

National Geothermal Collaborative

Final Meeting Summary

August 15, 2002

In attendance:

Paul Dunlevy – Bureau of Land Management (on behalf of the Department of Interior)

Dennis Giles – Geothermal Energy Association and Calpine Energy

Peter Goldman – Department of Energy

Roger Hill - Sandia

Stuart Johnson – Geothermal Resources Council and Caithness Energy

David McClain – David McClain Associates

Mike McKinney – Southern California Edison

Susan Norwood – Department of Energy

Marilynn Semro - Seattle City Light

Karl Gawell - Geothermal Energy Association

Joel Renner – INEEL (spell)

Ted Clutter – Geothermal Resources Council

Dan Schocet – Ormat

Steve Munson – Vulcan Power

Meeting Summary - July 17, 2002:

The participants finalized the meeting summary.

RPS Work Plan

The participants discussed the schedule. Because RPS is being considered in several states now, some expressed concern that this work plan should move as quickly as possible. Other expressed concern that the work group needs more time to ensure that the RFP is complete. The committee altered the schedule as follows:

- ? Resolve will produce the draft RFP and distributed it to the work group – August 30th
- ? The work group will send comments to Resolve on the RFP draft - September 15th
- ? Resolve will identify qualified consultants and distribute the RFP - September 30th
- ? The work group will review submittals and select a contractor - October 30th
- ? The contractor will produce a report between February & June 2003. (The work group will work with the contractor to establish the final deadline.)

The steering committee discussed the content of the report. The request for proposal should address, and the final report should include information about how RPS works in specific states, why specific states have considered and chosen not to implement a standard, as well as a general information about RPS, including:

- How state-level RPS works
- Principles for how it ought to work

What works and doesn't in existing RPS systems
What kind of RPS approach would work for all stakeholders
The appropriate place for geothermal in a renewable portfolio standard
How credit trading and RPS work together

Membership

The Steering Committee continued to discuss changes to its own membership. The discussion included these statements about the context for the membership decision:

1. The adopted operating protocols articulate a role for members. The members will work to develop consensus policies and recommendations to advance the development of geothermal heat and power.
2. Developing a diverse membership for the NGC is not an immediate but a long term goal.
3. The Steering Committee will serve as the guiding body of the NGC, will coordinate the actions of the NGC members in their sector or Working Group, will review and set the NGC's agenda.

The participants discussed the criteria for selecting the Steering Committee. The following are some of the essential criteria:

- ? Geothermal supporters
- ? All key constituencies are represented
- ? Manageable size
- ? Balanced representation
- ? Members needs to be collaborative
- ? Have the right representation from industry: large, small, and emerging organizations

The discussion led to several proposals:

1. Three seats - GEA-1, GRC-1 (both with a primary and an alternate), at-large-industry-1 (the at-large member would rotate approximately every six months)
2. Four seats - Industry representatives-3, GRC-1, all have alternates
3. Four seats – GRC-1, Leading US companies-3 (Ormat, Caithness, Clapine, or GEA)

There was no agreement on Steering Committee participation. The group agreed on these next steps:
Paul Dunlevy will speak with Susan, Karl, Peter, and Mike.
Resolve will work on a list and will discuss the options with everyone.

Protocols

Prior to this meeting individual members made grammatical changes to the Protocols these changes were accepted. In the meeting the participants made the following changes:

- ? Strike 'acquisition', change to 'use'
- ? Add language in the work group section – the chair person will ensure that the work group includes the appropriate experts and represents a range of viewpoints
- ? The group agreed that the phrase 'can live with' was not appropriate. The phrase was replaced with 'generally agree'. The discussion clarified that 'consensus' means all generally agree and that a majority vote is not consensus.

The Protocols were accepted with the understanding that the document is a work in progress and can be changed when the need arises.

Federal Land Siting

The group approved the work plan. The major elements of the work plan are....

The group discussed what it would take to make the workshops successful.

- ? Anyone who attends the workshop needs to have baseline information on geothermal energy
- ? The information needs to be perceived as credible and scientifically sound
- ? There should be an effort to measure how the workshop changes participants' perceptions
- ? Provide information on how to address impediments to geothermal development
- ? Avoid predetermined solutions

Next steps:

Between October 2002 and January 2003 the work group will design a strategy for:

- ? Reporting information from the findings
- ? Clarify the objectives and plan the workshops
- ? Set the schedule for the workshops between February and May 2003

Research

Resolve has been searching through the NWCC documents and is ready for the work group to start assessing selected documents for possible NGC adoption.

Next Steps

Next meeting will be scheduled when the steering committee list is finalized.

The Steering Committee may meet at the GRC conference, September 22nd and 23rd. Resolve will contact Ted Clutter to see if there is any time for NGC to meet in Reno. If so, Jody will coordinate schedules.

The NGC needs a logo that symbolizes its purpose.