

National Geothermal Collaborative
Final Meeting Summary
Steering Committee

May 12-13, 2003
Denver, CO

In Attendance:

Gordon Bloomquist-Washington State University
Ted Clutter – Geothermal Resources Council
Paul Dunlevy – Bureau of Land Management
Troy Gagliano – National Council of State Legislatures
Karl Gawell – Geothermal Energy Association
Mike McKinney – Southern California Edison
Bob Middleton – White House Task Force on Energy Project Streamlining
Susan Norwood – Department of Energy
Marilynn Semro – Seattle City Lights

Alternates:

Arlene Rocabado – Southern California Edison
Dan Schochet – Ormat (phone, May 12 only)
David Laroche – White House Task Force
Matt Brown – NCSL (May 13, only)

Guests:

Amos Street – White House Task Force on Energy Project Streamlining
Bob Grace – Sustainable Energy Advantage
Ryan Wisner – Exeter Team
Rich Ferguson – CEERT (phone, May 12, only)
Roger Hill – Sandia National Laboratory
Barbra Farhar - NREL

Decisions Made:

Number	Decision
Renewable Portfolio Standards Report	
1.	The target audience for the RPS report is decision makers – agencies and legislators.
2.	The RPS report will be broadly focused with sections that are geothermal specific.
3.	In the Introduction of the RPS Report remove the Rader reference and create more of a balanced point-counter point format
4.	The NGC will write a preface and Exeter will write an executive summary for the RPS Report. The group agreed to the content as stated above.
5.	The content of the preface will include stakeholder’s views - focused more on the geothermal portions of the report, and the design rationale. It will be about three pages and act as a stand alone document.
6.	Change Report title to: Evaluating State RPS: A focus on Geothermal Energy
7.	Chapter 3: Alternatives to RPS, will remain in its current location and be renamed “Other Policy Approaches.”
8.	Chapter 4: Stakeholder Interviews will move to the appendix.
9.	Chapter 5: Evaluating State Policies will begin by referring to the stakeholder interviews conducted.
10.	The report and preface will address direct use (not heat pumps) and will include a sentence that raises the question about receiving renewable credits for offsets from power consumption.
Impediments Findings and Workshop/Dialogue Development	
11.	The group agreed to create a broad statement of the issues - similar to a conflict assessment – to frame the issues around impediments to geothermal development on military lands so as to answer the so what? question.
Research/Issue Papers	
12.	Abandon the Research document adoption process. Initiate an issue identification process to further the purposes of the NGC.
13.	Objective of the Issue Papers: To inform decisionmakers about the geothermal resource (development potential), technologies and policies.
14.	The audience for the Issue Papers will vary depending on the issue and include: state and federal legislators/regulators, public and private utilities.
Beyond the Steering Committee	
15.	The NGC will continue with a small Steering Committee, inviting experts to join work groups as necessary, and begin compiling a mailing list for outreach opportunities.
Logo and Website	
16.	Continue to work on the logo with the blue earth behind, using red lettering create different word positions.

Action Items

1. *RPS Report*

- ✂ Steering Committee members will send detailed comments on the RPS report to RESOLVE by May 20th.
- ✂ Susan Norwood and Karl Gawell will develop a draft preface and disseminate it to the Steering Committee by May 21st (changed to May 27).
- ✂ The Steering Committee will send RESOLVE their “gut check” comments on the RPS Preface by May 23rd (change to May29).
- ✂ The Steering Committee will send RESOLVE detailed comments on the RPS Preface, in track changes, by May 30th (change to June 5).

2. *Impediments Findings Document*

- ✂ The Work group will continue to revise the Document concurrently with developing two workshops (or series of workshops) on the issues surrounding DOD lands and Tribal lands
- ✂ RESOLVE will develop a document that broadly lists the issues on DOD lands, similar to a conflict assessment.
- ✂ The NGC will investigate partnering opportunities for developing a technical workshop for Tribes.

3. *Issue Papers*

- ✂ RESOLVE will work with the NCSL on developing the nine Issues Papers identified.

4. *Website and Logo*

- ✂ RESOLVE will work with the contractors to develop a website and logo design responsive to feedback from the Steering Committee.

5. *Steering Committee Meeting*

- ✂ The Steering Committee will meet via conference call June 12th, 2:00 pm (eastern), 12:00 (mountain), 11:00 (pacific).

Meeting Objectives

The objectives of the meeting were:

- ✂ To develop a shared understanding of who serves on the NGC and their interest in this effort;
- ✂ To update the Steering Committee on all NGC activities underway and planned, as well as to give individual organizations the opportunity to share their relevant activities with each other and
- ✂ To initiate a consensus process for the RPS report and other documents with a clear procedural time line.

Introductions

Kathleen Rutherford, RESOLVE opened the two day meeting reminding the group about why they were formed, and how they would operate, and what they were here to do. Kathleen reinforced the notion that each chair at the table represented a distinct constituency or set of interests, and that they were asked sit at this table in order to negotiate fairly on behalf of their interests. The table is designed as it is to encourage constructive conflict that will shift some of what has seemed intractable in the geothermal world for the last twenty years. Kathleen also talked about the power of consensus- that rather than different parties

sacrificing or compromising their interests, consensus decision making offers the possibility to create new solutions that satisfy all parties' interests. She then posted on the wall the purpose of the NGC (from the Operating Protocols, adopted August, 2002):

"The purpose of the National Geothermal Collaborative (NGC) is to advance the development and use of geothermal heat and power in the U.S. by identifying issues that impede the use of geothermal power, establishing dialogue with key stakeholders, and catalyzing activities to overcome obstacles to appropriate development. Our vision is that geothermal power is environmentally, economically and politically sustainable and fully integrated into mainstream energy markets."

Steering Committee Members introduced themselves by telling their names, talking about their organizations and sharing their interests in joining the NGC. Interests included the following:

- ? Timing – industry communicated to the secretaries of DOI and DOE about a lack of coordination between agencies to advance geothermal energy.
- ? Integration of renewables and geothermal specifically – after deregulation California is a recovering market with a need for more renewable power to comply with an RPS that stipulates 20% by 2020.
- ? Need for Increased Understanding – because there is such little existing development, further opportunities are sometimes lost in RFP processes due to lack of overall understanding of the resource
- ? Learning – there is an opportunity for state legislators to learn more about the needs industries and agencies involved with geothermal resource development.
- ? Partnerships – there are few opportunities for all the interested participants in geothermal energy come together to work as a coordinating mechanism to reach across all agencies, industry, and utilities.
- ? As distinct from wind, geothermal is a regional resource; changes won't happen overnight. The effort has to involve everyone, all decision makers, government and major institutions. This effort should be different from the NWCC- to build on their successes without replicating their model exactly-we have different issues.

Renewable Portfolio Standards Report

Background- How We Got Here

The first NGC SC meeting in August 2002 created a work group to examine state level Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) across the nation. Members included Marilyn Semro (a rigorous critic of RPS), and Dan Schochet (experienced in geothermal development and RPS), and RESOLVE staff. The work group developed a scope of work and competitively bid an RFP to design and write a report that would provide a better understanding of RPS to legislators and anyone contemplating RPS, as well as clarify how RPS benefit geothermal energy.

Four proposals were submitted, and the team Exeter Associates presented was chosen for their breadth of experience in the field and with collaborative processes, as well as the number of publications on related issues

A first draft review of the report was conducted with the workgroup in March. The Report that was circulated to you prior to this meeting reflects workgroup feedback, and comes with a recommendation for adoption.

Because the report is a snapshot in time, RESOLVE recommended a hard deadline for reaching consensus. This recommendation was made with the balancing question of how to weigh time to fully develop consensus against disseminating a product with immediate applicability. Linked to applicability is a concern with obsolescence. Because the RPS as a policy is relatively new, there is limited data from which to draw. Similarly, the information on these data are changing over time. For this set of reasons, Resolve staff recommended a time focused and prioritized consensus process to the steering committee in order to optimize value of this work product.

During this time members discussed the terms “advocacy” and “advancement” and how they relate to the work of the NGC. The purpose of the NGC is to “advance” geothermal development. Underpinning this conversation was the fact that many read advocacy as lobbying. Discussion went quickly to clarifying purpose, and defining terms. The Operating Protocols stipulate that members of the NGC must desire to promote and advance geothermal, including those who would like to see it developed if it satisfies specific concerns/reservations. The NGC is not a lobbying organization, and products from this organization will not be designed for the purposes of lobbying. While different parties may use these products to different ends, including advocacy, delineating advancement from advocacy is important. The NGC was formed because DOE supports a collaborative effort of stakeholders to wrestle with those issues that have and continue to keep geothermal energy development from moving forward. Products from the collaborative will reflect consensus views of the steering committee, and will target decision-makers.

AGREEMENT: The target audience for the RPS report is decision makers – agencies and legislators.
--

Process Recommendations:

The proposed process for reaching consensus has three steps:

1. Identify those areas/issues in the report that are critical to preserve and protect
2. Identify those areas/issues that would block a participant from consensus
3. Negotiate one full issue set, in order to experience a complete negotiation – future negotiations will be via conference call and agree upon a timeline

RPS Report Presentation

Bob Grace and Ryan Wisner, both subcontractors for Exeter, presented the overall highlights of the report and answered clarifying questions. (see appendix B for the presentation). Following are some of the clarifying responses:

- ? The report does not discuss legislative or non-binding goals in detail.
- ? The focus on California’s interim procurement was due to its similarity to an RPS. The interim procurement was intended to begin the process of increasing renewable energy use as soon as possible, knowing that the RPS legislation would be adopted and that there would be an implementation period of about 18 months
- ? Many RPS are designed for local benefits and have strict rules for out of state certificates, for instance Maine allows for out of state generation but it must transmit energy into Maine or New England, Nevada’s RPS allows for very limited out of state certificates, the proposed federal RPS allowed for unfettered national trading.

- ? A RPS can address power issues beyond electricity, but only three states looked into it - Texas allows for geothermal heating and Nevada and Arizona allow solar hot water.
- ? California is the best example of a complex RPS, although it is new and may prove successful.

During the presentation there were some suggestions/changes:

- ? There should be a section about where there has been successful utilization of renewables without RPS
- ? The numbers for California should be updated.
- ? The document should be more like the presentation which clearly presented the pros and cons, noting where they cancel each other out.
- ? Define cost and funding.

Discussion

The discussion began by asking how much should the RPS report focus on geothermal. There were those that felt that the NGC document should be geothermal focused and report predominately the benefits for geothermal and not just tagged onto the end. Others felt that the report was intended to give a good understanding of RPS broadly and then report the benefits to geothermal.

AGREEMENT: The report will be broad with certain sections that are geothermal focused.
--

Areas/issues to Preserve and Protect

- ? All the geothermal elements/focus
- ? The layout - clear format/ easy to access info (lists and charts – easy to access data
- ? Alternative policy approaches section – illustrates the range of policy approaches, knowing not every state will have RPS -the section provides an education about the options
- ? Communicating a range - communicating all aspects, including potential negative consequences or downsides helps the document stay away from advocacy

Areas/Issues that Could Block Consensus (concerns/changes)

Following the Exeter presentation, Kathleen asked the Steering Committee to articulate the broad issue areas with which they had concerns. Seven major areas/issues were identified. Individual members used post-it notes to capture their specific concerns under each topic. The Exeter team then split the comments into easy and more difficult to address. The group then discussed each topic and resolved all of their overriding concerns in each area. Following are the seven broad areas identified for revision. *See detailed discussion notes in Appendix B.*

1. Modify the Introduction

AGREEMENT – Remove the Rader reference and create more of a balanced point-counter point format.
--

2. Need for an Executive Summary and Preface

This discussion revolved around two separate documents, an executive summary and a preface:

AGREEMENT: The NGC will write the preface and Exeter will write the executive summary.

3. Change the Title

The title did not adequately reflect the substance of the report. There was little discussion once a suggestion was made to flip the original title and subtitle.

AGREEMENT: Title – Evaluating State RPS: A focus on Geothermal Energy.

4. Retain/Remove Chapter 3: Alternatives to RPS

There was agreement to keep some if not all of the chapter. Some changes were suggested:

AGREEMENT: Retain the section in its current location and move Chapter 4: Stakeholder Interviews into the appendix. Begin Chapter 5 by referring to the stakeholder interviews conducted. Rename the chapter 3, “Other Policy Approaches.” Clarify sections 3.2 and 3.4 as described above.

5. Overall Concerns/Issues
(See modify introduction)

6. Too Broadly an Advocacy Document

AGREEMENT: The Steering Committee will give more direction on this issue by sending detailed comments in track changes to RESOLVE by May 20th.

7. Elaborate and/or Clarify

AGREEMENT: The report will elaborate the section about why geothermal was left out of AZ legislation and clarify and preface will address direct use and not heat pumps. Include a sentence that raises the question about receiving renewable credits for offsets from power consumption.

Next Steps

- ? RESOLVE will seek the quickest turn around time feasible for Exeter to return a revised draft report
- ? RESOLVE will disseminate the next draft of the report.
- ? **May 20th** - NGC members will review the current document for detail changes and send them to RESOLVE.

Note: the following three dates have all changed:

- ? **May 21st** - Susan Norwood and Karl Gawell will develop a draft Preface for the RPS and disseminate it to the NGC Steering Committee

- ? **May 23rd** - NGC SC members will send their “gut check” comments on the Preface to RESOLVE. RESOLVE will collate these and send on to Susan and Karl. This will give them broad direction- on or off/course with what they have underway.
- ? **May 30th** – NGC Steering Committee members will send detailed responses on the preface to RESOLVE.

Impediments Findings Document

Background

Kathleen Rutherford reviewed the background of the document. The report was to synthesize existing information from conferences and workshops. This was expanded by the workgroup to include interview specific perspectives – DOD and Tribal (Jessica Alcorn, White House Task Force on Energy Project Streamlining).

The purpose of the report is to serve as a basis for convening workshops/dialogues to develop and refine options for improving the permitting and development process. The document will outline what the problem sets are in order to focus the dialogues on problem solving.

Format

The document is separated into two main sections (see appendix for the Table of Contents):

1. Access – the challenges developers face when applying for permission to get on the property where the resource is located.
2. Siting – the challenges developers face when applying for permits to build power plants, produce energy, and transmit the energy.

The scope of the document has varied, from federal lands, to federal and tribal, to the current form which includes the exploration of issues on DOD lands under the federal lands rubric. Tribal and DOD land sections will follow the Access and Siting sections

The audience for the Impediments Findings document is first the NGC. The NGC will then discuss and decide any future audiences.

Workshops/Dialogs

The work group met in April and proposed two workshops/dialogs: DOD lands and Tribal lands. The members discussed each of the workshops/dialogues:

1. DOD Lands

This would be a targeted dialogue with carefully selected participants. The focus would be to gain agreement on whether or not there are impediments and then generate options to eliminating or overcoming those. The DOD has identified twenty-six possible geothermal development sites. Currently there is only one developed. There is an ongoing dialogue is with BLM and DOD with regard to DOD controlling access to resources adjacent to DOD lands.

Concerns were expressed about how money generated from this program is shared with the states. It was also stated that DOD is required to give a certain amount of energy generated to the Federal government.

AGREEMENT – The group agreed that it would be beneficial to create a broad statement of the issues - similar to a conflict assessment – to answer the so what? question.

2. Tribal Lands

This would begin with a series of educational meetings including tours of direct use facilities building to a dialogue meeting (opportunity to partner with GRC and their experience with ‘how to’ workshops), possibly piggy backing the CERT September meeting in San Diego. The need to discuss this area is that there are often resource and transmission issues with Tribal Lands, for instance in California 70% of the area where transmission lines would be appropriate are Tribal land areas.

This series of workshops will be cultivated through conversations with tribes to understand where the energy resources are and what tribes are connected to the resources. Kathleen began these conversations at the Council of Energy Resource Tribes (CERT) conference in April.

RESOLVE/NGC would serve the role of initiating a process or dialogue.

Participants acknowledged that work in this realm clearly needs to be a multi-level, ongoing process. The role of the NGC here would be to initiate a dialogue, and then determine the appropriate next steps as a result of that dialogue/workshop.

Bob Middleton and David Laroche spoke to the Indian Energy Initiative which the Task Force is undertaking. This initiative focuses on all of the federal agencies that work with tribal energy. They noted that due to their sovereign nation status, opportunities and challenges on Tribal lands are different from private and public lands.¹

Research Documents

Background

During the first meeting of the NGC in August of 2002 participants decided to pursue the possibility of adapting broadly focused issue papers authored by the National Wind Coordinating Committee (NWCC).. The workgroup that launched this effort was Karl Gawell and Ron Lehr. Ron, however, does not serve on the steering committee and is no longer involved with the NGC.

Jody Erikson, RESOLVE, reviewed all of the papers and selected the four that could be most easily adapted. Per decision of the Steering Committee, these were circulated to the whole for review after the March meeting.

1. Issue Paper #1: The Benefits of Geothermal
2. Issue Paper #6: Utility Procurement of Geothermal Resources
3. Issue Paper #7 Geothermal in a Restructured Electric Industry
4. Issue Paper #8: Incorporating Geothermal into Resource Portfolios

¹ Their first meeting was the week prior, focused on who has the resources and how to best focus on them. One avenue the group is exploring is the need of Tribes to generate good business plans to acquire the funds necessary to develop the resources. They are looking at partnering tribes with renewable resources with graduate MBA programs.

Is this the right process?

By and large, the feedback RESOLVE received seems to indicate that the process of adapting NWCC documents was not proving to be as efficient as the group had hoped for.² Concerns were expressed about the adaptation of these papers written for the advancement of another technology, in a different regulatory environment and by another group of interests.

Matt Brown, NCSL, worked with the NWCC to create the issue papers in 1996-1997. He discussed the document development process- the NWCC had a sub-committee that identified issues to cover, then NCSL hired a contractor to develop the documents which were targeted at state legislators. The objective was to inform state legislators about the technology and policies, including the pros and cons of each. These were vetted through the NWCC consensus process, and did not advocate for any particular policy.

Given this experience, Matt believes it would be more effective for NCSL staff to author the papers. His reasoning is that they are trained to write effective policy analysis pieces, and there is less management involved. NCSL could bring their expertise in writing for a state legislator audience and partner that with the expertise around the table to effectively write the Issue Papers.

AGREEMENT: Abandon the research document adoption process, and initiate an issue identification process to further the purposes of the NGC.

Issue Papers

Objective

The objective of the documents would vary slightly from topic to topic and audience to audience. It is important that these documents be credible with good scientific information behind them.

AGREEMENT: Objective: To inform about the geothermal resource (development potential), technologies and policies.

Audience

The audience of the documents would vary based on the topic of the document. The greatest value would be at the state level. The value for the utilities is to learn about the resources in their area and understand the local impacts.

AGREEMENT: Depending on the issue, the target audience could include state policy makers, public and private utilities and federal policy makers.

Topics/Issues to Address

1. **Environmental impacts and mitigation**—address the myths and the what if's. Similar document were initiated by the GRC, and published in two text books for the 1995 Geothermal World Congress.
2. **Benefits of geothermal energy**

² The members felt that Issue Papers 1, 6, and 8 would require major rewrites to bring them current and compelling for geothermal. They agreed that Issue Paper 7 was not salvageable because the market had changed dramatically. They also agreed that it would take less time and be more valuable to the NGC to start again by selecting the topics and deciding the audiences and objectives of the documents.

3. **Siting/transmission** (transmission – needs to be identified) –address impediments to plant and transmission siting (this could be connected to jurisdiction or separate).³
4. **Jurisdiction/authority** –clarify who has ownership or authority, including fractured ownership of the resource.
5. **Resource information** –address how to find out if you have the resource (good for utilities and state level).⁴(could link this to Energy bill paper, below, about evaluation of what we know).
6. **Direct use** –focus on tribal usage, new technologies, and economic development (for example, NREL is funding construction of a small direct use plant).
7. **Technology**, the current state of - include binary vs flash, direct use and more (might be incorporated into the Resource document or the Environmental Impacts document).
8. **Impacts/outcomes of the Energy Bill** –focus on what needs to be addressed once a bill is passed to clarify the benefits for geothermal on a Federal level (could link this to the Resource paper, what we will know).⁵
9. **What state policy makers can do** –address incentives, impediments, ensuring transmission is built, and deregulation of district energy⁶

Next Steps

Resolve and NCSL staff will get together to discuss a partnership structure to develop the issue papers with existing, and potential future funding.

There was a discussion on length, ranging from two to twelve pages (double spaced). RESOLVE and NCSL will work together to propose length and a time line for the completion of the Issue Papers. Timelines for production of the pieces discussed ranged from six months to the end of March 2004.

NGC and Beyond?

This conversation was grounded in three prevailing questions:

1. When is it time to grow the Steering Committee?
2. Given the interests represented at the table, what is each doing and where are there opportunities for leveraging resources?
3. What chairs at the table remain empty, and how can we fill them?

The Steering Committee discussed whether it is valuable to create a membership structure at this time. They agreed that the current model, a small Steering Committee with work groups that pull in outside experts, is the right one for now. The Committee felt that there were existing avenues for interested parties to learn about the NGC, through the upcoming web site and the freedom to attend NGC meetings as an observer.

³ The Impediments Findings document will have a piece that can feed the Siting/Transmission Issue Paper and the Environmental Impact Issue paper. It could be used as a place to start.

⁴ This needs to be a peer reviewed paper because there is a lot of debate among experts

⁵ At this time the work could begin on the language that is similar in the two bills and then wait for the new language to come out of conference.

⁶ Incorporating geothermal into a resource portfolio is not a topic for a paper by itself but the group mentioned incorporating it into other papers where appropriate.

GEA, GPW and GRC are members of the NGC Steering Committee and can help reach the larger geothermal community. This is consistent with how the table for the Steering Committee has been built, as a representative group of stakeholders with an interest in advancing geothermal development. Balancing that representation is critical.

The question was raised, what would the NGC do with members? What service would the NGC provided them? Given the scope and purpose of the NGC, it was decided that it would benefit the Collaborative and the larger geothermal community to include contact information/sign up spaces on the website, and to develop a mailing list that would inform people of upcoming activities/newly posted material, etc.

AGREEMENT: Continue with a small Steering Committee, inviting experts for the work groups as necessary, and begin compiling a mailing list for outreach opportunities. Establish a mailing/contact list for interested parties to receive activity updates.

What are your organizations doing that could contribute to meeting objectives of the NGC?

Geopowering the West

Susan Norwood gave a brief overview of what the GPW does, and turned the conversation over to GPW Team Members Barbara Farhar of NREL and GPW Technical Director Roger Hill, from Sandia National Labs.

Barbara Farhar reviewed her recently published report “Near Term Geothermal Development Opportunities”, and talked about her background facilitating two workshops on geothermal siting issues. Her efforts helped BLM identify that resource management plans need to include geothermal to ensure that it is not precluded as a possibility. Barbara also spoke to the need for a national inventory of where resources were-she noted that there is a lack of communication/coordination between many similar efforts in this vein. Roger Hill spoke to the work with which he is currently engaged, and shared maps from a presentation he gave at the CERT conference in April. Roger also stated that he has extensive experience working with tribes.

Geothermal Energy Association

They are uploading a database on geothermal plants on a state by state basis, including existing facilities, projects under development, and the resources in each state. The data has been reviewed by all GEA companies for accuracy. They have been working on some papers that narrow in on social and economic impacts, including a technical and literature review. When completed they will be published in a peer reviewed journal.

Gordon Bloomquist- WA State Working Group

Gordon continues to work with the state working groups. On September 9th, in Boise, Idaho, the state (geothermal) champions will gather to inform the GPW team what they need from them. Tuesday of that week is a state summit, Wednesday is a workshop on lessons learned, and Thursday is the state working group meeting.

Southern California Edison

They are working on restructuring transmission lines for the first time since the 1970s.

White House Task Force on Energy Streamlining

The Indian Energy initiative is focused on renewables and transmission lines. There is a memorandum of understanding between the Forest Service and BLM pertaining to right of way. The initiative is to help clarify which is the lead agency to permit linear rights of way and the role of the other agency. They are looking at 19-20 trunk line corridors to allow for growth in the west. They are working with the Western Governors Association, western utilities, and more. In the next 2-3 weeks they will identify the corridors and then begin an analysis on using them – currently to use a right of way one must complete a full EIS.

The largest Federal/state partnership initiative is the Rocky Mountain Energy Council. This group will look at how agencies work together, identify the issues and generate options. They will meet in Denver July 8th and 9th. They will look forward at where they want to be in five years, in ten years and identify the opportunities to change the process.

Two months ago the White House created regional Tiger teams to address the application for permits and drilling (APDs) process.

Bureau of Land Management

They are looking at the possibility of creating a database of database for GIS data. This idea is very new and is still in the very formative stage.

Steering Committee Chairs

There are a few perspectives not represented on the Steering Committee. It is important to remember when choosing the person that they are in the right position to help the NGC and that they have the disposition to collaborate. Chairs to be filled and recommendations included:

- ? Forest service – they have geothermal resources on their land, possibly someone from the California or Oregon offices
- ? EPA – they could provide an aspect of the environmental perspective from Federal government (Clean air/Clean water) possibly from the Denver or San Francisco offices
- ? Environmental (Kathleen will first clarify Rich Ferguson’s commitment)
- ? Commissioner

Website and Logo

Website

Jody Erikson presented the two website design models and asked the group for their feedback on what worked and what didn’t. The group liked the layout with table of contents down the left side, the option that looks like stone. Pictures are important both to be properly cited and for the image it places in viewers mind. The site map and search options should be below the table of contents on every page. All pages need to be consistently formatted.

The content should include a page where individuals can sign up for a mailing list; a place to ask questions; all contact information for NGC/RESOLVE should be on every page including a phone number and email address.

Make sure printouts will be high contrast.

Logo

Jody showed the group four logo roughs. The group selected the second one with the blue globe behind. They suggested using red letters and wanted to see different versions with different word placement.

AGREEMENT: Work with the logo with the blue earth behind, using red lettering create different word positions.

Bin Items

- ? Customer survey – BLM completed a satisfaction survey of Geothermal programs Respondents said that they would like to have someone from government promote geothermal energy legislation or comments (when energy bills were being developed that government folks pursued a proposal). NGC might want to consider utilizing a similar tool. It was shared that some from industry feel the NGC could do more to satisfy their legislative change interests.
- ? DOD issue paper will be an outcome of dialogue.
- ? Tribal issue paper will be an outcome of dialogue.

Next Steps

May 20th - NGC members will review the current document for detail changes and send them to RESOLVE.

May 27th - Susan Norwood and Karl Gawell will develop a draft Preface for the RPS and disseminate it to the NGC Steering Committee.

May 29th - NGC SC members will send their “gut check” comments to RESOLVE.

June 4th – NGC Steering Committee members will send detailed comments on the preface to RESOLVE.

June 12th – Next Steering Committee meeting, conference call