

## DOCKETED

<b>Docket Number:</b>	17-ALT-01
<b>Project Title:</b>	2018-2019 Investment Plan Update for the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program
<b>TN #:</b>	221812
<b>Document Title:</b>	David Comments Support Statement for Sylvatex
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	Kolisch Hartwell PC
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Applicant Representative
<b>Submission Date:</b>	11/17/2017 12:55:11 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	11/17/2017

*Comment Received From: David*

*Submitted On: 11/17/2017*

*Docket Number: 17-ALT-01*

## **Support Statement for Sylvatex**

There is no public funding available for either a) in-use demonstrations or b) production of new liquid fuels, and we request that the State of California makes these available to Sylvatex and others. If Sylvatex is ineligible for the larger funding allotments and only eligible under the 'emerging technologies' opportunities, then we request that the State of California increases the budget for companies in the latter category.

We also request the following:

1) Clarify in biofuels production solicitations whether or not alternative fuels such as microemulsion diesel, dimethyl ether, and other emerging technologies are eligible for such opportunities, and if they are, to provide criteria and details for what stages of production and sales would be competitive.

2) Increase the budget for emerging opportunities from \$4.2 million to \$6.5 million to support in-use demonstration projects of early-stage commercial alternative biofuels as well as pilot production opportunities for the following reasons since in-use demonstration funding for early-stage commercial biofuels is not available through CARB, existing CEC, or other state or funding opportunities.

3) Include in proposal scoring criteria the point allotment for projects that a) support disadvantaged communities or b) are proposed by minority and/or women-owned businesses such initiatives in the scoring criteria since grant solicitations claim to support these initiatives but apparently do not quantify this in the scoring.

4) Revise wording in biofuel production (as well as other) solicitations that might state that "Corn grain is NOT an eligible feedstock; however, corn oil and corn stover are eligible. If using municipal solid waste (MSW) as a feedstock, only the biogenic fraction of the waste stream is eligible." to instead say:  
"Corn grain is NOT an eligible feedstock for gasoline substitutes; however, corn oil and corn stover are eligible. If using municipal solid waste (MSW) as a feedstock, only the biogenic fraction of the waste stream is eligible."

Thank you for your consideration.

David P. Cooper  
IP Attorney  
Kolisch Hartwell PC