like to voice some of the concerns that Mr. Colwell mentioned, that we have deadlines. There are purchase power agreements within the -- that are dated for development for the geothermal side of it, which is critical for the lithium development. So those things are moving along. I think we're really going to have to concentrate on the permitting aspect, maybe get some extra help there.

That's all I have.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you, Mr. Hanks -- or Commissioner Hanks.

Next --

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

So we move to you, Vice Chair Kelley.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: It’s to me?

MS. de JONG: Yes.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: All right, so I will be brief, but Rod kind of spoke to it. The action by the PUC today is something that we have been advocating for for quite a while. And we always said that, you know, the Salton Sea, we don't look at as a burden, we look at it as an opportunity. And so now we have -- we should have such a problem, is what we were saying yesterday, now we have a problem. How would we see this kind of development happening now, how can we make it work right.
So a few of us were able to get together in the county a couple of days ago and we started talking about this proactively. And I think that Commissioner Olmedo will speak about it, but we had in terms from the community, the county, and industry. And I think that we're talking about how we -- how we will address all these concerns that mutually benefit and bring something back to this Commission to see.

And I was also encouraged today through the Salton Sea Authority that the University of California Riverside has got some meaningful information that they have done, and they want to be engaged in our conversation. And so we will include them.

But I will leave it at that: We should have such a problem and now we do.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Next up is Commissioner Lopez.

COMMISSIONER LOPEZ: No updates at this time.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Commissioner Olmedo.

COMMISSIONER OLMEDO: I have no -- no updates other than I want to thank Commissioner Kelley, Supervisor Kelley in making an invitation to having conversations that I think will be fruitful for the larger discussion here at the Commission. Thank you.
MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Commissioner Ruiz.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ: No updates at this time.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Commissioner Scott.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: No -- I don't have nothing at this time.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Commissioner Soto.

COMMISSIONER SOTO: Not too much other than the fact that, you know, there is a lot of alignment with respect to a number of Biden and Harris initiatives that we sent letters for that Assemblymember Garcia and Hueso sent letters for, and then working closely with those offices as well on enhancing some of the regulatory and legislative framework to create greater incentives for lithium production chains. So all of that said, you know, there is a lot going on but nothing more than that to report right now.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you, Commissioner Soto.

Anybody else?

Elisabeth, or did we go through the list?

MS. de JONG: Yes. So now that we've heard all of the Commissioner updates we can move to public comment on
both the Media, Legislation, and Commissioner Updates.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Okay. Is there --

MS. de JONG: Okay.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: -- anyone who is going to make public comment?

MS. de JONG: So if you're joining us by Zoom on the computer, please use the raised-hand feature and if you have called in, please dial star 9 to raise your hand and star 6 to unmute your phone line. First we'll go through the hands raised on the Zoom application and then if there are any on the phone.

I see Vijay Dhar. I have allowed you to speak, you should be able to unmute.

MR. DHAR: Can you hear me?

MS. de JONG: Yes.

MR. DHAR: Yeah. So actually I have been at these Commissioner meetings for several months and I have been hearing about two requests about enterprise zone and the permitting process but, you know, I had actually early on requested that this should be made -- these two topics should be made, you know, part of the agenda and some presentation should be given about all the aspects of one being -- actually being proposed and what can be done about it, but we can't hear this all along on the meetings, but we don't know what we are -- what we can do and what you do.
So that was one.

I also have another -- another point, that, you know, actually I work for New Energy Nexus and I went to Lithium Valley a couple of weeks ago and went to CGR and also engaged with some Tribes to discuss, you know, things. So I think that because day minus one is today, we should be having community engaged day minus one and we should be talking about that also in some kind of detail. And so I think that should be also brought up on the agenda some time soon.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

I don't see any other hands raised at this time, so we'll turn back to you, Commissioner Kelley.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Okay. So at this time we're on to the Legislative Report Discussion. This is a continuation of Terra's presentation from the previous meeting. I did want -- before I turn it over to Terra I do want to elaborate that what Commissioner Olmedo and I spoke about was it's only a couple of days ago but we did have community representative, community-based organizations, county, and industry all in the same room talking about all the impacts of what -- what the industry has seen, what the community wants to see, mitigation, infrastructure, education, and quality-of-life issues as well.

So I know it's not much, but from the comment, I
do want you to know that we are starting and we are probably a little slow but we're moving in the right direction. And I will turn it over --

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: Coach here, Kelley, before you turn it over to Terra, can you hear me? It's Jonathan Weisgall.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Oh, yes, Jonathan, I can hear you.

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: Oh, thanks. Just a clear -- I've actually been listening for the last ten minutes or so. I'm just off a plane at Washington Dulles and I'm in a car, but I just want you to know I'm here. Actually I'll say the opportunity to say I think that -- I think you're under stating the importance of that meeting a couple of days ago. I think it was really a job of getting together a lot of different groups, community, county, industry, environmental justice, and the like, and I'm very optimistic that that group can move forward and I think coordinate very well with this commission on some ideas at the local level. So I just wanted to commend you for putting that meeting together. I think it was very successful.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you, Commissioner Weisgall. And the check is in the mail.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Terra.
MS. de JONG: If I could just take a second, actually.

Thanks for joining us, Commissioner Weisgall. We -- I'm sorry that I overlooked the phone number attendance, but we did do the individual Lithium Valley Commissioner updates. If you have anything that you would like to add at this time?

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: Not really. I think it's just safe to say we are moving ahead with our lithium demonstration project. We are on target. I was actually there onsite yesterday. We have got our rebar ready to start construction. The site of course is cleared. We are just putting in a roadway next to -- in our Region 1 area, we've got our contractor ready to go for an EPC, Engineering Procurement Construction contract.

So really, just in a nutshell, we are underway and we are on target with our -- the first of our two grants, and this being the one from the Energy Commission to show that we can successfully recover the lithium chloride from our geothermal brine. So moving forward. That's my update.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you, Commissioner Weisgall.

MS. WEEKS: Okay. So I will hope in here. Hi, everyone, again I'm Terra Weeks. I am a Senior Advisor to Chair Hochschild of the Energy Commission and one of the
leads for the report, so supporting you all in writing the actual Lithium Valley Commission Report.

So we're going to use this time to continue the discussion that we had at last month's meeting. So this is really to help inform the outline. And, basically, what we're hoping to have is just kind of a brainstorm going through the various topics in the statute. And so then after this meeting, we'll compile the discussion from the main meeting and this discussion and help flesh out a draft of the outline that will then circulate for all the Commissioners to review.

So we covered quite a few topics last month. If we could go to the next slide, please. Perfect. And so this is the outline of the statutory requirements that I presented last month. And then will you click through -- so we covered a lot of them. We got through quite a bit of the agenda. We just have these three topics left to cover in this meeting. And so those are: Overcoming challenges to lithium extraction, looking at various lithium extraction methods, and then the economic and environmental impacts.

And so I just want to quickly note here, I know there was a discussion at the last meeting on the use of the term "recovery" versus "extraction." And so the language here is what is in the statute, although it does also use the term "recovery" in a couple of places, so I think we can
continue the discussion on which terms are appropriate for use in the actual report. So for the purposes of this discussion, I don't know if we need to completely nail down the nomenclature quite yet. I think we mostly just kind of want to talk about the various topics or perspectives that you'd like to include for each topic.

Okay, next slide, please.

So getting into the first of the three topics for this meeting, this is the fourth topic listed in the statute, and it is on methods of overcoming technical and economic challenges currently limiting lithium extraction, processing, and production from geothermal brines. And so, again like we did for last month, I will just kind of open it up for discussion. And, again, this can be just kind of a brainstorm session. So I'll first hand it over to the sub body. That's going to be the lead on this topic, which is Commissioner Hanks and Commissioner Ruiz.

So I will ask maybe one of you to open it up.

COMMISSIONER HANKS: Go ahead, Mr. Ruiz.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ: Yeah. Okay. Some of the conversations we have with community members and community leaders, some of these items, you know, have been presented. And people have questions over the technical -- or the technicalities on the waste stream, extraction, the impact to the environment, the impact to the water table. And I
think, you know, that it will be very helpful to compile the
information so that we can have a better understanding of
what are, you know, -- how can we overcome some of those
issues and how can we allow the people, allow the
communities to have a better understanding. I think we need
to return fair in the process.

And of course, you know, another topic that
currently comes to the conversation is that the economic
challenges and especially how to include the communities in
the process. So we understand that communities, especially
the Imperial County has been plagued with high levels of
unemployment, and so they are concerned that this, the
lithium industry, can be a potential win if it is done
correctly, if we can create the pipelines for the inclusion
of young people to develop the skillsets and perhaps working
with some community colleges and other educational
opportunities.

So another challenge that is usually presented is
the -- can these perhaps, you know, make geothermal energy a
lot more affordable. Obviously we are dealing with a lot of
challenges on the grid, and this can be perhaps make
geothermal energy more affordable, more competitive. So I
think it will be helpful to -- even though we haven't had a
discussion with Commissioner Hanks, I think it will be
really helpful to bring as much information so that we can
better understand it. And perhaps, looking at other models out there that have been through it, that perhaps can show us the roadmap to success.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you, Frank.

Jim, do you have more to add?

COMMISSIONER HANKS: Yes, I do, just a little bit. I think on some of the challenges, and I'm thinking more in terms of the site itself, will be the -- some type of certainty from the State of California through -- mainly through the Salton Sea Authority on establishment of what they perceive to be the water elevation of the Salton Sea long term. Also the rate of the playa exposure as seem to be increase over the last few years for whatever reason, whether it's evaporation or whether it's just the ramp-up of the transfers. If there is going to be areas that are in the Known Geothermal Resource Area that's going to be exposed, so we'll be challenged with temporary environmental issues, particularly with air quality, and trying to prepare for that.

The other aspect is with the geothermal process, we have skilled personnel, a lot of experience in those areas, but with the lithium recovery, extraction, whatever you want to call it, that's going to be a new area, and I think we are definitely going to need some type of vocational training to prepare for those operations,
especially when we get into the battery supply chain. So those -- those are the things that I'm thinking about now. There is -- there is also I think some challenges about different fees that's being considered and so forth. I think -- you know, we have talked to -- as I understand today, there's been meetings with the developers and so forth, but I think at some point in time those that have control of the minerals, mineral rights or agreements should be brought into the fold and make sure that there is -- we're not waiting till the last minute and then be all set to go and we have an issue. So I think they need to be included in those meetings.

And that's all I have to add.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you, Commissioner Hanks. And we have -- from that first meeting, we did discuss expanding to include more voices, and so I know that everybody was looking at that.

Terra.

MS. WEEKS: Okay. Are there other comments on this topic?


MS. WEEKS: Sure, go ahead, Jonathan. And then it looks like Rod also has a comment.

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: Oh, kind of hard to
collect my thoughts here while I'm driving a car, but I
guess a few. in terms of the challenges, from the industry
perspective the goal is to provide as much certainty as
possible to make lithium recovery successful. And, you
know, Commissioner Hanks talked about education, we've
talked about community involvement. I guess I -- I see
three big buckets of where the industry wants to be looking
for certainty or at least for de-risking.

And I think bucket number one is de-risking the
technology. I don't think that's really the job of the
Commission. Different companies have different
technologies. I think the second big bucket is de-risking
the production. And I think that includes everything from
workforce development, education, community outreach, things
like that, a number of the topics actually that Vice Chair
Kelley brought together the other day. And then I think
the third big bucket -- and actually, you know, maybe
included also in that bucket of de-risking production goes
the -- the incentives, local, federal, and state. And
obviously we have a sub-group looking just at that.

And then to me the third big bucket to de-risk,
and again speaking from the industry perspective, is the
market, the importance of lining up customers and a lot of
that of course the California Energy Commission grant
requires our company to produce lithium at under $4,000 a
metric ton. If we can do that, we will be able to attract a market. So that's another factor to keep up. But basically those -- you know, these de-risking points of technology, production, and market, I think kind of cover the waterfront of what I see are the overall challenges. Thank you.

MS. WEEKS: Great. Thanks, Commissioner.

And now, Commissioner Colwell, do you have a comment?

COMMISSIONER COLWELL: Just a brief comment or maybe a point of direction. I note the NREL Report that was posted today on the Lithium Valley Commission website. I would encourage Commissioners, fellow Commissioners, and the public to review that report. It's a very robust report. And actually it becomes -- it talks about technology, it identifies the attributes of sustainable energy. It really is a great report and particularly well covers this topic and many other topics as well. So it's just -- just a point of direction there. Thank you.

MS. WEEKS: That's great. And if you'd be able to send us that report, we can make sure it gets docketed and shared.

COMMISSIONER COLWELL: Sorry, Terra. It's already -- already docketed. It's on the --

MS. WEEKS: Oh.

COMMISSIONER COLWELL: Yeah, on the site. So
thanks.

MS. WEEKS:  Perfect. Thank you.

MS. de JONG:  That report can be found for the public, it is in the Lithium Valley Commission Docket.

MS. WEEKS:  Beautiful. Okay, are there other comments on this topic?

MR. [SPEAKER]:  I have nothing to waste.

(Very faint speaking in background.)

MS. WEEKS:  I'm sorry. What was that? Oh, um-

hum, Commissioner Olmedo.

COMMISSIONER OLMEDO:  Just to make a brief comment on the -- I think it would be important to understand, I guess, the parameters such as how industry sees technology and control measures. You know, kind of where that line is drawn. In the whole idea of de-risking. Technology can and has and is many times a matter of public interest because it depends on whether that technology, whether there's a component of, you know, emissions, discharge, efficiency, and so on, and whether that existing, currently exists or perhaps may in the future or perhaps not exists within the regulatory framework.

So I know that it's -- I understand Commissioner Weisgall's comment and that's why I think through this process it will probably give an opportunity to find clarity as to where that line is drawn between the industry's
interest and the public's interest. Just a general comment.

MS. WEEKS: Great. Any other comments before we move on?

Okay. Next slide, please. So the next topic is looking at safe environmental methods and standards for lithium extraction from geothermal brines and how this compares to other methods for deriving lithium. And so I will hand it to the sub-body, which is Commissioner Weisgall and Commissioner Colwell to kick this one off.

COMMISSIONER COLWELL: Thank you.

I guess I'll jump in, if you're still there, Jonathan.

So safe environmental methods, I mean there's been -- I mean in simple terms, I think really basic terms, a previous presentation I put out there, I mean this is not -- you know there's three methods of known lithium extraction. One is spodumene. It's, you know, generally in Western Australia, a solid ore body. It's mined out of hard rock. It's about six percent of weights, so for a time you get sort of, you know, six percent of that is the actual spodumene. And then it's shipped to -- usually to Asia for processing, quite a crude process, and then there's your lithium product. So for every, you know, kilogram of lithium that's produced from that there's 15 kilograms of CO2.
There's the Atacama, you know large evaporation bodies of water in an area that produces less than, you know, one inch of rain a year that uses half a million gallons of -- per metric ton of lithium produced, and produces approximately seven to seven and a half kilograms of CO2 per kilogram. So that's that side of plus post-processing of course with a footprint of moving all bodies or moving materials approximately, you know, 12,000 kilometers to Asia, then back, say, to the United States.

Firstly, with, you know, extraction or recovery from geothermal brine, it is another brine resource, just like, I guess, scienacmary (phonetic), except this brine is extremely hot. So with that you have steam and it isn't a true closed-loop system. There is no outside escaping of anything. It's a very -- you know, the process I guess in the geothermal world that's been in operation here for 38, 39 years. Known and proven, and again the lithium technology itself is, you know, predominantly an exchange technology. Again, there's nothing new and noble about that. It's been around for 60 years.

Applying it lithium, well, yes, it sets challenges. But none of those -- you know, reagents is de minimis to nil. We're using green steam to actually produce. Like most, it's a manufacturing process out of most manufacturing plants. The steam is there. That's one
of the fortunate parts and a 100-percent renewable energy that runs it.

The organic nature of this, you know, being sustainable in a closed-loop system and producing battery-grade lithium hydroxide or carbonate in real time, right, so not 18 months of evaporation or then sending it to China or where ever it goes, this will produce a better-grade product in really less than an hour, right, in a closed-loop method.

We will -- you know, general organic energy use like geothermal powers allocated about, in our instance, about 20, 25 percent of that energy is allocated to the lithium facility. So it is truly 100 percent.

So, you know, there's out the byproducts, there's no waste streams at all, to be really clear on this. So I think there's obviously standard for CEQA, NEPA, if applicable, but with CEQA the industry and certain measures that keeps everyone in check. Now beyond just what the standard are, well, of course there are aspects of sustainability which are like water. You know reusing water. In our development, we recapture a lot of that steam in our design and we reuse it, so keeping everything to a minimis, managing the resource properly as it has been managed here for many, many years.

So I think that, you know, sharing more information with the public at large on this and answering
those questions and getting the sort of -- you know, the idea of an open cut kit mine or, you know, a salar or evaporation ponds or waste products and just clearing -- you know, no pun included -- but clearing the air with that analogy. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: Let me jump in. Jonathan Weisgall here. I think Rod did a great job of summarizing those issues.

Two points I want to add on top of that. Number one, as -- as DHE Renewables is looking towards production. As I said earlier, our first demonstration plant is going to produce lithium chloride.

The second plant, and this involves our Department of Energy grant, we are going to be converting that lithium chloride into lithium hydroxide because that's the final end product for lithium ion batteries. Lithium carbonate is also used, but at this point we're planning to convert the core identigant to lithium hydroxide. In that regard, we are planning to use electrolysis, not chemical reagents. We think that will be better overall for the environment. Electrolysis simply being the use of electricity to induce a chemical change. So we'll be changing the chloride into hydroxide. But we think from an environmental point of view, that will be better than using chemical reagents. So that's point number one.
Point number two. I want to make sure is whatever the industry does is going to be minutely scrutinized under CEQA. And I think it's important to recognize that CEQA is an even more stringent environmental statute then the federal National Environmental Policy Act. I suspect -- I know that in the case of our company, we do not anticipate jurisdiction under NEPA because there will not be a federal land involved, so we anticipate getting approval under CEQA even though that will probably be an even more onerous statute, in general terms. And whether that approval process occurs at the county level or the state level, CEQA is CEQA. It's a rigorous statute and there will be a robust review and of course there is always opportunity for public comment in any kind of CEQA process.

So I'm jumping the gun a little bit of where we'll be when we get to the commercial stage, but I think it's important as we talk about the different environmental processes and I think we can all agree that what we're looking at in Imperial Valley is much more benign, almost a hundred percent benign and certainly way ahead of what we see in Western Australia and South America. There still will be the requirement to comply with California's very rigorous environmental statute. Thank you.

MS. WEEKS: Great. Are there other comments from other Commissioners on this topic?
VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Looks like none, Terra.

MS. WEEKS: Okay. I actually have a quick question on this, just thinking about the scope of what we would include in the Report, I do think this section hopefully will be pretty straightforward. I think there is a lot of publicly-available information about the various extraction methods. And I think, you know, having developers in this Commission and we can invite others to speak on a panel for this topic in the future, I guess I have two questions. So one is I also understand that Rio Tinto is looking at lithium through boron processing, so that might be just another topic to include in this, so I'm wondering if that's of interest to look at in addition to the mining and evaporation pond processes.

And, secondly, just kind of thinking about speakers for future meetings, wondering if it would make sense or if anyone has connections to companies utilizing the other extraction methods to just talk about, you know, lessons learned or potential overlap, not necessarily in the actual process of deriving the lithium but thinking through transportation or building the supply chain or regulations. So just kind of tossing those out as questions.

COMMISSIONER COLWELL: Yes, Terra, just to weigh in there, I mean, yes, we can bring in a technology plan or an engineering company to the panel and talk about the
process itself.

You know Rio, of course Rio is doing tilings from boron, that the byproduct of the tilings of that project. I'm sure they would be keen to talk about that as well, and that's a very unique type of opportunity that they're very advanced on.

MS. WEEKS: Commissioner Weisgall, were you going to jump in too?

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: Did we lose Rod?

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: No, he finished, Jonathan.

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: Okay. Terra, this is Jonathan. A couple of quick thoughts. I mean we are the Lithium Valley Commission, so I think the focus obviously is the geothermal brine at the Salton Sea, which, you know, as folks know from our meetings, is unique in the world mainly because of it's extremely high temperature and high silica content, but there are other factors as well. That said, there could be lessons learned.

There is a company called Standard Lithium that is looking at doing something similar, analogous at least from a business model point of view, to what we're trying to do in Arkansas. And by that I mean there is already briming production occurring, so there is commercially-viable brining operations in Arkansas. But that brine does have lithium, and you have a company there that is essentially
trying to do that bolt-on technology that, you know, the
developers are talking about at the Salton Sea, a geothermal
brine. But it's a different kind of brine. But that said,
there are -- you know, there could be lessons. I certainly
-- I could contact that company.

I think Rod, you know, Rio Tinto is using -- you
know, it's a different source all together, much like in
Nevada they're looking at clay, but, you know, it may be
worth looking at. So, Terra, I will follow up with you at
least with respect to Standard Lithium, which is a new
company working on brine in Arkansas, just to see if there
maybe some lessons learned there. It's not a bad idea.

MS. WEEKS: That's great. And, you know,
obviously defer to you all, Commissioners. And I think it
does make sense to focus primarily on the Salton Sea region,
so I was just kind of throwing that out as suggestions, but
feel free to take it or leave it.

Okay, any other comments on this topic?

Okay, let's move then to the final topic for this
meeting. So this is looking at potential economic and
environmental impacts to the state resulting from
extraction, processing, and production of lithium and
lithium-dependent products from geothermal brines. And some
of the potential sub topics have already been addressed in
previous meetings, include: How to prioritize local
benefits, looking at public health specifically; Salton Sea restoration; also looking at workforce needs and opportunities, including the training needs or apprentice programs; and then looking at infrastructure needs and opportunities.

And so the sub-body for this is Commissioner Olmedo and Commissioner Flores. So I will open the floor to either one of you to take the lead.

COMMISSIONER FLORES: I will let Commissioner Olmedo go first.

COMMISSIONER OLMEDO: I was going to say the same thing. You beat me to it.

Well, you know we have had quite a bit of discussion on this, and I'm -- I actually had an opportunity to talk to at least a couple of the Commissioners independently, just general conversation about kind of the vision. And part of the discussion is, you know, we've had examples already of Reno Energies. And some of those have really turned into undeliverable promises, you know, wind, for example; solar is another one, displacing agriculture land and affecting critical jobs where if some prescribed to sort of the low-skilled narrative, are jobs that were there. So I think here there is a great opportunity to design, in particular the -- those projects that are looking to build maybe some, the ones that have already been here for a
while. There is a long history and track record.

So I think it's going to be important to dive into that data, right, and some of the operations that already have existed and better understand what -- when we talk about public health, we understand that there is a mission and trying to at least make this a better process where the public can understand when we're talking about steam operation, we're a regulatory agency discussing pollutants generated in these operations. All of that has a value and we need to understand what that value is. Is there a risk to a fence-line community? What is that risk? How can that be de-risked? And how can there be a coexistence?

I think it's also fair that in my role, bring in and elevating the community's voice. And what does that mean? Bring in these conversations about the experience to the fence-line communities or at least within the perimeters of what we would consider the impacts on.

You know there's also the discussion about investments in the Salton Sea. I know that that's been often a selling point for the economic and environmental impacts or, therefore, a mitigation or perhaps for restoration. I know that those terms keep getting interchanged.

There is a long history of how we got to the situation at the Salton Sea, and that within itself we'll
have to have considerable discussion about and in that research about what are the impacts happening right now when we bring in speculation, right. And what are the impacts of the conditions of the Sea and how we got there.

The revenues that could be generated and that perhaps maybe are being generated by geothermal, because of my understanding that the methods that are being proposed, I think we all understand that, I would leave myself open in case I mischaracterize or misunderstand somewhere around there, I'm always open to being corrected, but you need to have a geothermal in order to have a lithium extraction and operation. So we're going to have to look at the history of how the lithium and how the geothermal has -- has operated, there's a significant amount of data, and how that will change with the lithium extraction in terms of will that create an increase, will that create a decrease. Economic and environmental impacts have a lot to do also with crater to cradle -- or cradle to grave, you know, which concepts will be used in this process.

So I'll just -- you know, I'll leave it there. I have yet to meet with the Commissioner that we'll be working together on this. Yeah, I will pause there.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you, Commissioner Olmedo.

Commissioner Flores, did you have some comments?
COMMISSIONER FLORES: Yeah. I was going to say, Commissioner Olmedo, that that's definitely something on my mind that we need to either -- because I know that, you know, brought up the topics of these impacts to the community, and I know I'd like to personally hear more of the experiences other communities like them, you know, pretty far away up here in Sacramento. So just definitely looking forward to working with you.

COMMISSIONER OLMEDO: On that of course.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Are there any questions?

MS. WEEKS: Looks like Commissioner Castaneda has a comment.

COMMISSIONER CASTANEDA: Thank you, Chair Kelley, if I could. Obviously I'm new, I haven't been exposed to any of the previous discussions and conversations that have been going on, but I think Mr. Olmedo makes some very good points regarding the history, the impacts, a lot of things that have occurred in the Imperial and Riverside Counties, in and around Salton Sea that have had a deleterious impact on -- on the community.

And I'm just wondering, because just what I was able to read, is there going to be an opportunity within the purview of this Commission to have that sort of community conversation where we can sort of air out, you know, what potential benefits there are, what potential impacts there
might be, and things that, you know, we certainly hear from the neighbors to understand what they matter -- and then the economic issues as well.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: So, Commissioner Castaneda, we -- we only touched about a conversation that happened a few days ago, but it included people from around the valley, but community members and community based from the north end, Calipatria. And we invited some people from Niland and Westmoreland to join. They were unfortunately not there, but at the next meeting.

I know on this agenda it will be talking about some community engagement that we should probably -- and I know that Elisabeth will probably be speaking about that at the end on our agenda, but we are engaging that. And where you're talking about how we probably -- and Luis would agree -- where we have been -- we have been so eager to get anything here that we haven't really paid attention to how it could benefit us, right. So we're trying to take a different approach now and we're trying to be more direct but open and transparent with industry, the community.

And, look, nobody is going to succeed if you can't get out to Mullet Island, so there's got to be some bridges repaired and there's got to be a road fixed, so there are a lot of things, but we're starting that conversation.

COMMISSIONER CASTANEDA: Thank you.
VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Are there any other comments, Terra?

MS. WEEKS: I don't see any hands raised. Anyone else want to hop in here?

Okay. So that wraps up this topic area or this agenda item, rather. So after this meeting, as I said, CEC staff will review the discussion from last month's meeting and then this discussion and start to flesh out the draft report outline. And so then we'll send that around for Commissioners to review hopefully ahead of the next meeting.

And, again, that can be a living document, but just give us some pointers to look to as we start thinking about workshops and potential speakers.

And I actually want to reply to a comment that was in the chat, there was a question around the order of the topic area. And I just want to mention the way that they're ordered in this presentation is how they're ordered in the statute, but I think there is a lot of opportunity to kind of shift things around. Some topics may even be combined, you know, especially as we start breaking things down into sub-topic areas. So I don't think this order is set in stone, it was just helpful to get the conversation going.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you.

So at this time we -- before we go to the next item, we will open the floor for public comment related to
the Legislative Report discussion. And, remember, you will have the opportunity for public comment on other items of the agenda as well.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

If you're joining us by Zoom on your computer, please use the raised hand feature. And if you have called in, please dial star 9 to raise your hand and then star 6 to unmute yourself.

First we'll go through hands raised in the Zoom application and then the phone.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Anyone wishing to make comment?

MS. de JONG: I had seen a raised hand from Orlando but earlier.

I did allow you to speak if you wanted to go ahead and make your comment.

MR. FOOTE: Yes, ma'am. Very briefly, and maybe it's some backpeddling that is inappropriate at this point, but there is always in the gorilla in the room which is the involvement and stability of water availability for the entire process, not just obviously geothermal but the extraction process related to lithium. And I think I heard a very brief reference to water, but nothing very -- nothing comprehensive. We have obviously a great deal of controversy still pending in connection with current
litigation involving IAD, involving the utilization of water for what purpose. And I wondered if that had -- that had introduced some instability that might not have preexisted that, that would now currently be involved in this current lithium development activity.

MS. de JONG: Thank you so much for your comment.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: So I think that might be something that could be addressed, Mr. Hanks could bring back to the next meeting to be able to -- we -- I think locally we know about the industrial water allocation and we know that IAD has the ability. What Mr. Foote is bringing up is a challenge to that distribution, an equitable distribution, which at this moment IAD prevails in an appellate court.

Commissioner Hanks, do you want to comment now or do you want to provide more next month?

COMMISSIONER HANKS: Well, I like the way you guys put that target on my back. No, I just -- this has been an ongoing issue. As you say, right now we have a favorable ruling from the appellate court. And today, I believe, there may be a conference at the Supreme Court level to see whether it moves on or not.

MR. [SPEAKER]: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER HANKS: But we have -- we have been making plans since about 2007, 2008 for geothermal growth
and also the possibility of mineral extraction. So there have been the challenges on our equitable distribution plan, and that's what's being sought after. But since 2010 to now we have asked our growers to participate in the voluntary conservation program, and they have been very successful in the amount of water that they are conserving, not only on the farm but in the system too.

So we believe we're going to be in pretty good shape on it, if we get cooperation from the weather. With this drought hanging over us, I don't know whether anyone has the answers for that, but we have a very strong water right.

We also have a strong desire to use that water in our service area, which the Known Geothermal Resource Area is in our water service area. So we think where we're at, we've lined up about as well as we can and we think we'll be able to do that and at the same time we are providing incentives to our growers to conserve water, so that's been a big plus. And I think when it comes down it's not going to be the same issue that we had in 2010, when there was this unknown. We keep hearing about certainty here, and I can guarantee you that our growers want certainty on their water. So we have been looking at those challenges. I think we have aligned ourselves quite well for it, along with other land uses that have come in that have created the
opportunity to move some of that water. So I think we're
going to be in good shape.

I haven't been given a fixed number from the
developers themselves, but we -- we have -- we have kind of
an idea what it may be, but I've been waiting for them to
come forward and put in a request for service and then we'll
know pretty much what that amount is.

But keep in mind this is not all going to be
developed at one time. It's over a period of time and it
gives us some timeframes to adapt and work out some
agreement with our water users.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: And, Mr. Hanks -- or,
Commissioner Hanks, you know, I think that Mr. Foote is --
it's something that's relative to us because we discuss it
in Imperial Valley and may not be known to the other
Commissioners or those that are listening, but the
availability of water is there for industrial development.
And IAD has set that aside. Yes, there have been
challenges, but nothing is in jeopardy at this moment, so I
think we can move along --

COMMISSIONER HANKS: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: -- and hopefully if anybody
has -- wants to learn more about it, they can reach out to
us.

COMMISSIONER HANKS: Yes. I think -- I think that
we're in good shape, Commissioner Kelley.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you, Commissioner Hanks.

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: And Jonathan Weisgall with one quick comment here which is while I don't think the industry knows exact numbers for water use, our goal is to use order of magnitude 95 percent less water per ton of lithium produced than is used in the South American process. And that's our target.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you, Commissioner Weisgall.

COMMISSIONER HANKS: That's a good number to hear, yes.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Elisabeth, are there any comments or public comment?

MS. de JONG: Yeah, thank you for asking. We don't have any other hands raised, but we have received a few messages in the chat that I just want to draw our attention to.

One question said: Any idea of what percentage of total U.S. projected lithium needs to electrify nearly everything that 300 tons will provide.

Again that is if we have a quick response or that's something that we could consider to answer in a future workshop.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: I think that I'm sure our
industry guys have a feeling of how much the domestic supply is today and what it's going to grow to, so they might be able to respond to this or provide it to you, Elisabeth.

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: I'll just -- Jonathan here, a quick --

MS. de JONG: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: -- nutshell. World use today is roughly 300,000 tons. Most analyses, Bloomberg and others would -- would project a tenfold growth in the next decade. That would get you to three million tons.

The geothermal brine at Salton Sea with -- speaking for our company, which -- which has 10 of the 11 existing plants in that area, we anticipate being able to produce 90,000 metric tons. That would more than take care of domestic U.S. use for the foreseeable future. But, again, if there is a gigantic increase in electric vehicle production, not to mention, you know, battery use for electric storage on the grid, the U.S. numbers may well go up as well. But as I said, that's for existing geothermal.

The lease rights that Cal Energy, that our subsidiary has in the -- in the Known Geothermal Resource Area adjacent to the Salton Sea could actually produce as much 300,000 metric tons, so that's just speaking for one company. But those are -- those are some rough numbers. I hope that responds to the question.
MS. de JONG: Thank you.

And Commissioner Colwell also raised his hand.

COMMISSIONER COLWELL: Yeah. I think Jonathan covered that well globally. We're seeing local -- localized demand just for the order sector as at 2024 being approximately 120,000 tons per annum lithium hydroxide. So there's a specific number there. I hope that helps, hence the expedition of this, you know, to expedite this process to do that.

MS. de JONG: Okay. Thank you.

Another comment that was written in, Terra actually addressed it, but I will go ahead and read it for the record and so everyone is aware. The comment says: I want to raise this topic, and this is in regards to the environmental and economic impacts, number 6, and is not higher up in the Report, would you consider it as such a large topic and perhaps the most important should be split into two, environmental impact and economic impact studies.

And the second part of that question is about if environmental could be split into economic as separate sections since they are both very big and important pieces. As I mentioned, I believe that was already addressed, and unless someone has additional comments.

Okay. I don't have any other hands raised at this time, Commissioner Kelley. Thank you.
VICE CHAIR KELLEY: So at this time I would like to entertain a break for anybody who needs to stretch their legs or use the facilities. And I would recommend 15 minutes, if that is agreeable.

Okay, not hearing any -- any dissent, then how about 3:20 we reconvene.

COMMISSIONER HANKS: Yes.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: Thank you.

(Recess taken from 3:05 to 3:23 p.m.)

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Does it look like we've got the majority back, Elisabeth?

MS. de JONG: I think maybe we could just confirm. Commissioner Olmedo, are you there?

Great.

And, Commissioner Castaneda?

COMMISSIONER CASTANEDA: I am here.

MS. de JONG: Okay, great. I believe that puts us at a quorum then, so I think we can proceed.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Okay, so the next item is the Future Meetings Discussion. And this is determining agenda topics and speakers for our future meetings. We talked about this last month in regards to kind of setting the table that we are going to start having some more dialogue about these breakout groups. So we're planning to spend
about half of our monthly meeting time to hold these workshops on designed topic areas. And this would be one and a half to two hours during each monthly meeting to discuss specific topics to the workshop. And the CEC is going to run through some proposals for a workshop format.

So, Terra, are you online and ready to go through some ideas?

MS. WEEKS: Yes, I am here and ready.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Okay.

MS. WEEKS: Okay. So could we go to the next slide, please?

Okay. So I wanted to just provide a sample template, just to give folks a sense of what we mean when we say workshop. And so this is really just a starting point, and you're absolutely able to amend this to suit your needs or you can go with a different format all together. This is really just to kind of get ideas about what types of people we might want to invite to attend these workshops and speak, or how we might want to structure the discussion.

So a typical -- (phone chimes) -- oh, I'm sorry. A typical workshop might include opening remarks by the sub-body members on that topic, followed by any Commissioner presentations if Commissioners have information on that topic that they'd like to share. We then might have a presentation by an expert which could be an overview of a
topic or possibly a deep dive on one particular facet. And then that could be followed by a panel of experts and stakeholders. And we would encourage you to have panels representing numerous viewpoints.

So in addition to some of the ones listed here, including environmental, community representatives, EJ and equity groups, industry, academia, you may also consider representatives from local, state, or federal government representatives; workforce representatives; utilities; California Tribes; or others. So these are just some -- again, some ideas to get you started.

If it's appropriate, I think it would be great to have a member of that sub-body moderate the panel. And, again, CEC staff is available to help prep questions or help with any logistics there.

For Energy Commission workshops, we often ask panelists to present for a couple of minutes and then follow that with a moderated Q&A, but that's just one model.

And then within each of the workshops, so each workshop will be focused on a specific theme. So, you know, one could be on looking at the different types of lithium-extraction methods, one could be on environmental impacts, one could be on economic impacts, and so forth. But we would propose maybe thinking about some overarching themes for the workshop, such as thinking about the community
impacts and workforce considerations across all of those
topic areas.

So Elisabeth now is just going to run through a
couple more logistical notes about our role in supporting
you with these workshops.

MS. de JONG: Thank you, Terra.

So to prepare for each workshop, CEC staff will
reach out to the sub-body Commissioner on the topic of the
upcoming workshop. We have been and will continue to
collect input on potential speakers, topics, presentations,
and materials to cover for each topic. We will share that
information and work with the sub-body Commissioners to hold
the workshop and create the agenda.

So the CEC will provide a time line to ensure that
all agenda and details are arranged in time for the public
notice to go out, according to the Bagley-Keene Open
Meetings Act. And the CEC will also assist in ensuring that
any guest speakers and panelists are given access to the
meeting for their participation.

So with that, I will turn back to you, Vice Chair
Kelley.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Okay. Thank you, Elisabeth.
So you caught me when I was trying to do two things. Sorry
about that.

So some workshops, relaying recommendations for
upcoming workshops, we've got lithium-extraction methods. We heard some of that. I think Terra mentioned other methods, the bromide extraction in other locations. But specifically probably we want to focus on what is being proposed in this area, of Lithium Valley.

   Furthering geothermal development. I think that, you know, we have started the conversation here, we might be able to have something relatively soon.

   Marketing opportunities for lithium. I'm not sure who's on that, but that is an important thing. Rod touched on some of the -- and I think Commissioner Soto as well -- on the attention that Lithium Valley and geothermal brine lithium is getting in Washington, D.C. And Secretary Granholm's comments from a few weeks ago are very encouraging as well. So marketing and also being able to enlighten more people about what this -- what this could mean, not just for Imperial County and Riverside County or California or the nation, but the world.

   And then the economic and environmental impacts that we talked about earlier.

   Are there any -- is anybody having a schedule of maybe having those extraction methods at our next meeting in July? Would that be possible, Rod and Jonathan?

   COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: I think so. I mean, again, let's think this through. I'm less interested --
mean it's up to the other Commissioners. I'm not sure what we're going to gain by learning what Standard Lithium is doing with bromine in Arkansas with different kind of brine. I'm just -- I think we have a pretty full plate.

It -- you know, it might be -- it might be better for maybe one of Rod's engineers or one of our engineers to talk about what, you know in a general sense, what we're planning to do that can do a somewhat -- you know, not overly technology-deep drive, but -- deep dive, but something that -- that is informative. So, anyway, those are preliminary thoughts. I'm not wedded to any of that.

I'm just --

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: I think I'm in agreement with you, Jonathan, is that we should probably be talking about what we're -- what applications would be used here, --

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: -- the variations between yours or Energy Source or Controlled Thermal Resource, or Matt, for that matter.

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: Yeah, yeah.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: That what -- what could be applied here, what's being contemplated in the pilot projects.

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: Yeah, I think explain them. And, by the way, I've sat through a Standard Lithium
presentation and got kind of, I don't know, I guess amused as they talk about, hey, this is Arkansas, you know, we can permit anything, there is no problem, and there is a big huge workforce here. And, you know, gosh, there all this chemical work and this is just this huge industrial area, so adding on some lithium is not a big deal, blah-blah-blah, along those lines. You know, we don't -- who care -- I mean that's Arkansas.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Rod, do you have any comments?

COMMISSIONER COLWELL: You know, if it's technically based, I mean specific to the extraction or extraction methods, I mean we probably ought to have our engineers or have the vendor explain at a level the process, if you like, and basically how it works. And maybe, you know, if it was five minutes granted by the Commission or ten minutes, we would have our engineer explain it at 60,000 feet, you know, the process. And I think that that -- if you're amenable to that, we could certainly organize something.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: I would appreciate that. And we could calendar it for the next meeting. And if they could also talk about the waste stream. I know that was discussed earlier. What is the -- what is the residual of any of the processes with lithium.

COMMISSIONER COLWELL: Right. We've got out deal
with that because there is none, so great.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Okay. Thank you.

And then furthering geothermal development for August, it's you and I, Luis. Do you think that we would have some stuff to be ready for presentation and the panel, as Terra put down? We could invite some of our colleagues to be on that panel, we could follow that format. What's your -- what's your view on that?

COMMISSIONER OLMEDO: Yeah. I think it's -- I think it's a topic that will need a little more discussion as to what angle, what approach are we going to take into producing and document that, that will adequately capture what we're trying to inform in terms of furthering geothermal development. When I see furthering geothermal development, I feel like into the future. What are the projects into the future. I'm not sure we're giving a fair assessment of existing geothermal. And I wonder if we need to -- to make that clear as to what we're trying to accomplish with furthering geothermal development, given that what -- we're talking about both, existing and future.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: So I have no --

COMMISSIONER OLMEDO: The end goal -- the end goal is lithium.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Yeah, I --

COMMISSIONER OLMEDO: Can't just be thinking
lithium in future projects, right? We're thinking lithium
into existing projects, --

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Sure.

COMMISSIONER OLMEDO: -- because at the end of the
day it's clear that the lithium is going to come from brine
that is generated through geothermal development. So I
would like us to -- I would like to propose that we think
about it in that way.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Sure. I am not opposed to
that. We can -- I think that we can do it in the August
meeting. And you and I can get together and talk about more
about that inclusion. And regarding geothermal development,
you know we're having a conversation about some other
things, but in regards to geothermal development, furthering
it, either existing or new production, I think we could be
ready for it in August.

COMMISSIONER OLMEDO: That's correct. As a sub-
category to furthering geothermal development, while I'd
like to propose that, we -- we identify someone, here is a
good presentation and help us better understand the
differences in the geothermal, because I understand there
are differences. There is no one geothermal alike.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER DOLEGA: So it would be interesting
to see, you know, the efficiency of each and every
operation, and then I would be able to have a better-informed ability to -- to our goal of putting forth a recommendation.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Okay. So we'll just keep it on the calendar for August. And, Luis, you and I will talk about it after the meeting. Sound good?

COMMISSIONER DOLEGA: Yes, of course.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Okay.

MS. de JONG: We have a hand raised.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: A question?

MS. de JONG: Commissioner Hanks has a hand raised.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Oh, Commissioner Hanks.

COMMISSIONER HANKS: Yeah. I just wanted to add in I've had some dealings with some of the engineers. I think Jim Turner would make a great presenter. He's very familiar with the geothermals in the local area.

Likewise the question came up about the water availability. I might arrange for our energy manager here to go over more on we'll-serve letters and availability. That would -- that would probably come under the environmental impacts, economic/environmental impacts.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Okay. And then marketing opportunities for lithium; is Commissioner Dolega or Lopez, are they on?
COMMISSIONER LOPEZ: Yeah. We're going to have to set up a meeting this upcoming week and go over it.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Okay. Do you feel comfortable about a September time line?

COMMISSIONER LOPEZ: I think we could reach that.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Okay. Thank you.

And then October, we have penciled in economic and environmental impacts. And that would be Commissioner Olmedo and Commissioner Flores. Any feedback on that availability for an October meeting?

COMMISSIONER FLORES: That makes sense.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER OLMEDO: It does seem kind of far to think about when we're talking about environmental impacts. I know there is a lot of eagerness from environmental groups, environmental justice. I see the eagerness to engage. I think that the sooner we create platforms, and I think that we don't have to wait till we have the discussion. I think we need to bring the environmental justice conversation basically to every area of the potential topics, in every topic that we're discussing. I'd like to recommend that, that we bring the environmental justice conversation.

I am most committed to seeing this path forward and seeing how there's -- we can achieve both a new economic
revenue streams, revenues, jobs. Much of everything we talk about, there is an environmental justice component. And I think we really should commit. Again, that's what I'm proposing, that we commit to bringing the environmental justice conversation to every topic. In fact, it shouldn't just read economic and environmental impact, every topic should have an environmental justice component to it, a discussion to it. That's what makes sense to me. We either do it, in creating a space for the environmental justice or we have a discussion between -- you know, we all just create that space, you know however we want to do it, but I just want to make sure that I elevated that, --

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Sure.

COMMISSIONER OLMEDO: -- that interest.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: I think, you know, in the format that Terra is sharing, nothing precluding you or Commissioner Flores from initiating more conversations now, but in October on the agenda would be a block for a panel discussion of people that you and Commissioner Flores have identified that could speak to some of the economic and environmental impacts, and some of the things that both you and Commissioner Flores have also recognized. So I agree. You know I think in every aspect the impacts of methods or new development or marketing, we'll always be thinking about how this is going to relate on the land and on people. But
this -- this is a good conveyance to be able to have a focused moment to have some in-depth conversation about that. So are you good with October scheduling?

COMMISSIONER OLMEDO: Yes, absolutely. Sorry I didn't respond to that. Yes, I'm okay with that. And to me we are just getting started. I think the discussions will become richer and hopefully we'll stay productive. That's the goal. But, again, I just wanted to share that with all the members. I hope that there is support to negotiating in every discussion an environmental justice conversation. And we can find ways, and I'm happy to -- I'm here to support this whole process. And I will just leave it for how we could do that. You know I respect everybody's assignment here, our positions as Commissioners, but I do want to be able to help in any way that I can. If there is anyone who feels I could be of hope, I certainly look towards the community for advice as well. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you, Commissioner Olmedo.

So we've gone through an idea for the next four months of scheduling. Terra and Elisabeth, I think we have concurrence with the sub-groups with that. That calendar can be marked, unless there is any other comment from Commissioners.

No? Okay. Then we move on.
MS. WEEKS: Just to hope in here. This is perfect. So we'll work with the sub-bodies to figure out speakers and logistics for these workshops. So we'll be reaching out to each of you to get these scheduled and coordinated.

And just a reminder, so this is just to kind of get things started, and of course we're not leaving off the other topics, but we'll just work on scheduling those at a later date.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Oh, thank you kindly.

So we'll carry on to the Community Engagement. This discussion, we've heard requests about the Lithium Valley Commission to hold a community engagement meeting, and wanted to take a moment to review ideas suggested thus far and see if we can determine a few more details for an event. Ideas considered: Calibrating with Assemblymember Garcia's office to hold a Lithium Valley Commission meeting in the Salton Sea region, to introduce the Lithium Valley Commission and describe its mandates and solicit public input. And the timeframe could be in the fall.

That must be somebody that doesn't live here that put that calendar in the fall. Whether -- whether the event may be virtual or in person will depend on the factors and health conditions, impact covering, and travel to the region, the status of the laws governing California's public
meetings. And, you know, things are starting to open up. So we'll also have to take into consideration the logistics and expenses for Commissioners and the staff to travel and host. So we might benefit from a discussion about what communities we could engage, what information we want to hear from or they want to hear from us, what community input and engagement we hope to generate to support our work.

If we're in a situation where we travel and it's not permitted, we want to look at the input of Commissioners and how important it is to hold in-person meetings. There is a lot to do. Shall we plan for something in the fall? What are we looking for? Where would we go? And -- and the logistics of us coming from different areas to meet in a certain spot. I'll open it up for conversation.

MS. de JONG: So while it's quiet, I just want to jump in and just also mention that if we're in a situation where travel is not permitted or encouraged, we wanted to look for input also from the Commissioners on how important it is to hold in person. We'd like to accommodate that, but it would -- it may not be in our control. So if we're able to hold it in person, we want to consider holding an in-person meeting or may want to consider holding an in-person meeting later than the fall to accommodate those restrictions being lifted.

And I also just want to mention, because we've
heard comments about translations and interpretations before, we are planning to provide interpreting services starting with the July public meeting, and we'll determine the need for that moving forward based on the use. This includes translations for the public meeting notice. And we intend to offer those services for any public community engagement events as well.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: So then comments about scheduling a community engagement, timing, location, logistics.

I'll start it out. How about Bombay Beach in September?

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: I just drove by it yesterday and it looked like there would be plenty of room.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: What about Calipatria in October?

MS. WEEKS: Vice Chair, it looks like there are a couple of hands raised.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Sure, sure.

MS. WEEKS: So it looks like Commissioner Castaneda.

COMMISSIONER CASTANEDA: Thank you, Terra, Mr. Chair, appreciate it. Yeah, I think it's obviously the rules and safety, and all those things are our first priority, but I think it's going to be incredibly important
as we move into these various communities that we do this in person. I just -- you know, I mean I think we've all seen sort of the break down in terms of communication with respect to the communities that, quite frankly, will be the most affected by whatever we decide whatever ultimately is done. And so I just would not want to be in a situation where we're having these very important discussions and folks aren't there because they don't know how to connect, or whatever.

So, you know, I think I would encourage just as much as possible that we do that, I guess. And obviously you know facility availability and what's there. I don't -- Bombay Beach, I'm not sure. September, you know, somewhere with good air conditioning I guess and so -- (laughing). But October it starts to get a little bit more, you know, friendly in terms of being outdoors, and so forth. And so I'm willing to do whatever, but I have enough experience in these kinds of things where I just know that these kinds of meetings, when we're out specifically giving that kind of information to the public and trying to solicit feedback and participation, it's always a challenge, you know, without doing it personally.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Um-hum. Agreed.

Terra, is there another comment or another raised hand?

MS. WEEKS: Yeah, there also Commissioner Olmedo.

COMMISSIONER OLMEDO: So this is a very important agenda item, you know, for me. I think it's going to be important to look in a couple directions. You know one is there are very actively engaged groups around the Salton Sea, from both the north end and Imperial Valley that could provide some really good input and recommendations.

We don't want to make the same mistakes that have been made throughout the Salton Sea effort. CNRA, the California Natural Resource Agency might also have some best practices. They have, you know, been in the trenches and have dealt with some harsh criticism about how they in the past have managed community engagement. So those would be two recommendations. I would propose it before going out and doing these community engagement meetings that we create an agenda item and invite, like I said, established groups that are engaged on the Salton Sea and the community, foremost. Not just the Salton Sea but that have roots in the community that understand the diversity of the community.

And I would check in with CNRA too also, so we don't make the same mistakes they did in the past. They're doing a lot better, but there were a lot of mistakes early on in the community engagement model that was implemented early on.
We want to make sure we do this right. You know, I mean we don't have to make the same mistakes.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Understood. There might be some advantage to talking with Natural Resources about their experience. I think, though, that we are very aware of, you know, the area, the community, and being able to do outreach, so we can help in that respect too, meaning the county.

As far as locations and timing, are there any comments?

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: Ryan, let me jump in. Jonathan. I think that -- I do think it's a good idea. And I could kind of see two parts to this. One part would be sitting down somewhere for the actual meeting, and I don't know where that could -- I mean, you know, El Centro may be the closest from a logistical point of a view with a room big enough, I don't know. But the second part I think would make sense would be to get a bus and give a tour to the Commissioners of the geothermal facilities.

And, you know, Rod's been talking a lot about what he's doing and I think seeing his lithium operations would be terrific. It will be under construction. I think the later in the year the better. We're aiming for March for actually commissioning our lithium recovery demonstration project, so a November, December -- later in the fall there...
would be probably more to see at least on lithium
demonstration. But obviously our geothermal plants have
been up and running for 35 years, so we can give that tour,
and possibly bring in Energy Source.

But, anyway, I would -- if there is going to be an
onsite meeting down in Imperial County, I think one
component should be taking Commissioners around and giving a
tour of the existing geothermal facilities.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: And let me -- Jonathan, I
understand that and I would offer that, and Commissioner
Hanks will probably want to comment on this as well, but
Calipatria Unified School District has -- they have venues
and they have seating. They have hosted --

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: -- a Public Utility
Commission's meeting in the past, and so I know that there
are venues that would be accessible to the resource area and
be able to conduct a meeting.

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: Yeah, and that's within
five miles of our plants. So I think that would -- that
would be preferable to El Centro. I'd like to offer up our
facilities, but our biggest conference room can hold, you
know, 10, 12 people, something like that. It's not going to
be able to handle this kind of a meeting.

MS. de JONG: Elisabeth here. I just want to jump
in and clarify that on our end, at least on the CEC side of things, if we're looking to do a community-based meeting in the fall it's more likely that we would need to hold that a solely virtual event. But if we want to consider other -- the possibility of an in-person meeting, we kind of wanted to get some feedback, if there is an opportunity to do a little bit further out, to be able to accommodate those travel restrictions.

And I do just also want to add that with this Lithium Valley Commission, there is no budget for travel, so I wanted to throw that out for consideration out as well, but thank you. And this is a great discussion so far.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: So --

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: Well, the other way -- I'll just jump in really quickly -- the other way we could do this would be, and I assume there wouldn't be a Bagley-Keene problem, would be just offering up a tour of geothermal facilities for as many members of the Commission who can get down there on a given date. I mean clearly, clearly this Commission, I mean folks who haven't seen geothermal facilities ought to go see them and see how they work. So I think that would be an important component.

So whether we do that as part of a community meeting or part of a next Commission meeting, or just kind
of look, we got a field trip planned and let's pick a date. And as much Commissioners as can make it, we'd love to have them. And if that's the case, then we could do it at all at our facilities. We could do a lunch in our conference room and get it done that way. And I'm sure Rod could show us his facilities and maybe even do the Energy Source Feather Stone Plant also.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Yeah. So I would -- since Elisabeth mentioned there was no money, I think we are all in agreement, unless somebody is objecting, that we do need to have a community in-person meeting. And if that's first quarter, second quarter of 2022, based off of the guidance that the Energy Commission is following from OSHA and CDPH, then that's when it's allowed. But unless somebody is objecting, I think it is absolutely necessary that we have an in-person meeting in the area.

MS. de JONG: We have a hand raised from Commissioner Olmedo.

COMMISSIONER OLMEDO: I just wanted to support the idea, Commissioner Weisgall.

I also want to -- you know I have seen where these types of tours can be very productive, get to kind of see operations where we a lot of times don't have access to.

I also wanted to offer that it would be a great opportunity to carve out a space to bring in local
advocates, whether it's -- you know because that way they
have time one on one or group settings and have access to
Commissioners and have more indepth conversations. They
would begin to kind of get to know ourselves. And we can
try to identify them. Some of them participate on a regular
basis. But it would be great to have that kind of component
built into our tour.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: So I think that, Elisabeth,
unless somebody speaks up I think we're all in agreement
that we would like to have an in-person meeting with the
support of the Energy Commission, if that's possible. And
that would, based off of what your guidance allowing you
either fiscally or by safety protocol.

And then in regards to what Jonathan offered and
Luis just spoke about, you know we have done those before
and through partnership with CGR, Cal Energy, Energy Source,
and the community, we can make that happen and we can invite
the members to be able to come for a tour of the Known
Geothermal Resource Area and see geothermal in operation.
I'm willing to help make that happen.

MS. de JONG: Thank you. And we do have another
hand raised from Commissioner Ruiz.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ: Yeah. I support both ideas.
Whether we do it virtually or in person, I think -- well,
you know to do it in person, maybe a combination of both.
But one thing that we really have to keep in mind, we need to advertise well in advance for people to plan accordingly and -- but we help those people to really get the message, using all the different venues of communications and social network and whatnot. That was one of the biggest issues for us when putting those community meetings together, the message was not percolating through the different layers of the communities. So if we are going to do it, let's make sure, you know, that I'm not opposed to in person or virtually, or whatever you want to do it, a combination of both, but we have to make sure, you know, that we allow people to really know in advance.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: So I think as far as an in-person meeting, Elisabeth, that would be participating by the Energy Commission staff, that we can -- we can defer that based on knowing the flexibility and funding for the Energy Commission. But outside of that, what Jonathan has offered and what we're willing to take on, we will try to start a tour using our knowledge and contacts to make that happen, and offer it to the Commissioners. Does that sound good with everybody?

And we'll wait for the cooler weather, until October.

COMMISSIONER HANKS: Ryan?

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Yes.
COMMISSIONER HANKS: Jim Hanks. Yeah, we'll --
we'll help you set that up, anything that you need we'll be
sure to help.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you, Commissioner Hanks.
Yeah, you were going to be the second call. The first one
was I was going to have to tell my wife I wasn't going to be
around for a day.

COMMISSIONER HANKS: Yeah, I was -- I was thinking
we might even sponsor dinner at Stockman's, or something.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: That sounds good.

MS. WEEKS: This is Terra just hopping in. So I
just want to clarify, our -- for State employees, our travel
restrictions are still kind of in flux, so we're not
actually sure when we'll be able to travel again. We
absolutely want to support an in-person meeting, but it
looks like we can tentatively plan one for the spring and
we'll just kind of keep you updated as that progresses.

So because that may still be a ways away, I just
want to propose consideration of doing a virtual event
sooner, just to get community members engaged earlier in the
process, although it would have to be virtual. But I think
we can make that a success. Then, as Elisabeth mentioned,
we could also have interpretation services for that virtual
event, to try to connect to more members of the community.
So just for -- I think we can plan for some --
VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Sure.

MS. WEEKS: -- meeting in the future, but if we want to also do a virtual one, we can do that sooner.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: So, Terra, I appreciate that. I do want to let you know, though, there are a couple of things that probably Luis was touching on or Frank was about the community here. A community meeting, it can't be during business hours. It's usually after 6:00, when people are -- those that have regular business hours are able to attend the meeting. And it's -- that means if you're traveling from out of county, that's an overnight. So just for your logistics, to be aware that that's where we see success, is when we're making it accessible and -- accessible to the people that actually can use it.

MS. de JONG: We have a hand raised from Commissioner Olmedo.

COMMISSIONER OLMEDO: Yeah, now good points about the outreach. And the sooner materials are made, you know, I'd be happy to provide input. My input comes from my colleagues. They have been doing outreach and engagement for a very long time, so I'd be happy to provide some advice.

As well, I see Vice Chair Kelley has signaled that we -- this is a disadvantaged population, hard-to-reach population. There is usually an enormous amount of
barriers. To put a meeting together, if it's not done right, you just may end up with the same of us, and I don't think that's the goal of a community-engagement meeting. So, you know, we have time to think about all the experience that exists here.

Also important, I do want to offer also, you know, cohosting wherever we can. You know we're here, those of us who are here in a logistical situation where we can provide cohosting support, so I'd be happy to have that conversation with Vice Chair Kelley, Commissioner Hanks, or anybody else, but be more than happy to cohost a meeting, a tour, anything that helps the community-engagement component.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: So, Terra, I'll ask. Does that answer the questions that you're looking for in regards to community engagement?

MS. WEEKS: I think it kind of answers them. So just to summarize then, you know, I think there -- I would agree there is a lot of value of doing an in-person meeting. And on our end too we're already thinking about how to host meetings outside of work hours. I think that's a really great point. We want to make sure that we're making it accessible to a lot of the community, so.

So just to summarize then, I think we'll plan for an in-person. I mean others are welcome to host a meeting. Again, the CEC won't be able to support it if it's in person
until early next year. So, you know, we can continue the conversation to solidify dates, but I think if we want, if you want the Energy Commission to support and we can run IT and logistics and just help with general coordination, that would need to be early next year, it looks like.

And then so I think maybe folks can just noodle on the idea of having a virtual meeting in addition to the in-person meeting, and so that could be done sooner. We don't need to definitively decide that today, but maybe folks can just continue ruminating on that.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Great. We're talking about probably trying host then a site visit for Commissioners in the fall. And if -- if the Energy Commission or Commissioner Douglas wants to come, more than welcome. I think the internet is not very -- it's relatively weak at those locations. So we wouldn't be able to remote, put you on a Surface Pro and walk you around. Or maybe -- maybe Jonathan will tell me different, but my experience is your - - it's not a very good signal out there.

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: No. No, it will be tough.

MS. WEEKS: And I think that's fine to have that as a separate meeting or tour. You know, I think we would probably -- our Legal team would have some advice on the Bagley-Keene issue.

But just another idea too, and this is probably
something to think about for next year, but our media team would like to do a media tour as well and maybe offer to legislators or their staff a tour of the facilities or an in-person meeting. So that's just something else to think about, but that's probably down the road a bit.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Okay. So then we'll move on to Public Comment. Is there anyone wishing to -- before we go to the next agenda item, anybody wishing to make public comment related to the future meeting planning? Or the opportunities for public comment later -- or you will have -

MS. de JONG: Okay.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: -- focused on that later opportunity.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

So, yes, if you're joining us by Zoom on the computer, please use the raised hand feature. If you've called in, please dial star 9 to raise your hand and star 6 to unmute your phone line. First we'll go through the hands raised in the Zoom application.

Orlando Foote, I have allowed you to speak. If you want to go ahead and unmute.

MR. FOOTE: I'm sure it will come as a shock to everybody, but I really don't have anything to add at this point.
VICE CHAIR KELLEY: It is shocking.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Sorry, did you have something else to add?

Okay. So we do have another comment from Vijay Dhar. You should be able to unmute yourself.

MR. DHAR: Yeah. Actually I had asked earlier about requesting for including enterprise zone discussion deep dive and permitting deep dive and community engagement, and I heard a lot of good discussion and a lot of good feedback about the community-engagement part, but I did not get any response about the other two items.

The permitting part was actually included in the fact sheet coming from DOE this last week, after the book was published. And so I heard about that problem across the country.

And I also know that there are some experts who have very good, bright ideas about how permitting can be improved for the twenty-first century. You know it's a very age-old permitting process.

So I think we need a deep dive for both, enterprise zone and permitting process. I did not get any response about how that can be scheduled into your agenda and stuff. And I know that Rod's team has got some experts on that. Thank you.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.
Commissioner Weisgall, did you raise your hand to respond to that question?

COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: Yeah, I'll just respond briefly. That that falls within the purview of our sub-group, part of it does this enterprise zone on incentives. And those discussions are beginning. And as soon as you want to, I mean I think what you were looking at, Elisabeth and Terra, was just trying to do the next four sub-group meetings, but if you want to add the fifth on incentives, please do. I believe I'm taking the lead on that and I forget with whom right now.

But, anyway, yeah, I mean there are -- there is a whole lot of things that can be done with existing laws, state laws. There's more that we can look at for suggested state laws. And then there is potential for federal incentives as well. All variations of what would be part of an enterprise zone. So certainly from my perspective as a Commissioner, that is a front burner priority, no question about it. I think we just didn't have time to cover it in any detail today.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

I see hand raised for LCJA ECV Office. You should be able to unmute yourself.

MS. LORA: Yes. Thank you. This is Mariela with Leadership Council. I just want to say thank you for this
conversation and it was really nice to hear and thank you for advocating for the need to have in-person community engagement.

And I also wanted to throw out the idea of extending the tour to community members. Or if really not possible for legal reasons, or whatever, the possibility of having a virtual tour that's accessible to the community as well. So I just wanted to throw that out there too. Thank you.

MS. de JONG: Thank you.

Okay. I'm just looking through, we have a few, I think, written comments. And we did get one comment in, just mentioning that the Annual Geothermal Rising Conference will be held in San Diego this year. That's October 2021 and that will be in San Diego.

And let me see if there are any other... There is one other comment here from an anonymous attendee that says, "Notices of public meetings have not been received over the Lithium Valley Commission list serve, so please try to make sure that the meeting schedule is distributed in advance. Thank you very much."

That was provided from an anonymous attendee. If you would mind -- if you wouldn't mind, please email us at lithiumvalleycommission@energy.ca.gov, and we'd be happy to help troubleshoot that, as you should be receiving those
notices.

All right. I believe -- let me do one last check here. Looks like all are -- yeah, I believe that that answers all of the public comments on this community-engagement event.

I will turn back to you, Vice Chair Kelley.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you, Elisabeth.

So now we come to a General Public Comment. Now we'll open for public comments on any item.

And so back to you, Elisabeth.

MS. de JONG: Yes. Thank you.

So just to remind everyone, please raise your hand, use the Zoom raise-your-hand feature. And if you have called in, dial star 9 to raise your hand and then star 6 to unmute your phone.

I will start by mentioning in the chat earlier we had a comment from a Greg Kelly. If you're -- if you're still listening and able to speak, raise your hand and we'll unmute you. Ryan -- or, sorry, Greg Kelly expressed interest in being considered to be included in the industry construction input for further discussion.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: So, Elisabeth, I did respond to that directly to Mr. Kelly, and gave him information to share with me. And I would coordinate his inclusion in some of that conversation.
MS. de JONG: Thank you.
And we do have a hand raised from Orlando Foote.
MR. FOOTE: One last comment, very quickly. It
seems to me that the bridge between community involvement
and workforce development is -- is clear as it could
possible be. And to the extent that those could be combined
in some fashion, it seems to me might be -- might move
things forward even more quickly than they are now.
MS. de JONG: Thank you.
I do not see any other comments at this time and
so I will turn back to you, Vice Chair Kelley.
VICE CHAIR KELLEY: All right. Well, thank you
for allowing me to occupy for one meeting. And I appreciate
all your input. I also appreciate every one of the Energy
Commission for putting up the guiderails on everything I was
trying to do and making sure I didn't get in any trouble, so
I appreciate that. Thank you.
And I will entertain a motion to adjourn.
COMMISSIONER LOPEZ: Motion.
VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Thank you, Commissioner Lopez.
A second?
COMMISSIONER WEISGALL: Second.
VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Mr. Weisgall, Commissioner
Weisgall, thank you for the second.
All those in favor, just by an audible "aye"?
[COMMISSIONERS]: Aye.

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: Have a pleasant --

MS. de JONG: Thank --

VICE CHAIR KELLEY: July 4th.

MS. de JONG: Thank you. We'll see you all July 29th.

COMMISSIONER COLWELL: Thanks, Elisabeth.

MS. WEEKS: Thanks, everyone.

COMMISSIONER COLWELL: Hey, Terra, bye.

MS. WEEKS: Bye.

(Whereupon, the Commission Meeting was adjourned at 2:48 o'clock p.m.)
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