

ETAAC errata sheet for Draft Final Report

For discussion at Feb. 11, 2008 meeting

ETAAC members: Please use this chart to specify any errors, typos or points for discussion you may see in the draft final report. Please include chapter #, page #, the text as it currently exists (enough words to uniquely identify the text or concept on the page), and either your preferred modified text or comment for discussion. (Table cells should expand to accommodate the length of your entry). Under significance, please indicate major if you believe the suggested change warrants group discussion, or minor for simple typographical errors that don't significantly change the meaning and thus are not worthy of discussion. Extend the table (add rows) as necessary. See examples below. Please coordinate through your sector lead so they can transmit to me (schurch@arb.ca.gov) by 4pm on Sunday, Feb. 10 (so I have time to process before the Monday morning meeting).

Submitter's Name: Ed Pike

<u>Chapter #</u>	<u>Page #</u>	<u>Existing text</u>	<u>Desired text or comment</u>	<u>Significance?</u>
		"In addition, analysis of other non-renewable technologies with GHG emission reduction potential would be useful in expanding RPS targets, and integrating these technologies with the RPS and other policy goals in the future."	"In addition, analysis of other non-renewable technologies with GHG emission reduction potential would be useful in expanding RPS targets, and integrating <u>coordinating</u> these technologies with the RPS and other policy goals in the future." <i>Jan- is this a clarification of the sub-groups intent ? Integrating seems to imply that nukes, low carbon fossil, etc could maybe count towards RPS, rather than in deciding what RPS number to use; if so we must be clear that they could only be considered for 33% RPS and NOT for 20% RPS such as: "integrating these technologies with the RPS, if it is expanded to 33% or higher, and other policy goals in the future."</i>	Jan, is this just clarifying what everyone intended, or a point for discussion on Monday ?
5	5	Responsible parties	Add US DOE	clarification
5	5	"LED technology suitable for general illumination is estimated to be five to ten years away..."	Change "five to ten years" to "several years" – <i>Jan, this is the update I received informally from the US DOE LED program contact</i>	update
5	6	First line	After "utilities" and "and DOE"	clarification
5	14	"This technology would benefit from additional study by the CEC and State	"This technology would benefit from additional study by the CEC and State incentives, and the recommendations in Chapter 4E."	clarification

		incentives.”		
5	15	First paragraph under 5.IV.F: “The greatest demand for electricity in California’s occurs”	“California”	typo
5	18	1 st paragraph under “problem”	Add to the end paragraph add “(For a more in-depth assessmend please see CARB’s ZEV review panel webpage)”	Clarification in response to public comment
5	19	Line seven starts “in the future, this approach offers multiple benefits.”	“in the future, this approach offers multiple benefits that should be recognized during policy developed realted to these areas.”	clarification
5	21	Third line under “problem”	Change 6-E to 6-F	typo
5	24 and 28	Headings for 5.VI; 5..VI.J;and Priority Action table item 11	In each case, change "low" to "zero and low"	Non-controversial Clarification - the recommendation clearly talks about low and zero
5	24	End of GHG reduction potential	Add “(This recommendation is not intended to recommend a reduction target for this sector, but rather how to facilitate meeting it).”	clarification
5	27	Item 3 line 3: “the CEC and CPUC”	“the CEC, CPUC, and US DOE”	clarification
5	27	Item 6	Change “Ca.” to “California” or “CA”	typo
5	27	Cal-ISO reform is now highlighted in chapter (in response to public comment), but absent from table	Add Cal-ISO reform Item: resolve Cal-ISO bottlenecks for renewable energy projects Relates to: Renewable Energy Who: Cal ISO	Update table to match updated recommendation
5	28	Item 12: “State Water Control Board”	“State Water Control Board and others” (to be consistent w/ ag chapter)	clarification