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CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Let's start the Business Meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon the Pledge is recited)

COMMISSIONER McALLISTER: This is Commissioner McAllister. I'm going to recuse myself from Item 1a, since I am the Board representative for the Collaborative for High Performance Schools, so I will step out.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Great.

(Commissioner McAllister recused himself from the room.)

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Okay. I'll move Item 1a.

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: Second.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All those in favor?

(Ayes.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: 1a passes 4-0 with one Commissioner recusing themselves.

Let's go on to Item 2.

MS. WEEKS: Good morning, Chair and Commissioners. My name is Terra Weeks. I am an Advisor to Commissioner David Hochschild, who is the Lead Commissioner on the 2018 Integrated Energy Policy Report update or IEPR Update. And this is Baily Wobschall, our Art Director here.
at the CEC.

And we are excited to present for adoption the
2018 IEPR Update Volume I entitled "Toward a Clean Energy
Future." This is what the report looks like, also shown on
the screen. And this year, we split the IEPR Update into
two volumes. So Volume I is a high-level retrospective
overview of California's leadership in clean energy policy.
It is graphic extensive and intended to reach a broader
audience than the traditional IEPR format.

Pending adoption today the report will released
ahead of the Global Climate Action Summit in September, and
serve as a tool kit to highlight California's clean energy
accomplishments for audiences both within the state and
from jurisdictions around the world.

Volume II will include more detailed analysis on
several key energy issues and is scheduled to be adopted in
February 2019.

So Volume I is a 23-page booklet, broken up into
two-page spreads that cover all the topics shown here
including renewable energy, energy efficiency, clean
transportation and energy equity, among others.

It also highlights key policy accomplishments
spanning the last two administrations under Governor Brown
and Governor Schwarzenegger. These include the state's
ambitious greenhouse gas emission reduction targets, the
renewable portfolio standards and the recently adopted Building Standards that will require solar on new homes starting in 2020.

So here is an example of one of the spreads from the report and apologies for the fine print, but for a closer look please download the report from the Energy Commission website. And this page really helps exemplify the basis for this project. As California has pioneered clean energy efforts it has grown to be the world's fifth largest economy and as you can see on the graphic on the left, consistently outpaced the national GDP growth rate.

The right side of the spread also shows that California has successfully decoupled both GDP and population growth from emissions. Since 2000, as population and GDP have increased, our total statewide emissions have decreased by 9 percent. And as we approach the Global Climate Action Summit in September other states and other countries will be looking to California as a key model, demonstrating that clean energy does not come at the expense of a thriving economy.

So there are two small changes that I want to highlight. And we have provided these changes to you in writing and have hard copies available at the entrance to the hearing room. So the first one, California ISO published their Second Quarter Western EIM Benefits Report.
yesterday. And so we are going to update numbers in the geographic diversity section, accordingly.

So the original language for that section was, "By optimizing energy resources the EIM has generated more than 330 million in cost savings for participants and displaced 250,000 metric tons of CO2 emissions since 2014." This will be changed to, "By optimizing energy resources the EIM has generated more than $400 million in gross benefits for participants and displaced 300,000 metric tons of CO2 emissions from 2014 through the second quarter of 2018."

And the second change is the number of jurisdictions under the Under2 Coalition has increased from 205 to 206.

And now, I will turn it over to Bailey to provide some highlights from the report.

MR. WOBSCHALL: Thank you, Terra.

For this project our main aim was to think through, visualize and break down some complex topics to reach a younger, more general audience. Our main focus was to create compelling visuals. Here's just a couple of examples from the report.

Here, you can see a spread on energy efficiency showing that California's per capita energy consumption falls to roughly half of the U.S. average and that also
California electricity bills are lower than the U.S. average.

Here's our clean energy innovation spread where we showcase the many sectors that our extensive research and development projects address. What we wanted to show here was that our work isn't strictly in electricity, that our work does feed into many facets of our community.

And lastly, here's our spread on partnerships across the state. We really wanted to show we have accomplished so much and we can accomplish so much, but we can't do it alone. And we really depend on our partnerships across the state and beyond.

So thank you. And on behalf of the Energy Commission staff we would like to recommend the IEPR Update Volume I and it's changes for adoption. And we look forward to your comments.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Great. Thank you.

First, are there any public comments from anyone in the room? Please identify yourself and come up.

MR. KOLODJI: Hello. My name is Brian Kolodji. I'm with the California Engineering Services Company. And I'm impressed with the report. I picked it up this morning.

It focuses on renewable energy and there's other methods, but I propose there be some consideration for
utilizing the carbon to enrich growth of crops. This is a technology that's been proven for 100 years and it's not being mentioned at all and it can actually remove all four gigatons of CO2, that are produced every year that need to be removed to reverse global warming.

It's a concept that -- the CO2 producers today, they manufacture about 100,000 tons only of pure CO2 and pipeline it to sources or truck it to sources. And it's at a cost of about $200 to $300 per ton. The technology that is actually out there also can take flue gas right off the stacks of power plants and other flue gas sources and feed it directly to crops after it's been conditioned. And this will cost less than $10 a ton of CO2 and actually makes a profit for the growers, because of increased yield and increased biomass.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you.

MR. KOLODJI: So there's no mention of that in this report.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: No. I would suggest the ARB is looking at natural lands and essentially how to make that more of a way to absorb CO2. And that's certainly something, which -- not to do with some other agency, but the answer is some other agency is really on point on this. So thank you.

MR. KOLODJI: Yeah. Well, the CARB organization
as well as the California Department of Food and Agriculture. In fact I presented at the Environmental Farming Initiative Scientific Advisory Panel on this technology and the low cost of the technology --

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Yeah, well that's good.
That's good. Go continue to work with them.

MR. KOLODJI: Yes, but I'm also asking for help from the California Energy Commission because power plants and industrial providers --

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you, your time -- thank you.

Any other public comment? Anyone on the phone?
(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Okay. Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to make a few acknowledgements, first and foremost to my friend and colleague Commissioner Douglas whose idea really was the vision for this when we were starting, when the goal was to do something more compressed and readable with a lot of visuals that would be inspiring to a global audience. And it's obviously not possible to put all of our climate activities in 23 pages, but we're trying to get some of the most compelling elements. And Commissioner Douglas shared a document she had produced during her tenure at EDF on the Salton Sea
with these very colorful spreads. And that was really the
template of what you see today. And I want to thank her
for encouraging us in this direction.

I really want to thank Heather Raitt, in particular, for keeping the trains running on time. And then Terra just did a magnificent job just refining and going through it again and again and again and getting feedback from multiple stakeholders on this, and Bailey as well.

I just think for me we have got to make all of our documents more appealing to a broad audience. And in this day and age attention spans are shorter and we have got to get better at communicating important information in ways that are going to get across. And you've really done that. I'm just really, really proud of this document, both of you. So thank you so much and I'm open to other comments as well.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: You know I'll just speak up and say I may have gotten a little too much credit on this one. David really took this on and said, "You know, I want to do something different and I want to do something that is high level, readable and a document that first and foremost communicates in a different way than past IEPRs." And of course that means that there's a lot of nuance and a lot of detail and we usually dive into the rabbit holes.
And this was different. This was panning out and looking at the forest and conveying it in a way that communicates a lot of information much more easily and much more readily. And so I did have a couple of models for him to look at, because I've faced that challenge in a past life and in other endeavors. And it is a perennial challenge that will always be with us, because we are very analytical and it's our job and it's our work to get into the weeds. And we take some measure of delight in it most of the time and we are very good at it. And yet that is not going to reach a lot of people in today's environmental. It'll reach some and it's good that it does, but I think there are multiple ways of communicating.

And I'm impressed too at the way that we were able to do this in-house and produce a document that really looks nice. So thanks to everyone who worked on this as well.

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: So I echo all those comments, and also the comment about the rabbit holes. And I'm the economist member here on the Commission, so probably maybe most guilty of that. I'm not sure. So there's probably good competition for that title.

(Laughter.)

But I agree communication is the key and we have great jobs because we get to get out there and communicate.
And I think all of us certainly speaking from my own personal experience practice makes better, maybe not perfect, but practice actually makes you better at this. But having it sort of documented and printed and official, and sort of not just PowerPoints posted on the Web, but actually have something that can go out there and go viral, is valuable.

And I wanted to just acknowledge the multiple rounds of feedback, because when you distill complex topics, you really have to be careful to both get right the substance. But also communicate and not sort of reduce the message so much that you end up with kind of a different message. And so I think the level of the graphics and the kind of level of the text actually accomplishes that. And so I think we'll get a lot of use out of this.

I've done two IEPRs and this never occurred to me to do. So there's strength in diversity and there's strength in bringing of our individual creativities to this. So it certainly, I think expresses well or reflects well Commissioner Hochschild's kind of communication skills. And just kind of an understanding of how to get big messages out there, so I appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Yeah, and I'll echo mostly what you've heard already. And just kind of pile on the idea of taking some of these really complex concepts and
putting them into digestible bite-sized pieces, I think is really great.

And there's a lot to talk about. I mean the overview over the last ten years or so, the state has accomplished a lot. And so to be able to kind of put that in a series of understandable graphics and tell the story I think is really great. So thank you to you for your leadership on that and to the team who worked so diligently to put it together.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Yeah, no thanks. I mean, obviously they say what, one picture's worth 1,000 words, so you have a very long document here. (Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: Well, my next request before we vote on it is once it's approved, please circulate it and let's get this out as broadly and widely as you can.

I also want to thank the media team who's now preparing a three-minute IEPR video, which we'll also share when that's completed, which we hope will go viral as well. It'll be completed by the time of the Climate Summit, so with that I'd move the item.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Yeah. I'll second and I'll say an IEPR video had never occurred to me either, so well done.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All those in favor?
(Ayes.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: This passes 5-0. Thank you.

I'm looking at Cody, so we've had some issues on audio, although apparently it's not our side. What's, come on up Alana. If you have an announcement why don't you make that?

MS. MATHEWS: I'll defer actually to Cody.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Okay. Microphone, please?

MR. GOLDTHRITE: So I guess it's cutting in and out when people are calling in, but right now it's fine. It's going in and out, but right now it's fine. In five minutes it could be out, but right now we're good.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Good, keep working on it. So let's go to Item 3.

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Wait, wasn't he supposed to identify himself, so he can transcribe that?

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: No. I thought he was going to point out that the PUC regulates telecommunications, but any way (Laughter.)

MR. BUCANEG: Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Haile Bucaneg and I will be providing an update on the Proposition 39 K-12 Program. This is the largest grant program that the Energy Commission has been involved with
to date.

And while it is tempting to jump straight into the benefits seen in the program by applicants such as the $1.5 billion in energy projects identified and $105 million in annual estimated energy cost savings, it is also important to recognize the large amount of work done by Energy Commission staff in creating and deploying this program.

As such, I will first touch upon development of the program and implementation of the program before expanding on the program accomplishments. I'll wrap up by talking about continuing program activities and finally touching upon some future programs that we'll be rolling out, spinning off of this Proposition 39 K-12 Program.

So this program came about as a result of the Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act and enabling legislative language in Senate Bill 73. In addition to this legislation, there was also a lot of public input that was incorporated into this program. And this was done just to make the program as accessible as possible while still meeting all legislative requirements.

The Efficiency Division's Local Assistance and Financing Office was tasked with developing the Proposition 39 K-12 Program very quickly. And this short development cycle did pose some challenges for our project managers and
our student hotline. And that was just because where
project managers and students had to learn the program and
then relearn certain aspects of the program as the program
changed in development.

But our program managers did become experts in
the program requirements and experts in our application
tools and review tools. And speaking of these tools, they
were completely developed in-house by our Energy
Commission's Information Technology Services branch. And
our IT team did face many of these same challenges as our
project manager is having to develop these tools around a
program that was still being created.

While all of this is going on internally, the
Energy Commission had to coordinate with the California
Department of Education who was tasked with holding the
funds and releasing grant funds.

So how short of a development period did we have?
Well, the original Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act was
passed in November of 2012, but it wasn't until Senate Bill
73 was passed in June 2013 that the Energy Commission's
role in the program was identified. So beginning in June
2013 our program team did create very quickly a set of
draft guidelines and hold public workshops to gain public
input for the program.

By December 2013 the program, Proposition 39 K-12
Program Guidelines were adopted by the Energy Commission. And by January 2014 just six months after Senate Bill 73 was passed, the application process for the program was released to the public and LEAs were allowed to -- and applicants were allowed to apply to this program.

The Proposition 39 K-12 Program was allocated $1.7 billion over the course of five years. And these grant funds were for energy projects to reduce energy usage and energy costs throughout California.

These funds were made available to Local Educational Agencies or LEAs, and there are about 2,200 LEAs throughout California. And these consist of public school districts, charter schools, county offices of education and state special schools.

LEAs were allowed to use the Expenditure Plan Online System as a one-stop shop for applying to the program. LEAs were able to fill and submit their application through this online system and all reporting through this online system as well. And the expenditure plan online system is one of two major systems developed by our IT teams to support the Proposition 39 K-12 Program.

The second major system created by our IT team to support the program was the Proposition 39 Energy Expenditure Plan System. And this was an internal review tool that was used by our project managers to review
applications and reports submitted by LEAs. Additionally, this tool is used to consolidate information on the program for annual reports to the Citizens Oversight Board and to report approval information to the California Department of Education, who would then release grant funds to these LEAs.

So as I mentioned, applications began in January 2014, and LEAs were allowed to continue submitting applications through February of 2018. Our project managers continued to work with LEAs to approve applications through June 30th of 2018, and a final list of approved applications were provided to the California Department of Education last month, in July.

So during this application period a large number of LEAs did take advantage of this program. At this time, the majority of LEAs are still in the process of installing energy projects, but we do have a few LEAs that have completed installation already.

Overall, 80 percent of eligible LEAs took advantage of the Proposition 39 K-12 Program. This includes 98 percent of public school districts, 98 percent of county offices of education, and 100 percent of state special schools and 65 percent of charter schools.

We did notice that larger school districts did tend to participate at higher rates. For example, 99
percent of LEAs that had an average daily attendance of 2,000 or more applied for this program.

To make sure that as many LEAs as possible participated in this program, our project managers did hold quite a few outreach and training sessions for small -- they were targeted mainly towards smaller LEAs, but all LEA sizes were allowed to participate. But these outreach sessions were very helpful -- or I believe that they were helpful as even our smallest LEAs with average daily attendance of 100 students or less had participation rates of about 70 percent.

So LEAs were allowed to include a variety of energy measures in their proposed projects. This included common energy measures such as lighting systems, HVAC and photovoltaic solar projects. But in addition to these common measures, LEAs were also eligible to fund less common measures such as building envelope and plug load measures.

Based on program applications, the most common energy measure identified was for lighting. And this was kind of anticipated, because lighting measures most easily met the program requirements such as savings to investment ratios. LEAs took advantage of this by combining lighting measures with other types of energy efficiency measures to make sure that the overall energy project met these
All in all, about $1.5 billion -- again, I'm just kind of emphasizing that because it is a lot of money, but $1.5 billion in energy projects were identified. And these projects are expected to have a large effect on energy usage of LEAs throughout California. As these projects are installed and when these all go in, it is expected that electric usage would decrease by 520 gigawatt hours of electricity annually and natural gas usage would decrease by 2 million therms. This corresponds with an estimate annual energy cost savings of $105 million for these LEAs.

And although the application period is now completed, there is still quite a bit of work to go on this program. And this mainly has to do with program reporting requirements. LEAs are required to encumber grant funds by June of 2019 and complete installation of these projects by June of 2020. This means that LEAs will be providing annual progress reports and final reports through 2021. Energy Commission staff will continue to consolidate this reported information for annual reporting to the Citizens Oversight Board.

And in addition to these reports, Energy Commission staff will be working with LEAs to amend any applications if during the implementation phase there are any changes to these projects.
And finally last year Senate Bill 110 was passed to identify three new programs to take advantage of any remaining Proposition 39 K-12 grant funds. This includes a school bus replacement program, a competitive loan program and a new competitive grant program.

Of the $1.7 billion that was allocated to the K-12 Program, the California Department of Education estimates remaining funds of $117 million. So this $117 million will fund $75 million for the school bus replacement program and approximately $42 million for the competitive loan program. And unfortunately, because we were so successful in getting grant funds out to the LEAs there is not enough remaining funds to fund a new competitive grant program at this time.

So the Energy Commission was tasked with creating a large program and launching it in a short amount of time and I believe that our program team was successful in this launching the Proposition 39 K-12 Program just six months after passage of enabling legislation. And additionally, $1.5 billion in energy projects were identified and are expected to save LEAs about $105 million annually. And I did just want to once again acknowledge the work of our staff, our project managers, our students on our hotline and our IT team whose hard work made this program so successful.
CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you.

Is there any public comment from anyone in the room? Anyone on the line?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: I will assume the answer is no to that, but let's go on to Item 4. Thank you.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER McALLISTER: I will join in and comment in applause there too. Just to add on a little bit, thanks for the very comprehensive presentation, Haile.

I wanted to just ensure that a number of people get acknowledged for their work on this program and first just make one point. We are very intentionally at the Energy Commission, developing a skillset in program design and administration. And it maybe isn't obvious, but we've had a number of programs that we have developed that as part of our brand. You know, NSHP is certainly one of them, the long-term ECCA Program, the Prop 39, which is as far as we know in monetary terms it's the largest program the Energy Commission has ever implemented.

And I think where the success that you just heard about is really part of burnishing our brand, so that the Legislature and others know that when there's something big to be done they can entrust the Energy Commission with part of that effort.
And it takes resources and certainly we need those from the Governor and the Legislature to do these big programs, but above all need skills and knowledge. And it is a specific skillset to do these programs to actually design, run, receive applications, evaluate -- there's a very specific skill set that's associated with that. But I think we're clearly one of the leading agencies if not the leading agency for running these kinds of programs, certainly in the energy sector. So I wanted to just point that out.

And then also thanks to Haile for the presentation. And over the years, the program has had a number of program managers, so Marsha Smith at the beginning of it, remember? She sort of helped to kick the whole thing off and then retired. And Liz Shirakh and Elise Brown and I guess those are the kind of leaders of this effort in a very practical way.

I also wanted to acknowledge Jim Bartridge and Jack Bastida for running the Citizens Oversight Board and just making sure that that functions well.

And finally, well and IT as well, Haile mentioned them, but they've done an incredible job of streamlining the application procedures for that. And we have a lot of work left to do, to manage and monitor what's going on and take in the reports from the schools and really understand
what the impact of the program was in practice.

We're getting a lot of data from the schools. And so that work will continue. And I think we'll learn a lot from it going forward.

So the applications are all in and processed. But the actual work in the world, which is what we're trying to achieve, is very much ongoing.

And then finally Kate Gordon I wanted to acknowledge the lead -- she was a sort of mover and shaker on the proposition itself. And then shaping the program kind of along the way in the political realm and then was chosen to lead the Citizens Oversight Board and still does. So I think that her effort there and just expertise has been really key as well, so bringing a critical eye to all of this.

Yeah, and not just Kate, but also all the Board Members, I'm not going to name them all off, but it's been a diverse group. And I think the agencies have appointed really good people all along the way, so it's been great.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: (Indiscernible.)

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Yeah, for sure.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: I'd love to chime in briefly also. Thank you so much for bringing this great presentation to the Energy Commission so we can kind of see -- to the Business Meeting, so we can see what's going on
and see the wrap-up. I appreciate that and all of the amazing work that the team has done in really successfully implementing Prop 39.

I just want to say as the Public Member on the Commission, the outreach and the education sessions that you did, having the student hotline 24 hours a day basically seven days a week, so that people could call in and really make this accessible for every LEA, every school that wanted to be part of the program, just make it as easy and streamlined for them as we can. That's a lot of work to put that together and I appreciate the work that happened there.

My understanding is also that we, staff personally called every LEA in the state to make sure that they knew about the program. I mean we just -- the team did some incredible really impressive work and I appreciate the can-do attitude. I want to kind of underscore what you said about the Energy Commission really being well-positioned to take on big initiatives. And it's because of great people like you and the Prop 39 team to make that happen. So thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: Yeah, I second all that. And Commissioner McAllister did it with the New Solar Homes Program, he's running that, got that running for Pasadena (indiscernible) and with this as well. I
agreed, this is something we've shown we do well and I hope
it's an authority and responsibility we can continue to
grow here.

The only closing thought I have is I just think
we should be looking for occasions to commemorate
accomplishments of the program as we get each next billion
dollars out the door or something. That needs to be
celebrated, because it's the biggest program of its kind in
the country. So thank you.

COMMISSIONER McALLISTER: Yeah, the participation
rates, there was the low number there that sort of skewed
the overall sort of LEA participate rate was the charters.
And there's a story behind that where the charters really
did -- there were structural issues with their
participation. And if you look at it on a monetary basis,
i mean it's just top 90 percent participation. So really
the participation was comprehensive throughout the state.
And as Commissioner Scott said that's almost unheard of,
really. And so yeah, just kudos to staff for all that they
managed to get done.

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: Do we need to move the
item?

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: No, this is
informational.

I'm assuming we had no call-in, comment on this?
Okay.

So let's go onto Item 4. Thank you.

MS. YERRAPOTU:  Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Amulya Yerrapotu. I'm a Summer Fellow in the Chair's Office, through the Stanford Energy Internships in California Program. I'm here today to present an informational item regarding the Energy Commission Project Map. This project, like the recently launched Energy Equity Indicators, uses GIF mapping to display energy-related information across California.

The Energy Commission Project Map will be an interactive map that tracks the location of projects funded or supported by the Energy Commission, overlaid with the locations of disadvantaged communities, low-income communities and legislative districts.

The purpose of this project is to provide a tool to help elected officials, other government agencies, community-based organizations and the general public, visualize and understand the location of projects funded or supported by the Energy Commission.

In this presentation I'll walk through the data included in the map and demonstrate its functions, using screenshots from an initial concept map.

But first, let's start with the data we plan to include in the map, which is essentially all projects
funded or supported through currently active Energy Commission programs, as well as power plants permitted by the Energy Commission with the intent of eventually expanding to all power plants. These two slides list all the data sources we plan to include in the map. Some of the projects include the California Clean Energy Jobs Act or Prop 39's K-12 Grant Program as we just learned about, the Alternative Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program or ARFVTP and many more.

Below each program, you can see the list of related data we plan to include as well. For example, for the Local Government Challenges Grant we intend to also share grant recipients' address, project summary and grant amount. As you can see, different programs will report slightly different data. For example, ARFVTP projects won't have megawatts generated data like the New Solar Homes Project might.

In the case of programs where information regarding location or recipient is confidential, data will be anonymized and aggregated to higher level.

So next, let's go into more depth on what this map can actually do. Some features we wanted to highlight include layer selection, which allows the user to control which data sets are displayed on the map; location search, which allows users to look up particular locations; the
screening report, which allows users to download information from the map and the chart function and dashboard, which allows users to understand data at a glance.

Here is a demonstration map itself. The user can zoom in and out and drag the map around to view any location. The sidebar contains the rest of the features of the map including the legend, layer list, screening report and charts. Clicking the icons at the top of the side bar bring up each of these features.

So let's start with the legend, which displays the symbols associated with each of the currently visible data sets. As you can see each color corresponds with the type of Energy Commission supported project. Red is power plants. Orange is ARFVTP and so on. Furthermore, the map also uses brown lines to display county boundaries, a transparent orange layer to indicate disadvantaged communities and a transparent green layer to indicate low-income census tracts.

When two transparent layers overlap, the resulting color on the map is a combination of both. That's where you get that olive green color that you see near the Central Valley that the black arrow is pointing to. That location is both a disadvantaged community and a low-income census tract.
There is also the option of adding or removing layers to the map using the layer list, which is the second icon at the top of the widget bar. Clicking the boxes in the widget allow the user to choose which programs and boundaries are displayed in the map. Here, everything is turned off except for ARFVTP, low-income communities and disadvantaged communities, allowing the user to focus in on the specific program.

The layer list function allows the user to examine in greater depth specific relationships between individual points and the characteristics of communities. For example, leaving on layers regarded disadvantaged communities and ARFVTP could allow users to identify areas that might potentially benefit from increased participation in the program.

The map also contains two legislative district layers: one for Senate districts and one for Assembly districts. Right now, the map is showing the Senate District overlay, which shows all Senate districts color coded by the party affiliation of each Senator.

You can also search for particular locations on the map including a specific address like the Energy Commission, a particular project like say a local school that received Prop 39 funding, or a boundary like Santa Clara County or your local legislative district.
Let's take a look at Senate District 6 right here in Sacramento for an example. Clicking on a particular point on the map brings up a popup window that displays more details about the project. So if I click on an ARFVTP Project the popup shows me information related to that project, like the recipient, title, amount and so on. However, you'll notice that there's more than just an ARFVTP project present at that point. Clicking on the arrows in the top right corner of the popup lets me cycle through all the data associated with the location. The number in the top left corner indicates how many other data points are present.

As you can see, moving to a different data layer allows you to view more details about that layer. This feature provides context about the location of a project including the presence of other projects in the immediate area.

So next let's go over the Screening Report. This feature allows the user to pull data from the map to use in their own analysis. The user defines a location. They can pick a preexisting boundary, like a county or a legislative district, or a particular location, an address or a specific project and a radius.

For example, if you wanted to get an understanding of the Energy Commission's presence in your
local community, you could search up your home address with a five-mile radius to find all the projects close to where you live. Clicking the report button pulls up a page that displays all the projects within the chosen location, in this case District 6.

Next, using the downloader print icons allow the user to export data as a CS feed file or a screening report, respectively. In either case, the information can be used by individuals or organizations looking to perform their own analysis specific to particular locations. Essentially the Screening Report ensures that all data in the map is public and easily downloadable. Interested parties don't have to sift through huge data sets and can choose to download what is specifically of interest to their needs.

Next, let's go over the chart function. This tool allows the user to view charts already created by Energy Commission staff. Essentially, the chart function serves as a vehicle through which the Energy Commission can present and highlight analysis we feel is particularly important.

Listed right now are a few demonstration charts I created to show what charts in a final map could look like. Users can chose to limit the data contained within the chart to whatever is currently displayed on the map. So
right now, we're zoomed in on Sacramento. Using the spatial filter to limit features would show us the distribution of ARFVTP project types in Sacramento only.

You can expand the chart to fill the screen and see it more easily. This chart shows the distribution of the number of ARFVTP projects by project type. As you can see, electric vehicle charging infrastructure accounts for a clear majority of ARFVTP projects funded in the Sacramento area, represented by the large gray slice of the pie chart. If we were to change the location of the map or zoom out to see all of California, this distribution would look different. In this way you can see how different areas of California differ in regards to the kinds of projects present. Moving forward, we plan on working to expand the charts offered and think more on how to display information that stakeholders are interested in viewing.

Finally, the map will be accompanied by an associated dashboard, which provides some higher level information about Energy Commission projects across the state. The dashboard displayed on screen is a proof of concept demonstration I created to visualize what the final product could look like. This particular dashboard, when complete, will show the sum of money spent on various programs. It also displays pie charts depicting the portion of projects by count that are in disadvantaged
communities, low-income communities, both or neither represented by orange, green, yellow and blue, respectively.

A feature like this would be of use to someone who is more unfamiliar with the Energy Commission and wants to get a better understanding of the scope of our work. The dashboard provides aggregated at-a-glance information and can convey information without overwhelming the user.

In terms of next steps, we're currently working on updating the data included in the map in a phased approach. You'll notice that the demonstration map includes just five data sets on Energy Commission projects. The first phase will center around updating these five data sets with recent projects and expanding beyond those data sets by adding information on programs like natural gas research that aren't currently included in the map. The second phase will comprise of adding information to existing data sets. For example, jobs information on power plants.

Finally, we're working with the Public Adviser's Office to incorporate information on Energy Commission outreach into the map to give interested parties a way to see the communities the Energy Commission is present in and has reached out to. We hope to have a map containing the first phase of data updates go live by the end of August.
After getting the map up and running data and the map will be updated quarterly, adding new projects and updating project status as projects are completed.

I want to take a moment to give a special thank you to the representatives from each division that have been working to compile all this data, as well as to Travis David from the Cartography Unit for putting this map together. I also want to thank Chair Weisenmiller for giving us the opportunity to go forward with this project. It would not be possible without him.

Overall, we believe that the Energy Commission Project Map will serve as a helpful tool in communicating the work of the Commission to interested parties and helping Californians better understand what we do and where we do it.

Thank you so much for your time and attention in learning about this ongoing staff effort. I look forward to answering any questions.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you.

First, any comments from anyone in the room? Anyone on the line?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: So again, let's sort of transition to the Commissioners.

Amulya, we really want to thank you for your
energy and creativity. You know I think Kevin for years now has been trying to really organize the information on what the Energy Commission does and this really is taking it to a greater level of sophistication.

I'll take the opportunity also at this point to introduce Matt Alexander who's my other Stanford intern. There just at I think at this point we've all had that.

So again, I think it's really important to again all of us are struggling with how to convey information. I mean, I think we talked about that first in the IEPR. I think this is another example of how we can use the data tools and GIS to really get information out.

So any comments from anyone else?

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Well, I'll just echo that it's really exciting to have this information presented in this way. We've had an ARFVTP map for a little while and it's great to kind of have all of the projects that the Energy Commission is working on. And I love the legislative layers and the fact that it will be really easy for people to be able to click on it and focus in on what portion of what they're looking for, so thanks for putting this together. It's a great project.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Yeah. I'll just agree. And I do think the parallel to the discussion this morning is exactly right. This information empowers people to go
in themselves and look at what we've done and ask questions and go through the data and begin to answer them. And I think it's valuable for us. And I think it's a real service to people in California to have this tool available. So thanks for your work on it.

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: I'm sorry, what year are you at Stanford?

MS. YERRAPOTU: I'm going to be a junior.

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: Okay. When I was a sophomore in college, I could not have done this, so well done.

I just want to say, you know I think all of us have had the experience with meeting with members of the Legislature too and I know the Office of Government Affairs here has helped compile these reports on how much of our funds from different programs are happening by legislative district. And it's just been interesting, in my experience it's new information every time. The legislators have no idea how many dollars of Prop 39 or New Solar Homes or ECCA or ARFVTP. And it's really important to do that, because there are real benefits and real jobs and real savings. And so this is yet another step in that direction, so great work. Keep it going, thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Yeah, and I'm piling on. It occurs to me that as we do more outreach and try to
get present in communities around the state and not just
have meetings here in Sacramento -- we do a lot around the
state, but we really need to do more. And I think we're
aiming to do more certainly in some of the existing
buildings that I oversee. We're trying to do workshops and
here just listening, meetings with stakeholders around the
state. And it might even be a good thing to even represent
that, those efforts, you know in a GIS. "Here are all the
places that we've met around the state," and sort of be
more transparent about that.

Because I think again it goes against the sort of
brand that the Energy Commission has, which is that we're a
regulatory body. We're not that accessible. We've changed
that tremendously, I think, but we still have work to do.
So I guess I'm going to be thinking about new pieces of
information we could represent visually and geographically.

And then just also another teaser out there, I
mean we'll be able -- in a year or year and a half or so,
not to put pressure on the data staff, but we're going to
be able to represent energy trends like in the very
granular way in this same kind of visualization and
longitudinal changes and sector-by-sector. We're going to
be able to do a lot of slicing and dicing of actual energy
consumption and building trends and things like that. And
again building on the GIS stuff that I think Commissioner
Douglas really pioneered on the VRECP work. So just lots of different threads of effort are coming along, and they're relating and intertwining in really interesting ways and we're going to see a lot of positive outcomes from that, I think.

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: Could I just ask you a question, Amulya? Just as you were doing this, what was the most challenging and what were the barriers you encountered?

MS. YERRAPOTU: I think in terms of the most challenging, definitely massaging GIS in like the chart function to get it to display data in a way that makes sense or is more helpful. So for example, the ARFVTP graph that you saw shows projects-by-project count. So it would be that large slice of electric vehicle charging was by the number of chargers, which I think is not necessarily as helpful as getting an understanding for how much funding is going to various parts of the project.

So figuring out the difference between those different measures and what is most useful to display, I think was definitely one of the challenges.

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: Great. Good to know.

Thank you.

MS. YERRAPOTU: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Yeah. Thanks, again.
(Applause.)

Let's go on to Item 5. Actually before we do, Alana, do you want to make the announcement just to make sure everyone knows?

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Great. Let's go on to item five. Actually, before we do, Alana, do you want to make the announcement just to make sure everyone knows.

MS. MATHEWS: Yes. So apparently there continues to be a little bit of technical difficulties and we just want to make sure that there are any members of the public who would like to make a public comment, please contact the Public Adviser's Office. We have the number up there, or anyone else who's experiencing technical difficulties in hearing this meeting please contact the Public Adviser's Office at the numbers that are listed. We have a local number as well as a 1-800 number, so that we can further assist you so you can participate in today's Business Meeting. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thanks. Go ahead.

MS. ROOT: All right. Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Christine Root and I'm the Compliance Office Manager in the Siting Division. I also have Kirk Oliver with me, Staff Attorney.

Today, staff is seeking approval of a proposed settlement agreement for the Gateway Generating Station.
The Gateway Project is a 530-megawatt combined cycle natural gas-fired facility located in the City of Antioch in Contra Costa County, California.

The facility was certified by the Energy Commission in May, 2001 and began commercial operation in January 2009.

The settlement agreement is intended to resolve issues rising from staff's investigation and reporting violations by Pacific Gas and Electric Company, the owner of Gateway.

The certification for the Gateway facility requires that PG&E notify the Energy Commission within ten days of receiving any complaints about its operations. But PG&E was untimely in notifying the Energy Commission about four separate complaints that have been reported to Gateway between May 28th, 2016 and June 22nd, 2016. The complaints allege that particulate matter, originating from the Gateway Generating Station, caused damage to boats and other personal property located near the facility.

PG&E's notification to the Energy Commission were made over three months after the complaints were made, exceeding the ten-day notification requirement. The extended time between the receipt of the complaints by PG&E, and PG&E reporting the complaints to the Energy Commission, precluded staff from investigating the root
cause of reported damage of personal property in the vicinity of the project.

Staff and PG&E agree that this matter can be effectively resolved by a settlement agreement under which PG&E will pay $50,000 to the Energy Commission, reporting requirements in Gateway's certification will be amended to provide additional clarity. And two new conditions of certification: AQ-SC12 and AQ-SC13 will be added to Gateway's certification to allow for verification of the level of particulate matter released upon restart after an outage.

The proposed settlement agreement provides that the Energy Commission agrees to close the matter without further action or litigation. And I'm available to answer any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you, Scott?

MR. GALATI: Scott Galati representing PG&E, just ask that you approve the settlement agreement. We worked well with staff. We think the clarification to the Condition of Certification will ensure that something like this doesn't happen again.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Okay.

Any public comment? Any comment from anyone on the phone? Commissioner Douglas?

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Yeah, I'll just say I got
a briefing this. And I think that it's a good settlement and I recommend it for your approval. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: Can I just ask, I'm just concerned about the failure to report and your sense of how I guess all the utilities that we deal with in this capacity, I mean is that gray area. Has this kind of thing happened before? It's the first time I've seen that fine for failure to report on something like that.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: You know, I think one of the reasons and I'll speak to staff again too, I think one of the reasons this is the first time you've seen it is that we've been working to augment our communication with project owners and so we have a new process Christine can speak to around enforcement of existing conditions.

And a lot of that is iterative, as Scott sort of pointed out. Part of this involves clarifications to conditions to make it exactly and precisely clear that they need to report to us within ten days and so on. And it's timeliness of us getting notification of issues is very important, because if you don't have timely notification of an issue by the time the Energy Commission does hear about something, and even if we send people to the site, there's nothing to see. You know, data is stale and so one.

Christine?

MS. ROOT: Yes. I may add that staff has been
working with our stakeholders and our enforcement policies and have had actually two workshops previously in the last couple of years on new tools and policies that the Energy Commission is using in its compliance enforcement for the power plants in the State of California.

MR. GALATI: Commissioner Hochschild, may I respond? I just also wanted to let you know that PG&E is different than many other applicants that the Energy Commission has granted a license to. Whereas the sole source for many applicants, the sole ability to make a complaint is to the plant. And we've also instituted some procedures internal to PG&E that when complaints don't come to the plant, but they come to some other part of the organization, they filter to the plant in a way such that the plant can report.

So we do believe that between the changes to the Conditions of Certification and the measures we've taken on our part, this is also the first time you've seen PG&E who owns three plants get a Notice of Violation. We've worked very well with the Commission and that's why we settled this and got to this quickly, made these changes, so that this kind of thing won't happen again.

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: So I'll move approval of this item.
COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Second.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All those in favor?

(Ayes.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: This item passes 5-0.

Thank you.

Let's go on to Item 6.

MS. DYAS: Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Mary Dyas and I'm the Compliance Project Manager for the Argus Expansion project known as ACE. With me this morning is Jared Babula, Senior Staff Attorney, and representing the project, Bob Therkelsen is here.

Today, we are requesting the Commission's approval of a Petition for Termination of the ACE project.

The 100 megawatt ACE project was certified by the Energy Commission on January 8th, 1988 and began commercial operation in January of 1991. The ACE project was a coal and petroleum fired power plant located in Trona, San Bernardino County.

On October 2nd, 2014 the power plant ceased operations and was placed in a long-term outage condition to secure the facility and minimize environmental hazards. On June 10th, 2015 the Energy Commission approved a petition to decommission the power plant and adopted additional conditions to ensure demolition and other decommissioning activities would comply with all legal
requirements and not result in adverse environmental
impacts.

The approved plan proposed to demolish several of
the structures on the ACE site used exclusively for power
generation and retain other structures for future
industrial use, reuse.

In September 2015, New Mill Capital acquired the
ACE project and initially suspended all decommissioning
activities to review options for the facility. On May
14th, 2018 SB Industrial Services purchased the ACE Project
and plans on demolishing some of the structures at the ACE
project including the boiler and stack and retaining
others, including the turbine generator building for
industrial reuse consistent with the approved
decommissioning plan.

On June 19th, 2018 the project owner filed a
Petition for Termination with the Energy Commission
requesting approval of a petition to remove all remaining
open conditions related to the approved 2015 project
decommissioning plan to terminate Energy Commission
jurisdiction over the ACE project and to waive the 2018–
2019 annual compliance fee.

The Petition for Termination includes a letter
from San Bernardino County regarding their willingness to
assume jurisdiction over the project in its current
condition, and the reuse of the retained structures, as
well as their willingness and ability to oversee demolition
of the non-retained structures.

Staff has reviewed the petition for termination
and has not identified any apparent environmental or health
and safety risks that would warrant the Energy Commission
to retain jurisdiction. Staff has also confirmed San
Bernardino County has the ability and is willing to assume
jurisdiction over the ACE facility for future repurposing
as an industrial site.

Staff has determined that open Conditions of
Certification related to the future demolition of facility
structures can be removed because San Bernardino County's
demolition permit process would ensure the substantive
requirements of the conditions would be met.

In addition, the facility is no longer a power
plant. A Notice of Receipt was docketed and mailed to the
ACE mail list and listserv on June 22nd, 2018. Staff's
analysis of the petition was docketed and a notice was
mailed to the ACE mail list and listserv on July 12th,
2018.

The only comments filed on the petition came from
Searles Valley Minerals or SVM, the owner of the project
site. The comments were not directly about the petition,
but related to terms in the land lease agreement between
SVM and the facility owner.

Staff has reviewed the comments and does not find them relevant to the issues before the Commission today. Staff would defer to the applicant to respond to specific questions about its lease agreement with SVM.

Staff recommends approval of the petition to remove all remaining open Conditions of Certification related to the approved 2015 ACE Project Decommissioning Plan, the termination of Energy Commission jurisdiction over the ACE project and the waiver of the 2018-2019 annual compliance fee. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you.

Mr. Therkelsen?

MR. THERKELSEN: Good morning, Commissioners. Am I on?

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Green light.

MR. THERKELSEN: Anyway, my name is Bob Therkelson. I'm representing ACE Cogeneration Company today. Larry Trowsdale, the General Manager of the facility is on the phone. He may or may not be listening to you on what's happening on that end.

But it's amazing to me to think that 30 years ago, 6 months or so, this project was approved by this body. It was approved as a demonstration project to show that a coal-fired circulating fluidized bed power plant
could be economic, could operate reliably and could also meet California's air emission requirement. And that project succeeded. It was quite a demonstration. I think it was the first demonstration project ever approved by this body.

Anyway, as Mary mentioned in 2014 the plant was shut down to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the facility and to approve the overall profile from the Southern California Edison system.

Today, as she mentioned we are asking that you terminate the jurisdiction of the Commission for the project. We'd like to turn the project over to San Bernardino County to do demolition and also to work with us in terms of reuse of the site as an industrial facility.

I'd really like to thank the staff. They did a super job, not only working with us in terms of developing the decommissioning plan, but they were very patient while we looked at options for reuse of the facility including reuse as a renewable hydrogen production facility and also how rapidly they responded to our petition for termination. They did a super job in all of that.

If you have any questions I'd be more than willing to answer them.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you. Are there any
public comments from anyone in the room? Any public
comment from anyone in the line? And again if you have
problems call the Public Adviser and she'll make sure your
comments get through.

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Well, let's transition to
the Commissioners. Commissioner Douglas?

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: I've reviewed this. I
think it's a very solid and good proposal. Obviously, San
Bernardino County has a strong program around
decommissioning. They've got a lot of interest in this
area, in terms of the Trona area and possible reuse of the
site. So I think this is a good idea and I think transfer
to the county at this point is appropriate.

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: I had a quick question
for staff. Please correct me if I'm wrong, but am I
remembering correctly this is the last operating coal plant
in the state? Or are there still others that remain after
this is shut down; does anyone know?

MS. ROOT: Yes. This is Christine Root again,
Compliance Office Manager. This was the last operating
coal facility that has not operated in quite some time and
Mary could probably help with the date there.

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: But there's no others
that we know of?
MS. ROOT: No.

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: Okay.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Yeah. There may be a small one that I think Shell has retrieved from shutting down. Presumably it's selling a similar label, what I hate to think anyway.

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: So move approval of this item.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Second.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All those in favor?

(Ayes.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: This item passes 5-0.

Thanks.

MS. DYAS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Let's go on to Item 7.

MR. BABULA: Now we're getting to the exciting stuff, rulemakings. So my name is Jared Babula and I'm an attorney here at the Commission.

Title 20 of the California Code of Regulations contains the provisions governing many of the Commission's activities and programs. This rule making addresses just four distinct areas of these regulations with an overarching goal to proactively improve the functionality of procedures, modernize the language and remove obsolete...
sections.

The first part encompasses what could be considered language refinements to sections of the regulations covering adjudicative proceedings, request for investigations, complaints and power plant licensing. The majority of these changes are for clarity or to add consistency between similar procedures. For example, harmonizing the general complaint process under Section 1233 with the complaint process set forth in 1240 covering a renewable portfolio standard.

The second part of the rulemaking restructures the regulations, so that the small power plant exemption process is no longer partially spread between two distinct sections, the 1700s and the 1900s, but solely contained within the 1900s. While there are not substantive changes, consolidating the process in one article will make following the small power plant process easier for those filing exemptions with the Commission.

In addition, consolidation will provide greater distinction between the requirements of the small power plant exemption and the application for certification process.

The third part of the rulemaking repeals Sections 2301 to 2309, which were originally designed to implement the California Environmental Quality Act the provisions,
which date back to 1978 are obsolete and superseded by the Commission's Certified Regulatory Program, of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

Finally, the fourth part of the rulemaking is specific to Commission power plant licensing program and amends Section 1708, 1769 and adds a new provision, 1769.1.

Section 1708 provides details on the cost and accounting under the statutory processing fee the Commission charges power plant owners for reviewing amendments to facility licenses.

The proposed section changes to 1769 provide more flexibility and efficiency by allowing staff to provide changes to the conditions related to air quality requirements, when those changes conform to changes made by the Air District and its permit and the changes will not impact the environment. This is a key innovation in the regulations that addresses an inefficiency, which has historically hampered consistency between the Commission's license and the Air District's permit.

New Section 1769.1 creates a subset of amendments that Commission staff can initiate with the project owner. This will allow for a more efficient and flexible process to address obsolete conditions while also not triggering the amendment fee, because the amendment is staff initiated.
The proposed language changes resulted from a multifaceted effort by Commission staff to engage stakeholders, especially on the issue of power plant license amendments, to understand barriers to efficient amendment review and approval, while ensuring public participation. Staff held two workshops to discuss proposed language changes and to solicit comments from stakeholders.

During and after the workshop, staff received thoughtful comments from a diverse set of stakeholders including the Independent Energy Producers, California Union for Reliable Energy, the Center for Biological Diversity and others. Many of the comments resulted in language changes, improving the regulatory language. It should be clear that just because a comment did not result in a language change, does not mean that staff did not carefully consider the comment.

The comment period on the proposed regulation changes ended on July 20th. One set of comments were received by the Independent Energy Producers. Staff reviewed the filed comments, which reiterated prior comments. Staff will be responding to the comments fully in the Final Statement of Reasons, although I am prepared today to address any written or oral comments made.

Staff recommends no further changes to the
proposed language and that the Commission adopt the Express
Terms, the Notice of Exemption and Findings as set forth in
the resolution. I'm available to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you.

First let's start with any comments from anyone
in the room.

MS. NEUMYER: Good morning, Samantha Neumyer with
Ellison, Schneider, Harrison & Donlan on behalf of
Independent Energy Producers.

We'd like to thank CEC staff for their hard work
in this proceeding, particularly Jared. We do agree that
we think the proposed amendments reflect some careful
consideration and collaboration with interested
stakeholders. We did submit additional comments on the
language, so we won't raise those again. We think
additional clarity is needed relating to the cost for
amendments to the petrol project certification.

Notwithstanding these concerns, we do think that
these amendments represent progress. We think it'll lead
to greater clarity, particularly with processing petitions
for modification. And we thank the Commission for its
efforts.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you.

Anyone else in the room? How about on the line?

MR. BABULA: Is Lisa Bolanki (phonetic) on the
line? She said she might call in.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Sarvey.

MR. SARVEY: Hello?

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Yes. Please go ahead.

MR. SARVEY: Oh, you can hear me. Great. Okay.

I've been having a lot of trouble in getting on the phone, so I wasn't sure you guys were going to get to me or not.

I appreciate the work that the Commission did in supporting the passage of Public Resources Code 25806(e). Staff's proposal to amend Section 1708 is not consistent with the intent of Section 25806(e). Staff's proposed language for Section 1708 states that the activities of Commissioners, their advisers, Commission hearing officers and other attorneys, Commission staffs, advising Commissioners or the Commission are not considered part of the processing the Petition to Amend. Excluding the Commissioners and their staff's expenses from the cost of the Petition to Amend is contrary to the language of Public Recourses Code 25806(e).

Section 25806(e) requires the Commission shall conduct a full accounting of the actual cost of processing a Petition to Amend for which the project owner shall reimburse the Commission.

There's no basis for excluding Commissioners and
their staff's travel, meals and lodging expenses to attend hearings for the amendment in locations outside Sacramento. These costs are easily identified and can be substantial. There's no legal basis to require ratepayers to fund these costs when the Legislature has clearly stated the project proponent is responsible for the full actual cost of the amendment.

Staff's proposed language is unacceptable as it shifts costs of amending licenses to ratepayers, an outcome that Public Resources Code 25806(e) was specifically passed to prevent.

In addition, staff's proposal to amend Section 17694(a) concerning a Commissioner-approved amendment should include a public review and comment period of 14 days of staff's analysis before the full Commission makes a determination on the amendment. This will provide the public participation requirement that CEQA imposes.

Thank you, Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you.

Anyone else on the line?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Staff, do you want to respond?

MR. BABULA: Thank you. Again, there'll be a full response in the final Statement of Reasons, but to
respond to those comments on the cost of the -- first of all, these are amendments. So generally there's not a lot of travel and hotel costs and such forth, because most of these amendments are shorter processes. A lot are just staff approved, so there isn't necessarily Commission costs.

The part that we weren't costing dealt with deliberation and the development of the decision when that -- for those hours. But the actual, if you look at what is included would be creation of the document, administrative time. So we are costing the work from the decision makers in the context of physically creating the proposed decision when you have one. And again, a lot of amendments don't rise to the level of having proposed decisions and so forth, because these are not the same as an AFC.

And I'm not clear when you're saying ratepayers what exactly that is a reference to, because this isn't like ratepayers in the sense of costing for a power plant.

As for your other comment regarding the 14 days is consistent with what we have right now, as a 14-day window where the public has an opportunity to object to something that's going to be staff approved. And then it will go to a Business Meeting for Commission approval if the objection meets the requirements in either the current language or in the new language. So nothing's really
changing regarding the 14 days. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Okay. Commissioner Douglas?

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: So I'll just make a couple of comments on this. This package is not a large package, but it took a long time to develop and we've been through a pretty long process on this.

We set out to do these regulatory updates in part to bring our regulations up to date with the new amendment billing and also to really review our amendment process. And ensure that it is as efficient and kind of reasonable as it could be or to make some important incremental improvements at least in that direction, especially given that we were moving into a new fee for service type of approach. And so I think these amendments achieve that.

We did make a decision that the deliberative time and the decision making side of the equation of the Energy Commission not be included in the fee. It's for amendments typically a very small portion of that fee. And depending on the issues and depending on the Commissioners, of course you could get more time spent reading or less time spent reading. But what we -- you know, documents and asking questions and going into review and deliberation and it just didn't seem as we thought about it, to make sense to charge applicants if we needed a closed session or
something like that.

But what we did endeavor to do I think with a fair degree of thoroughness, is ensure that we were able to cover the full costs and charge the full costs of preparing the environmental analysis and everything that's part of that, up to and including document production and circulation. And so I think the billing that we will have will be very thorough in terms of the costs of processing the amendment, so.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Commissioner Douglas, what about his second comment on the 14 day?

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Jared responded to that. Can you repeat what you just said?

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Yeah, I think he said that 14 day is the current. I wasn't clear whether the question was, was it proposed to be decreased or exactly what the issue was.

MR. BABULA: Yeah. I wasn't 100 percent clear. Right now, if staff believes that the amendment doesn't trigger any environmental impacts, doesn't have a change to a Condition of Certification, or doesn't create an inconsistency with LORS then staff can approve the amendment. And that approval notice goes out for a 14-day comment, in which case the public can object that staff's incorrect in one of those three elements and therefore the
amendment would need to be approved by the Commission. We retained that in this, the new regs propose to continue that 14 day, so it's an existing time table that's set. And you've got to keep in mind that this is for an existing licensed project that had a full environmental review. So it's not that this is a new things and staff's going to approve it. This is a slight change of some change to a performance design or operation feature of an existing licensed project. And the 14 day is a merely to see if someone objects to staff approving the change.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Yeah. I think it just didn't trigger much with me, because we really didn't set out to change that. So I don't know if there are other questions or comments?

(No audible response.)

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: All right. Well, I want to thank everyone who took part in the process and I know it was an extended one. And I'll move approval of this item.

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Second.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All those in favor?

(Ayes.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: This item is approved 5-0. Thank you. Let's go on to 8, petition to the U.S. Department
MR. STEFFENSEN: Good morning Chair and Commissioners. I am Sean Steffensen, a Mechanical Engineer with the Appliance Office in the Commission's Efficiency Division. With me is Matt Chalmers, with the Chief Counsel's Office.

Staff is requesting that the Commission delegate to the Executive Director or his or her designee, the authority to sign a petition requesting the U.S. Department of Energy or DOE, to conduct a rulemaking process to establish new Federal Appliance Efficiency Standards in test procedures for dedicated purpose pool pump motors.

Pool pump motors use a significant amount of energy, as much as 2,500 kilowatt hours per year, per pool.

In 2004, California set standards to prohibit the sale of the least efficient pool pump motor types and in 2008 updated those standards to require standard sized pool pump motors to be dual or variable speed.

The Commission has released three staff reports and held three staff workshops in recent years to discuss opportunities to update the Standards.

At the same time the Commission participated as a voting member as part of DOE's efforts to create a national standard for dedicated purpose pool pumps. Working with energy advocates and pool pump motor industry
representatives, this effort achieved a unanimous consensus for strong national standards that expanded coverage to more pool pump types than are covered by California standards, set minimum efficiency levels leading to widespread use of variable speed motors, delivered overwhelming cost effective savings to the consumer and yielded significant energy savings and greenhouse gas reductions.

Energy advocates and industry view the effort as incomplete, as the standard did not set equivalent standards for pool pump motors; a significant opportunity since many consumers choose to replace the motor as a popular repair option.

Over the last four months the Commission, energy advocates and industry reached consensus on potential national standards for dedicated purpose pool pump motors. The Standards will deliver significant energy savings to Californians by requiring many pool pump motors to be variable speed.

It also extends California's prohibition on the least efficient motor types to apply to a broader set of pool motor applications. The proposed compliance date will be July 19th, 2021, the same date as the National Pool Pump Standard. With these proposed standards, a consumer will achieve cost effective savings whether they replace the
motor or the entire pool pump.

The next step is to request that the DOE set these standards as national standards. Therefore, staff asks the Commission to approve Item 8 to allow the Commission to join a petition requesting that DOE set national efficiency standards for dedicated purpose pool pump motors. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you.

So any comments from anyone in the room? Any comments from anyone on the line?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Commissioner McAllister?

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Thank you, Sean and also Christine. You guys represent us really well in those gatherings of industry and stakeholders and advocates.

So this is pretty straightforward. I mean the goal is to keep aligned with pool pumps and the pool pump motors, so that there's not the ability for folks to game or for inefficient products to make their way into the marketplace. And we have just sort of consensus or are consistent across the board in terms of efficiency in the various offerings. A huge, obviously, savings potential here and I just wanted to -- just pretty straightforward, I would think.

I just wanted to also say that this is our -- we
will be authorizing the Executive Director to enter this petition. But it doesn't necessarily, really doesn't mean that we would letting our foot off the lever, off the pedal locally in California to possibly develop, sort of do what we need to do in our own context and using our own authority. It really depends on how this whole thing pans out in Washington, which is still an unknown.

And so I think we have sort of two tracks we're going down to try to achieve this end in California. So this is the federal level piece of it, so I'll move Item 8.

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: Second.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All those in favor?

(Ayes.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Item 8 passes 5-0. Thank you. Let's go on to Item 9

MR. DEAVER: Good morning Chair, Commissioners. My name's Paul Deaver. I'm the Program Manager for Publicly Owned Utility Integrated Resource Plans. Today I'm presenting revisions to the Publicly Owned Utility Integrated Resource Plan Submission and Review Guidelines. These guidelines were originally adopted at the August 2017 Energy Commission Business Meeting. The changes in these revised guidelines will reflect requirements from Senate Bill 338, which went into effect January 1st, 2018. But the revisions also include minor
clarifications and changes.

A little background on integrated resource planning, integrated resource plans are electricity system planning documents that describe how utilities plan to meet their energy and resource capacity needs; also their environmental policy goals. They describe how the utilities will address their physical and operational constraints and also other utility priorities.

Senate Bill 350 requires publicly owned utilities with annual loads greater than 700 GWh to adopt integrated resource plans by January 1st, 2019, submit them to the Energy Commission and update these plans at least once every five years thereafter. We expect for 16 publicly owned utilities to submit integrated resource plans to the Energy Commission.

Senate Bill 350 tasked the Energy Commission with reviewing these resource plans for consistency with requirements of legislation. The guidelines were developed to provide the publicly owned utilities with the requirements for submitting the resource plans including what supporting information to include. It also describes how the Energy Commission will review these resource plans.

The revised guidelines being considered today address requirements of Senate Bill 338 and Senate Bill 338 requires the Publicly Owned Utility Governing Board in
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developing their integrated resource plan to consider the role of existing renewable generation and grid operation efficiencies, energy storage, energy efficiency as well as distributed generation and meeting their energy and their reliability needs during the hours of net peak demand.

The publicly owned utilities must also consider these resources while reducing the need for new generation and transmission in achieving the state's energy goals at the least cost to the ratepayers.

Changes to the Guidelines provide the publicly owned utilities with instructions on what to include in their resource plans pursuant to Senate Bill 338. As part of the revision process for the guidelines staff held a public webinar in May of 2018. During the webinar we provided an overview of our proposed amendments and we solicited stakeholder feedback on these. Staff received comments, both during the webinar and after the webinar during the comment period. The publicly owned utilities generally supported our proposed changes and they suggested minor changes and clarifications.

So in addition to the changes resulting from Senate Bill 338 staff is proposing changes to address publicly owned utilities' comments seeking to clarify and improve the reporting and the review process. Some of these changes include clarifying that integrated resource
plans are to be updated at least once every five years from the date that the Publicly Owned Utility Governing Board adopts the resource plan, improving the consistency with the RPS terminology and requirements, also updating the reporting tables and the instructions and making minor formatting and typographical corrections throughout.

So today, staff is requesting the Revised Public Owned Utility Integrated Resource Plan Submission and Review Guidelines be adopted. Thank you and I'm happy to answer any questions or comments.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you.

Any comments from anyone in the room? Sure, come on up.

MR. KOLODJI: Okay. In the earlier presentation they show that about 10 percent of the greenhouse gas emission reductions have been achieved, of which power plants such as these are basically half of the power supply in California. And there's no way -- I mean, we can't avoid, we can't ignore the fact that we have to remove or capture the CO2 off of the stack of a conventional --

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: People have tried that (indiscernible) --

MR. KOLODJI: I am a chemical engineer. I didn't mention that. I've got 40 years of experience.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: That's fine.
MR. KOLODJI: I'm an expert in gas processing, (indiscernible) sulfur, etcetera.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: That's fine, yeah. Go ahead.

MR. KOLODJI: My point is that yes, there is a way to do it. It's economical today with patents pending that I have personally, okay? And also we would take the stack as neat (phonetic) and we just don't have cooperation from the stack (indiscernible) producers right now. We're asking the California Energy Commission to consider these new methods, okay? Not the old methods that cost $200 a ton, but the new methods that cost $10 a ton of CO2 to allow the capture of that gas. And then we can speed it up quite a bit, speed this removal of CO2 from the atmosphere up much faster than any of these other renewable concepts, because we can retrofit these facilities for very low cost per ton compared to existing methods out there.

Large companies are removing CO2 off of stacks, producing pure CO2. The technologies I'm proposing do not recover and do not purify the CO2. They take the CO2 and dilute it for crops. They take it at 10 to 20 percent CO2 off the stack and feed it to crops at 1,000 parts per million. So we dilute it with air and we actually increase the yield of the crops by almost 100 percent making a profit off the flue gas. New concept, the California Air
Resources Board is aware of it and the California Department of Food and Agriculture invited me to present this technology and scientific (indiscernible) and it works. It's been done for over 100 years, but not in the way that you can capture. I mean, it's been done in greenhouses.

What we're going to propose, what I'm proposing doing is using this in open air flue gas flooding our cultural fields with this high-concentration CO2 and diluting it down to where crops can accept.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Okay. Go talk to some of the producers, offer them contracts and your price, but thank you.

MR. KOLODI: We need some help from the California Energy Commission to help promote this.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Well, this isn't the right forum. We do have research money that we come up with, investment plans and so make proposals there. But not --

MR. KOLODI: Okay. But it's not mentioned in these plans and it's not mentioned in any --

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: No, well again these plans are the utility resource plans. So you can go talk to them too, but our job is to set the guidelines based upon the law, which we've done. Certainly that's a good
forum for you to raise that question say of LADWP.

MR. KOLODJI: I'm bringing it up here, because in Section H. Greenhouse Gas Emissions, nothing is mentioned about having to remove it from the stack gas and making a profit by producing more food.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Yeah, that's good. Thank you.

Okay. Any comments by anyone else in the room? Anyone on the line?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Okay, transition to the Commissioners.

This is a relatively straightforward amendment of our guidelines. It reflects Senator Skinner's legislation. The POUs are starting to file IRPs with us. I think we've gotten the first one. We're trying to give them complete regulations that include the Skinner requirements, hopefully as part of those filings.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: I just have one comment. I got an excellent briefing on this topic just on Monday on the updates. And there is the definition for plug-in electric vehicles is a little different than the way that we talked about them throughout the rest of the Commission, but not such that we felt like we needed to do an errata or anything to update that. But that may be one thing for us...
to keep an eye on, as the POUs are putting this information together.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: That's good.

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Move it?

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: I will move approval of Item 9.

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All those in favor?

(Ayes.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: It passes 5-0. Thank you.

Let's go on to Item 10.

MR. CHAUDRY: Good morning, Chair, Commissioners.

My name is Shahid Chaudhry. I'm with the Local Assistance and Financing Office of the Efficiency Division.

I'm here to request your approval for a $422,795 ECCA Loan at 1 percent to the City of Rio Vista. The City will use this loan to implement energy efficiency measures at its buildings including City Hall, the fire station, airport terminal, Corp Yard, two wastewater treatment plants and a lift station.

Upon implementation the project will reduce about 213,000 kilowatt hours of grid electricity consumption annually, saving the City an estimated amount of $25,900 in utility costs.
Based on the loan amount, and utility cost savings, the simple payback is approximately 16.3 years.

The loan request is in compliance with the terms and conditions of the ECAA Loan Program. I therefore request your approval of this loan. I'm available for any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you.

Is there any comments from anyone in the room?

Anyone on the phone?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Okay. Commissioner McAllister?

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: So I've looked this in some detail and that looks like a good project. I guess it's kind of interesting, actually there are some generator heat pumps in there, which I thought was interesting. And also, I think what that's about 12 percent of that cost and then there are some power factor corrections actually in there too, which is we don't see that often coming through these projects. So they are clearly trying to integrate. The rest of it's mostly lighting, I think about 50-some odd percent, but so it's all good.

I think I like to see that kind of innovation and just pragmatic approaches from our applicants, so obviously I support.
Right, so I'll move Item 10.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Second.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All those in favor?

(Ayes.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: This also passes 5-0.

Thank you.

MR. CHAUDRY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Let's go on to minutes.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Move approval of the minutes.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: Second.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: All those in favor?

(Ayes.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: These also pass 5-0.

Let's go on to Lead Commissioner or Presiding Member Reports. Commissioner Scott?

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Sure. I just have one update that I'd like to share with you all, which is last week I had the opportunity to almost make it to the San Diego Port Tenants event where on the 10th Avenue Marine Terminal they had a bunch of Dole electric vehicles that are going to be moving cargo handling equipment around.

I had no idea that San Diego can also get fogged in. Unfortunately, my 7:00 a.m. flight, which was -- no, it was a 6:00 a.m. flight that was supposed to land at 7:20
and we circled for about an hour then we flew to Ontario, landed, got more fuel and got there in time for me to basically have missed most of the event.

But I raised it, because the speeches had ended, but everyone was still there. And the Port of San Diego, the Port Tenant Association, Dole, SDG&E were really gracious. They called everyone back together to hear my remarks, so I got to talk about what the Energy Commission is doing in this space and how excited we are to have this great partnership with the Port of San Diego to demonstrate this type of equipment there.

And it just is a great project, because one of the things that the Port Tenants Association is going to do, and Dole is so Dole is really going to put this equipment through its paces. But anybody else who's a port tenant that wants to try out this equipment, see what it's like, put it through its paces as well. So even though it's about ten trucks, the impact of those, a lot of folks are going to get a chance to kind of kick the tires on this equipment and see how it works.

We also got to see there's a fuel cell truck that is operating at that 10th Avenue Marine Terminal as well. And one of the exciting things that we saw it doing, so this was from a previous Energy Commission grant, they have the base of windmills, wind turbines there. And I don't
know if you've ever seen those. It comes in three huge parts. I mean, these are really big and they're very, very, very heavy. One of the heaviest things that goes through a port and that fuel cell truck was able to pull that and move it to where it needed to go. So they're doing a shakedown run on that as well, so that was pretty cool to see.

I mean, if any of them are listening or just happen to read the transcript I want to just say thank you, because it was really gracious for them to allow me to speak even though I was late and tried so hard to get there. But it was a great day and fun to be able to celebrate, so that's all I want to highlight today.

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: It hasn't been that long since our last Business Meeting, so not too much to talk about. I just last week spent most of the week in D.C. and did a series of meetings with congressional committees. Really mostly staff, but Congressman Tonko from New York sponsored this really good on at the House. And it was a small group of states just talking about all of the things that they're doing on clean energy. And the context really is the EPCA Reform and the Process Rule that Department of Energy is looking at.

And so I think the effort was just to sort of get a little bit of a reality check on what happens at the
states and why the state energy offices are relevant and are doing things that actually are very reasonable in helping our economy and just broad-based benefits. And so I think there's an ongoing effort to kind of demystify the state energy offices, really I'd say as a defense mechanism in the current Administration. To just make sure that the Congress at least knows that everything is going on productively and reasonably, right?

So and it seems to be working, because Congress is a strong supporter of the State Energy Program, and weatherization and all of the things that the energy offices do. Even though the Administration keeps zeroing them out Congress actually has given them more money than they asked for, so we want to keep that dynamic going obviously. And increasingly as we get more engaged at that level people, other states, you know, of all colors are just looking to us for leadership. And it's a little bull in the china shop, because we drop numbers that are a couple of orders of magnitude bigger than the other states. You know, we use a lot of "b"s, you know, in the billions and everybody else is in the millions or something quite small. But we're all facing similar challenges, just in different scales so I think it's helpful that we're there at least, because people really appreciate it.

Yeah, I guess I would just highlight the
ongoing outreach around the Building Standards. There continues to be a lot of interest in it and yeah, I think it's overwhelmingly positive. And I think people are really paying attention and the implementation is moving forward well, which we need to keep our eye on that ball obviously.

And then just increased focus generally on decarbonization. I think it's one of these topics that not just in the Legislature, but just out there in the world there's so much talk about decarbonization and so I think our task in the next months and years is to really get to a common understanding of what that means. And have the broad conversation that really that's going to lead to, which is what our energy supply look likes one, five, ten years hence. But it's nice to see all of the different stakeholders really putting some creative thought into this huge challenge that we have.

Yeah, so that's it.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS: So I'll just report on a couple of tribal meetings I had a couple of weeks ago. A group of us from the Energy Commission met with the Hupa Tribe and the Karuk Tribe. We also had a quick meeting with the Paiute Tribe. And then last week we had a meeting with the Trinidad Rancheria, both staff and the Tribal Counsel and many of these meetings. So those were
productive discussions. We're working towards a Tribal Energy Summit in the fall and we have a lot to talk about with a number of the tribes up and down the state. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: So first of all, Commissioner McAllister and I had a little ceremony to thank the staff of the New Solar Homes Program at Davis a week or two back, which was lively. And included some unexpected surprises for me, but it was a real pleasure to just talk. That is actually where Commissioner McAllister and I first met was on this committee putting that program together over a decade ago and just to trace the arc of the growth of that industry all the way to the standard we adopted this spring. And it was great, we had a lot of staff there who had administered the program, but I think for them to see all of the stakeholders and the progress was terrific.

Then for the last few years I've done a Clean Tech Investor Roundtable with Commissioner Peterman and Commissioner Rechtschaffen and a few others in San Francisco, a bunch of the top investors, just to get a better sense of investment trends and dynamics. A lot of interest in electrification, a lot of new money coming in, the Twitter money through obvious ventures and others.

And I guess the big take-home is just the number
of investors in the space has grown. Again, you know, it ebbs and flows, but we had an overflow attendance, so that was really fruitful. Mark Ferron was there from the ISO as well.

And then in two weeks we're going to host a workshop here at the Commission on the eligible equipment list, so we maintain that list. That's over 20,000 different pieces of equipment in terms of solar panels, inverters and meters and we're interested in how to make that more user friendly. It's used by states all across the country as well as to look at whether we can incorporate storage into that list.

And then I'm interested to delist dumb inverters that don't have telemetry and voltage regulation, so we're going to get feedback from stakeholders and be making some changes following that.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Great. Now, a couple of things, I spoke at the annual CCEEB event up at Squaw Valley. You know, the focus a lot is on the fire issues. I was on a session with Senator Wieckowski, Kip Lipper, and we talked about the issues the state's confronting on the fire stuff.

I also met with the Governor of Sonora. We met and came up with Mary and Matt and then came over and met with Pam, Maria (phonetic) and I.
We just got a flag that the 4th Climate Assessment will be rolled out over the course of the month. There's actually an IEPR workshop tomorrow that starts trying to bring the science into the PUC's regulatory framework and others. Anyways, a whole series of events from now through October that as we go forward, more and more attention, but I think certainly not many will be around for through a lot of the 3rd Climate Assessment. Sorry, this is a big deal is the bottom line. And certainly I'd have to say the events on the ground are outrunning the science.

I think the example I tend to use is that the science studies were done on modeling fire and they were based upon 2000 to 2016. And 2017 had the same impact as cumulatively 2000 to 2016 and 2018, so far is worse.

You know, when the State Operation Center was activated last week Justin went out for that. And we're set up to provide initially 24 by 7 support, although our role is pretty much fuels. You know, a question of is there jet fuel let's say at the Redding Airport. But, you know, certainly the pictures from the fire hit very much the Bureau of Reclamation's facilities up north. And I guess the Bureau of Reclamation is not the most 21st Century entity. They have manual files for the leases, they had to evacuate their operating centers obviously from
the fires. So that tended to cut off powers and they had a number of transmission lines that just melted, pretty dramatic pictures. And that tended to cut off a lot of the more remote areas up in Northern California in terms of power.

I think some are still cut off, but obviously PG&E has had to cut off some areas for safety reasons as did Edison down in Riverside. It looks like the fire up there was caused by a malfunctioning car and in Riverside it was arson. But I think if it's certainly as I said something that really gets the message out about climate change and the challenges we have there.

Chief Counsel's or actually Andrew was going to have a footnote on the COB. Do you want to? Yeah.

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Yeah, I just want to mention that the first post-application deadline of the Citizens Oversight Board meeting happened for Prop 39. And I'm so happy it moving on to the new programs including the school buses and infusing money in the ECCA-Ed Program. But the audit was discussed there and we came out, maybe Executive Director Bohan wants to add something here. But I think we played a really positive role in that.

You know, the Controller's Office did a very thorough job and a few issues carried forward that we maybe have small disagreements about in terms of definitional
issues and things like that. But basically it came out as
a clean audit with a couple of "to dos" to sort of
continually improve the process in the accounting and the
monitoring of what's going on out there in the world, out
there with the schools and the implementation.

But anyway that was the main topic of the COB
meeting and I want to just thank Drew for being really on
top of that. And I think we have a relatively positive
relationship with the Controller and the auditors that now
really know the program. And that seems to be working
reasonably well year to year now.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Yeah, so Chief Counsel
Report.

MS. VACCARO: Nothing today, thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Executive Director Report?

MR. BOHAN: Nothing to add except I would just
follow up on Commissioner McAllister's point that yes we're
working closely with the Controller's Office as well as
CDE. At this point we're obviously not approving any more
applications, but changes can still come in and we're still
working on some of the financial issues. But it's a
positive collaborative process.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Okay. Public Adviser?

MS. MATHEWS: Good afternoon. I only have one
item to report and that is basically on our Summer
Internship Program. Normally we would have a Summer Institute. We were not able to have that this year, but we did have three high school interns. And so I also have three college interns that I thought they would be in a better position to share how our new partnership with these three high school students went this summer, so I'll bring them up at this time.

MS. GOMEZ: Good morning. My name is Adriana Gomez. I'm a Student Assistant to Commissioner Scott and I go to Lewis & Clark Law School.

MS. ALMARAZ: Good morning. My name is Maria Almaraz. I'm an intern with the Public Adviser's Office and I will be a senior at Sacramento State University.

MS. BURNS: Good morning. My name is Lauren Burns. I'm an Intern in the Public Adviser's Office and I go to UC Berkeley.

MS. ALMAREZ: We had the privilege of hosting three high school students to learn about energy, the environment and community engagement. These are our three students: Briana Gutierrez who goes to Florin High School and is interested in law, Jared Estes (phonetic) who goes to Franklin High School and is interested in political science and Abbie Shankut (phonetic) who goes to Pleasant Grove High School and is interested in environmental law.

MS. BURNS: So during their time with us they
were able to be exposed to a lot of arms of state
government as well as learn the ins and outs of the work
that's done at the Energy Commission. So we were fortunate
as that we were able to have a tour CAISO, which the
students thought was so interesting and fun. We were also
able to tour the Capitol and meet with the Assemblyman Jose
Medina. We were able to attend the Business Meeting last
month and we also met with many members of Commission staff
including Drew Bohan, Executive Director; Commissioner
Scott and staff from Government Affairs.

MS. GOMEZ: We really wanted to provide the
students with an experience that was more educational
rather than just them doing a lot of clerical work. While
they did some clerical work, they were also able to do a
lot of learning as well. So every day we would start out
by giving them an article from various topics ranging from
alternative fuel vehicles to power plant siting. And they
would journal about it and discuss the topic, so a lot of
them -- all three of them actually left saying that they
had learned a lot more than they had anticipated.

And when we got to hear from the other students
that were part of the program, but at different agencies,
many of the students said that they solely did clerical
work. So we were very excited to be able to offer them
something that was more engaging and more meaningful.
They also got to a lot of work kind of developing an outreach plan for the Stanton Power Plant and trying to engage youth for the evidentiary hearing.

MS. ALMARAZ: Here are some highlights of what they worked on during their time here. They had skill enhancement workshops, which included a scholarship and college seminar. So they learned about financial aid and how to write a personal statement for when they apply to college.

They also participated in a public speaking seminar with Leah Moni (phonetic) who gave them an excellent workshop on improving public speaking skills. And they created a video for the youth of Stanton to encourage participation in the Stanton Evidentiary Hearing.

They concluded their time here with a graduation ceremony with the Mayor of Elk Grove and Public Adviser Alana Mathews where they received an award for their participation in the program.

MS. GOMEZ. So each of our students, every week would write a reflection about their experience. One of our students, Briana, said, "I feel that I've used a lot of skills this week. I was able to work cooperatively in a group to reach a common goal." We really wanted them to be able to work together, which was fortunate they were able to.
MS. ALMARAZ: Another student, Jared, said, "Our project in the past days has been our work on the Stanton Power Plant and an outreach campaign in order to get the youth of Stanton to attend the hearing on August 2nd. We have decided to produce a very short video telling the community and Stanton about the hearing and encouraging the youth to come and let their voices be heard.

MS. BURNS: Our third student, Abbie, said, "I worked on more collaborative assignments and took on harder tasks that made me feel like I was truly an office employee."

So I think the general consensus was that they really enjoyed their time here and got to do a lot of meaningful work in our office. Thank you.

MS. ALMARAZ: Thank you so much. (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Thank you for your assistance.

MS. MATHEWS: And lastly, I just sort of have an announcement. We will have our second Disadvantaged Community Advisory Group, which is a joint advisory group with the CPUC meeting later this month, August 21st. It will be in San Francisco at the CPUC starting at 10:00 o'clock a.m. so the notice will be forthcoming. But I did just want to tee that up today.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: You want to mention the
loss of the one member?

MS. MATHEWS: Yes, I do. So we will acknowledge that, but at this time it is with a heavy heart that we announce that one of our members, Woodie Hayes, who represented the San Bernardino-Riverside area and she was President of their local NAACP chapter, passed away.

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: Okay. So public comment?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN WEISENMILLER: The meeting is adjourned.

Thank you.

(Adjourned the Business Meeting at 12:00 p.m.)
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