

**Meeting of
Association of State Energy Research and Technology Transfer
Institutions
October 18-20 2000
The Sagamore, Bolton Landing, NY**

Kristine Growdon, ASERTTI Chair, and Washington State University called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 18, 2000 with the following persons present:

Peter Meadows Adels, Citizens for Pennsylvania's Future (PennFuture)
Larry Ambs, CEERE
Floyd Barwig, Iowa Energy Center
Christine Benedict, NYSERDA
Sherry Benzmilller, Energy Center of Wisconsin
Robert Bielawa, NY State Department of Environmental Conservation
Jim Cole, CIEE – University of California
Tammy Cunningham, NYSERDA
John Cuttica, University of Illinois at Chicago
G. Muir Davis, PG&E National Energy Group
Mike DeAngelis, California Energy Commission
Craig Dewitt, South Carolina Institute for Energy Studies
Peter Douglas, NYSERDA
Richard Drake, NYSERDA
Ron Edelstein, GRI
Phillip Fairey, Florida Solar Energy Center
Tom Fiesinger, NYSERDA
William Flynn, NYSERDA
Rick Gerardi, NYSERDA
Kristine Growdon, Washington State University Energy Program
Mark Hanson, Energy Center of Wisconsin
Jeffrey Harris, Environmental Energy Technology Division, LBNL
Jennifer Harvey, NYSERDA
Brian Henderson, NYSERDA
John House, National Institute of Standards and Technology
Steve Kalland, Zantrex / Trace Engineering
George Kelly, National Institute of Standards and Technology
Helen Kim, NYSERDA
Charles King, Northeast Utilities
Bob Koger, Advanced Energy Corporation
Jeanne Koger, North Carolina State University
Russ Leslie, Lighting Research Center
James Manwell, CEERE

Vicki Mastaitis, Interstate Renewable Energy Council

Karl Michael, NSYERDA

Valerie Milonovich, NYSERDA

John Morrison, Advanced Energy Corporation

Lawrence Murphy, National Renewable Energy Laboratory

Ron Nesse, Battelle, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

Norm Olson, Iowa Energy Center

Brian Parsons, National Renewable Energy Laboratory

Nag Patibandla, NYSERDA

Russell Pennington, EPRI

Miriam Pye, NYSERDA

Susam Rapaport, NSYERDA

Mark Rea, Lighting Research Center

Jim Reis, NYSERDA

John Ruckes, Connecticut Office of Policy and Management

John Saintcross, NYSERDA

Ron Shelton, Oak Ridge National Laboratory

Larry Shirley, North Carolina Solar Center, NC State University

George Simons, California Energy Commission

Roya Stanley, National Renewable Energy Laboratory

Tom Tanton, EPRI

Tom Tuffey, PPL Sustainable Energy Fund

William Valentino, NYSERDA

Joseph Visalli, NYSERDA

Abby Vogen, Energy Center of Wisconsin

Gunnar Walmet, NYSERDA

Jack White, ASERTTI

Don Wichert, Wisconsin Division of Energy

William Worek, University of Illinois at Chicago

Ernst Worrell, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

1. Renewables R&D and Deployment Panel Discussion

a. DOE Perspectives and Relationship, Bill Parks – U.S. DOE Office of Power Technologies

There have been many changes within the Renewables area of DOE over the past year. The Renewable area is in great demand throughout the nation to provide alternative energy sources. The federal role is to assist in encouraging a competitive marketplace for the expanded use of clean, efficient, reliable and affordable energy resources. The DOE supports advanced energy technologies, addresses regulatory and institutional barriers and the establishment of cost-share RD&D partnerships with industry and others.

The cost per Kwh of wind power over the past 20 years has substantially been lowered due to R& D efforts. Geothermal technologies have also lowered the cost per Kwh from 16 cents to approximately 5 cents since 1985. Additionally photovoltaics are becoming increasingly competitive. Through more industry experience, improved technologies, economies of scale and financing programs these and other technologies are becoming more easily accessible to industry and other applications.

DOE has developed four renewable deployment programs: 1. Million Solar Roofs, 2. Wind Powering America, 3. Geopowering the West, and 4. Bioenergy projects.

Potential joint ASERTTI activities with the Office of Power Technologies include:

- Alternative energy projects
- Distributed Energy projects
- Clearinghouse activities – a national mission to advance the use of clean technologies

b. Clean Technologies – Coordinated Incubation, Lawrence Murphy – NREL

Clean energy investment is increasing, however most investors want a “business” not a technology. The ability to track the value of the creation of a new technology, assist in creation of a market driven business, leading to higher values making significantly greater investments available.

One solution to the investment problem is incubators. Incubators address all key development areas. They are technology focused and provide support networks. Regions that support clean energy are more likely to use incubators of technology.

The national alliance provides a broad base support to build a clean energy infrastructure. The use of incubators provide for lower cost and higher success rates of commercialization.

c. A Model for Coordination, Lewis Milford – Clean Energy Fund Network

There are currently 14 states involved in the Clean Energy Fund Network (CEFN), which have state benefit charges as a result of electric restructuring. As a result of restructuring, the states will have over \$2.8 billion to invest in clean energy activities over the next ten years. Renewable energy technologies (solar, wind, hydro, biomass, geothermal, ocean) as well as advanced clean energy technologies (fuel cells, distributed generation, and energy storage) are areas of clean energy investments.

This is a new approach including coordination and information sharing. The markets are at the state level rather than the federal level. The CEFN has met twice, in February 1999 and 2000, and is funded by the Energy Foundation. The principal goal is to increase the quality and quantity of clean energy proposals presented to state funds in order to accelerate the commercialization of eligible clean energy technologies. CEFN is encouraging joint activities to promote investor opportunities, sharing market intelligence and ensuring robust competitive markets.

d. Renewable Energy R&D and Deployment Activities, Mike DeAngelis – California Energy Commission

In the early 1980's there was a mandated public interest IOU program. From this program technology development was enhanced through public interest research funding. Technology deployment was enhanced through a standard offer contract and other incentives. There was decline in public interest IOU programs in the mid 1990's.

As a result, through the California Energy Commission (CEC), the PIER program was developed to provide RD&D to the state. PIER was initially set up through the year 2001, but received an additional ten year extension. PIER advances science and technology in six subject areas including renewables. There have been three solicitations to date with the development of 22 renewable projects.

Bill Worek – University of Illinois at Chicago Energy Resources Center
Photovoltaic programs are a collaborative effort with the ERC, Commonwealth Edison (Com Ed), Illinois Department of Commerce & Community Affairs (DCCA), and Chicago Department of Environment. Three programs are a result of this collaboration; the Renewable Energy Resources Program, the Wind/PV Generation Pricing Experiment and Solar Connect Illinois. The three programs have customer participation and are on target. There are some additional needs such as the marketing of available programs, and follow up case studies on existing installations. Case studies will include technical performance data, installation and maintenance costs, benefits to both consumer and utility and a financial analysis of sites.

e. Commercialization/Investments, John Anderson – Connecticut Clean Energy Fund

Connecticut SBC funds were allocated to a unique state entity, the Connecticut Clean Energy Fund. The primary objective is to build the green power market, establish clean energy companies, and to enable the fund to be self-supporting. The emphasis for Connecticut is to make a capital investment

that provides clean energy, build consumer demand, and make clean energy products.

2. Multi-state Agriculture Initiative Planning

a. Joe Visalli – NYSERDA

There is over 20 million tons of manure produced annually, and a system needs to be developed to handle the problem. NYSERDA issued a competitive solicitation, and as a result, a database was developed to assist in the transfer of information to farmers. NYSERDA is interested in setting up a multi-state collaborative, although projects will continue on a state basis, results can be shared across the states.

The rationale behind a multi-state effort is to improve prospects for wider applications through a diversity of site specific factors and types of systems, reduce costs to any one state through the sharing of information and peer review.

The objectives of the collaborative are:

- Develop comparable system performance data in participating states
- Use the data to evaluate net energy, economics and environmental benefits
- Identify and test systems improvements to optimize profits
- Produce information useful to individual producers and service providers.

Common tasks among the states:

- Provide funding for on farm demonstrations
- Develop and implement a common monitoring and evaluation program
- Identify and test system optimization concepts to maximize profits
- Develop a means of compiling information from different states into on cohesive document
- Develop state specific technology transfer

b. Norm Olson – Iowa Energy Center

Iowa agriculture is number one in the nation in soybean and corn production and number two in hog production. An energy efficient form of manure removal is a necessary technology. Anaerobic digester activity in Iowa includes a 5000 head farrow operation, 5000 head finish operation and a \$4.2 million dairy training facility. Additionally the Becon facility has 4 pilot scale digestors.

The problems that need to be overcome are the low value of excess electricity and heat, maintenance and operation costs, installation costs, and return of

investments. Some solutions include: co-locate with compatible industry, scale to support full-time operators, increase the value of products produced, and consideration of additional feedstocks.

c. Mike DeAngelis – California Energy Commission

California is interested in joining a multi-state agricultural effort. A multiphase approach would be beneficial, and a collaboration in this area is important.

d. Mark Hanson – Energy Center of Wisconsin

Wisconsin is also interested in joining a multi-state agriculture effort.

Currently Wisconsin has two sites being installed, one with a technology from Denmark, and a second site where there is a problem with the system design.

e. Jeanne Koger – North Carolina State University

North Carolina is one of the top producers of hogs and needs better swine waste management systems. The current management system is a lagoon system, which is not an optimal system. One solution may be a gasification system, which disposes the waste completely, eliminate viruses and microbial population, produces fewer odors and requires little feedstock storage capacity. There are various options in the gas produced including ethanol and other synfuels.

f. Kurt Roos – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

AgStar was launched in 1993 under the climate change action plan. In 1994 the program conducted waste characterization and technology assessments of US farm systems. In 1995 the program developed basic products and project development tools, and throughout 1996-98 the AgStar program launched charter farm programs and have had great success in developing state partnerships and pilot programs.

Presently, AgStar 2001's purpose is to provide stakeholders with successful environmental strategies across livestock sectors by providing:

- Informational Programs – develop materials that expand policy and project development
- Outreach and Extension Programs – multi-state field days and trade shows for swine and dairy sectors
- Measurement Programs – comparative across systems and industry with mass balance focus, applicable to water and air emissions and establishment of fair metrics.

AgStar also provide and inter-agency label for low risk digester systems consistent with USDA/NRCS standards, team of technology and performance

evaluation personnel, set of tools and productions for expanded dissemination. Additionally, AgStar has the ability to provide cost share and have available budgets to expand measurement programs. Agstar also has a website hotline and tradeshow booth for use at state programs.

ACTION: Formation of a committee to start discussion on building a multi-state collaborative. States that do not have funding available are able to participate, to allow for communication and learn from the collaborative. Members willing to serve on the committee are: George Simmons, CEC; Tom Fiesinger, NYSERDA; Rich Hackner, ECW; Don Wichert, Wisconsin Energy Bureau; Norm Olson, IEC; Jeanne Koger, NCSU; and representatives from Advanced Energy, Ohio, and Illinois. Tom Fiesinger will serve as committee lead.

3. Barbara Sisson – Office of Building Technology, State and Community Programs, U.S. DOE

Barbara Sisson provided the membership with an overview of BTS and DOE's approach to improving buildings energy efficiency.

BTS objectives are to:

- Lower energy use in commercial buildings by 25% or more relative to conventional practice
- Reduce energy use in new homes 25-50% relative to conventional practice at little or no increase in cost and
- Ensure healthful indoor air quality

BTS is wanting to improve ASERTTI participation in R&D solicitations. Historically, ASERTTI member participation in solicitations has doubled from 1999 to 2000 although participation is still modest at best.

FY2001 ASERTTI/BTS Joint Planning process objectives are to start up one or two joint projects and to develop a long-range plan for collaboration.

4. National SBC Update, Bill Valentino – NYSERDA

NYSERDA and ACEEE have been working jointly to track SBC funds as more states are receiving SBC funds. It is important for ASERTTI to keep informed of these funds.

Currently 27 states have energy efficiency SBC funds. Across the nation over 75% of states are undergoing electric industry restructuring. Of the 27 states only two (Vermont and Wisconsin) are going ahead with restructuring without legislation in place.

There are some differences in program elements, however the similarities are that most programs have similar goals (energy efficiency, facilitation of competition, environmental benefits, reduction of peak demand, and improvement of system reliability).

The New York perspective – currently in phase II of the SBC program. SBC II goals are:

1. Improve energy efficiency and access to energy options for under served customers
2. Reduce environmental impacts of energy production and use
3. Facilitate competition to benefit end-users
4. Improve system wide reliability through end-user efficiency actions

Lessons learned from SBC I:

- Certain sectors are slower to develop than anticipated
- Certain sectors are faster to develop than anticipated
- Flexibility is key – modify program strategies accordingly
- Level and duration of program support will need to be expanded to make lasting behavioral changes in the market

5. Collaboration Updates

a. Compressed Air Challenge™

Floyd Barwig, IEC updated the membership. CAC has been incorporated as a 501(c)(3). CAC is continuing to gain momentum and is still accepting partners. There are currently two levels of training available and a Best Practices manual.

b. LRC Proposal for SBC States

Mark Rea, Lighting Research Center presented a proposal to the membership for possible collaboration. The Energy Efficiency program provides a key element in energy efficiency and pilot program development for other end-use technologies. The goals of the collaborative are to assess barriers and opportunities, identify and prioritize key activities, and identify commonalities across states for leverage of funding.

The proposal is three phases – 1. Collection of information and assessing the potential for collaboration, 2. Roundtable of key stakeholders, and 3. Application of results.

c. NLPIP

Gunnar Walmet, NYSERDA, updated the membership of the status of the NLPIP collaborative. NLPIP is one of the first collaborative efforts of ASERTTI, and have accomplished a great deal over the past 10 years. NLPIP

is a “Consumer Reports” for commercial lighting and provides an unbiased source of information.

d. Smart Schools (MOU ASERTTI/DOE)

DOE announced that a collaborative effort as a result of the MOU with DOE has been awarded to a joint NASEO/ASERTTI proposal in the Smart Schools area. This effort will be led by NASEO in close coordination with ASERTTI.

e. Steam Challenge

Miriam Pye, NYSERDA informed the membership of the Steam Challenge. The Steam Challenge is now in the Best Practices stage and has developed a guide. The main thrust of the Challenge is marketing based efforts. Full information can be obtained through the Best Practices Clearinghouse.

f. Commissioning Training

Mark Hanson of ECW updated the membership on commissioning training. This is a three year old effort and approximately 14 trainings have occurred to date. The collaborative effort is focused on advanced training and is being led at the Iowa Energy Center’s resource station. The next step is continue the momentum of the advanced training including partnership with National Energy Management Institute (NEMI) and continued collaboration with ASERTTI and DOE.

g. Daylighting Collaborative™

Abby Vogen, ECW informed the membership of the Daylighting Collaborative activities with ASERTTI members. The Collaborative provides a practical way to begin at the mass market ground level of building development. Daylighting integrated building design is one of the tasks in the Smart Schools DOE/NASEO/ASERTTI grant. Successes to date include the adoption of daylighting guidelines to be applied to all state of Wisconsin buildings.

h. Cooperative State OIT Technology Transfer

Mark Hanson of ECW highlighted the Wisconsin IOF efforts. Currently Wisconsin is working with the Metalcasting industry and has developed a state roadmap. One of the largest barriers facing Wisconsin metalcasters is the turnover in the labor market that leads to mis-casting and wasted energy.

A parallel effort in the Forest Products area is also going well and over one-half of Wisconsin’s paper mills were represented at the first roundtable.

Additionally, a water consortium is forming starting in Wisconsin and New York has joined the effort.

NYSERDA is sponsoring an ASERTTI booth at the OIT conference scheduled for February 2001.

Washington State has held a kickoff meeting in its IOF areas.

i. Empowerment 2000

A highly successful conference was held that brought together educators and facilities staff with over 150 participants. There is interest in a second event in 2001, with a possible event sponsored by PG&E on the west coast and an east coast event sponsored by NYSERDA.

j. Light Right Consortium

Ron Nesse, PNNL, informed the membership of the status of Light Right. The goal of the consortium is to transform the market for lighting by using sound research to investigate the link between lighting quality and the performance, satisfaction and productivity of workers. The consortium is looking for state involvement. The value of the investment includes:

- Concrete information to support the message about lighting and productivity
- Builds market transformation into the program design for maximum efficiency, intelligence and market impact and
- Sponsor money is leveraged by other funding

k. Opportunities for Energy Efficient Industrial Ventilation

Jeff Harris, LBNL, informed the membership of ventilation processes industry activities and opportunities.

l. Emerging Energy Efficient Technologies for Industries

Ernst Worrell, ACEEE, provided an overview of emerging technologies in the industrial sectors. Industry is one of the largest energy consuming sectors in the US. An assessment of current technologies is key for the development of successful energy strategies. Results from the study show that new technology is not running out, have important non-energy benefits, and capital costs may be cheaper than the conventional technology that is displaced. Energy results is cross cutting technologies save the largest amount of primary energy and are most important to save electricity. Future research areas include regional assessments to direct public benefits, support statewide industrial energy efficiency programs, energy forecasting, and integration of technology transfer and market assessment into policy designs.

6. ASERTTI Joint R&D Planning

a. Fuel Cells

Richard Drake of NYSERDA leads the ASERTTI effort in the fuel cells area. The interested parties talked about every two weeks within the first six months and submitted a proposal to DOE. Although the proposal was not funded through the MOU process, the lessons learned were valuable.

b. Transportation

The transportation area is continuing to move forward. A workshop is scheduled that will focus on establishing a near team collaborative. This collaborative will address state issues with a DOE overlap. The goal of the workshop is to include members of the DOT and states to start a collaborative relevant to the states. The next solicitation for transportation sector is scheduled for early 2001, and will be looking for RD&D proposals and not deployment activities.

c. Buildings

Jim Cole of CIEE and John Ryan of US DOE, discussed the buildings area R&D. It is hoped that in the near future a meeting in Washington DC can be held to gather the principals in this area to discuss how to work together and decide on a few projects in which to pursue. Some possible areas of collaboration are daylighting and its effects on productivity, market transformation areas, indoor air quality, and commissioning of new and existing buildings.

It is suggested that as an overall effort to increase communication regarding the MOU process and joint planning is to use the ASERTTI website to post summaries of projects and well as a summary of proposed work or other potential collaborative areas.

7. Member Updates

a. North Carolina Solar Center – Larry Shirley

The Solar Center is involved in both RDD&D work as well as work directly with the consumer. Current activities include PV power heat pumps and a solar home available for public tours.

b. Gas Technology Institute – Ron Edelstein

GTI has gone through a recent merger with GRI increasing the depth of the company. Most of GTI's funding comes from gas companies and DOE. On the program management side, the FERC has given permission to charge service fees in 10 states across the nation.

c. EPRI – Tom Tanton

EPRI's programs are aimed at the public interest market, and provide assistance from the early stages of a project through commercialization.

- d. PPL Sustainable Energy Fund – Tom Tuffey**
Pennsylvania has 4 regional funds with approximately \$20 million for the Sustainable Energy Fund. This Fund has a large renewable and energy conservation interest.
- e. National Institute of Technology Standards – George Kelly and John House**
Sixty percent of NIST's funding is from the federal government. Project areas include building environments, communication protocols, refrigeration and refrigeration alternatives, insulation, and PV efforts to develop integrated systems. NIST is also working with CEC on a few projects.
- f. University of Illinois at Chicago Energy Resources Center – John Cuttica**
ERC is not funded through public benefits funds. Revenue is received from service contracts with the city of Chicago and the state of Illinois. ERC has also recently received a grant from DOE to become a new Industrial Assessment Center. ERC is working on a collaborative to become active both locally and nationally in the CHP and cooling systems areas.
- g. Florida Solar Energy Center – Philip Fairey**
100% of FSEC staff time is spent on RDD&D work, with about _ of this time spent in the buildings areas. FSEC initiated project for moisture controls in residential buildings, and also has a residential PV demonstration center. FSEC is working successfully with a hydrogen fuel program and has a hydrogen research applications center that looks at hydrogen as a fuel for space vehicles as well as other space applications.
- h. Advanced Energy Corporation – Bob Koger and John Morrison**
North Carolina has set up a study commission to look at deregulation. It appears that restructuring in NC will not begin until 2007 or later. Advanced Energy continues to work on projects in the industrial area and have a successful program to certify motor efficiency.
- i. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Washington DC – Jeff Harris**
LBL is concentrating efforts on peak load reliability issues in California. Efforts continue with industry, developing a new generation of light sources both organic and inorganic. Projects are also underway with residential diagnostic and commissioning activities.
- j. Connecticut Office of Policy Management – John Ruckes**

Connecticut's R&D funds are limited and there is not a specific area of research pursued. Current work is with various technologies related to energy efficient display terminals and a device to eliminate the redundancy of a back up system.

k. Long Island Power Authority – Richard Bolbrock

Current activity is a clean energy initiative with a 5 year, \$165 million budget for energy efficiency projects including PV, residential fuel cells, wind projects, and an ozone laundry facility for hospitals.

l. Northeast Utilities – Charles King

Northeast Utilities is a new entity, and have released their first set of RFPs.

m. Energy Center of Wisconsin – Mark Hanson

ECW is concentrating efforts on market transformation. ECW has trained over 6000 persons in the past year in various areas (residential, industrial and commercial). Public Benefits will be run through the State Energy Office with over \$66 million per year for energy efficiency areas. The Center is planning on participating in most if not all of the public benefits areas.

n. National Renewable Energy Laboratory – Roya Stanley

NREL is actively involved with the Million Solar Roofs Initiative and Windpower America.

o. Iowa Energy Center – Floyd Barwig

IEC was created by the Iowa legislature and is funded by a service charge. Current projects include biomass research center and a wind resource assessment center. Also IEC is actively involved with the Compressed Air Challenge.

p. Oak Ridge National Laboratory – Ron Shelton

The majority of ORNL's financial support comes through DOE. ORNL is actively involved in Rebuild America and concentrates its efforts in the buildings area.

q. California Energy Commission – Mike DeAngelis

Energy is one of the top three priority areas in the governor's office. CEC has a new \$50 million one year program to reduce peak load demands for the summer of 2001. The Energy commission has been restructured into four divisions including an R&D area. Terry Surles will head the R&D division.

r. Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy – Larry Ambs

CEERE is an R&D organization located at the University of Massachusetts. Projects include work in buildings, renewables, and variable speed drives. Recent

success have been more environmental based rather than energy efficiency based. Monitoring and research of wind includes implementation of offshore wind measurements.

s. Xantrex / Trace Engineering – Steve Kalland

Xantrex is interested in ASERTTI and would like to become more involved in ASERTTI's collaborative efforts.

t. Washington State University Cooperative Extension Energy Program – Kristi Growdon

WSU Energy program concentrates on applied R&D. Current focus is on moisture problems in multifamily dwellings, portable classrooms, social sciences, telecommunication and intersection impacts on energy.

8. Host Presentations

a. Distributed Generation – Richard Drake

NYSERDA's Distributed Generation project goals are to:

- Build test evaluation and demonstration sites of 80 Plug Power 7 Kwh fuel cells power systems in stationary applications
- Deploy units at publicly owned and accessible facilities across the state to verify the clean environmentally friendly power source.

Phase I (lab evaluation of 24 pre-production prototype units) and Phase II (initial evaluation of 6 pre-production prototype units) are complete. Phase III is underway with the first 10 units to be deployed by the end of 2000. The remaining 40 units are scheduled for deployment in March 2001. Phase III also includes a demonstration of up to 50 test and evaluation units.

NYSERDA is working with three major fuel cell components (fuel processor, fuel cell stack and power conditioner) and two major market applications (grid parallel and grid independent).

The potential residential customer benefits include: improved reliability, reduced cost, CHP potential, and high power quality.

b. R&D Summary – Gunnar Walmet and Joe Visalli

NYSERDA's R&D program goals are to:

- Promote and catalyze technology innovation and objective information
- Provide public benefits
- Impact the wide customer base who pay for programs
- Transfer program success to others.

Goals for Buildings area include:

- Reduction of energy costs in residential and commercial buildings, including buildings that address special needs of low-income and multifamily sectors
- Promote NY based development and manufacturing of building equipment and materials with improved performance for energy, environment and IAQ
- Increase use of renewable energy sources

Industrial R&D Goals include:

- Enhancement of the competitiveness of NYS industry
- Demonstrate the use of innovations energy efficient products and processes

Renewable R&D area include:

- Projects on Windpower, PV and biomass,
- Work in environmental areas

New York also has R&D projects in the transportation area.

9. DOE Awards Update/Feedback to DOE, Joe Malinovsky – US DOE

Joe Malinovsky reviewed his role with DOE – to assist in four areas, 1. Acquisition advisor to the Assistant Secretary, 2. Plan implementation (labs, formula grants, and other grants), 3. Field management activities (oversight of Golden office, 6 regional offices) and 4. Implement environmental and safety requirements.

The membership discussed the difficulties of working with DOE's solicitation processes. ASERTTI members stated the following difficulties when working with DOE.

- Lack of notification (adequate timing)
- Cycle timing
- Transaction costs are high
- DOE spends more time with the winner of solicitations rather than letting the non-winning bidders know the problems with the proposals.

DOE is working on addressing some of the difficulties including transferring 75% of all money to the field offices by the end of October, change target dates of solicitations and make awards in a more timely manner.

The membership also provided some possible solutions including: a single point of entry for responding to solicitations and joint implementation mode rather than a joint planning mode.

10. ASERTTI Update

- a. Report from the Chair, Kristi Growdon – Washington State University**
ASERTTI filed for 501(c)(3) status on June 13, 2000, and is now a non-profit entity.

b. Treasurer Update, Mark Hanson and Sherry Benzmiller – Energy Center of Wisconsin

Current financial statement was distributed to the membership. Some members receipt of dues are delayed, however ASERTTI remains on budget.

c. Meeting Minutes

Minutes from the February 2000 meeting were approved as written and will be posted on the website.

d. Executive Director's Report – Jack White

Jack is continuing his efforts in working with DOE and the MOU process. The next joint planning process is scheduled for February/March 2001 and it is anticipated that some projects will result.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m. on Friday, October 20, 2000. The next ASERTTI meetings are scheduled for February/March 2001 in Washington D.C. and fall 2001 in Chicago, Illinois (host-University of Illinois at Chicago Energy Resources Center).

Respectfully submitted by,

Sherry Benzmiller
Executive Assistant
Energy Center of Wisconsin