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**PROCEEDINGS**

2:01 P.M.
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA, FEBRUARY 27, 2018

MR. DODSON: So good afternoon, everyone.

My name is Geoff Dodson and I’m the Lead Staff member on the Renewable Energy for Agriculture Program, also known by the acronym REAP. And I’ll be going over the presentation today.

A couple of little housekeeping items to go over real quick. In the event of an emergency, please follow CEC staff out to the nearest exist and proceed to Roosevelt Park, located diagonally across the street. I believe all the hail/snow has melted off, so it should be safe for your evacuation needs.

Restrooms are located just outside the main door to the left, just before the exit. And there’s also a snack bar up on the second floor.

We have several folks joining us online, on WebEx, so I ask that you please keep your lines muted while the presenter is talking.

There will be time for questions, where we will cover the questions from those in the room first, and then go to the questions over on WebEx.

For those on WebEx, please ask your questions privately through the chat function, if it is just a question. If you have comments, we
will also be opening up the lines for WebEx guests to speak.

So here’s a little overview of the agenda for today. I’ll be continuing on the presentation of the current proposals for the Renewable Energy for Agriculture Program. And then, the most important part is we want to hear from you.

We have developed some discussion questions that we would appreciate your feedback on and we also welcome general public comment.

At the end of our scheduled time or when public comment is complete, we will review the next steps and make sure that everyone has the contact information so they can follow up.

This presentation will be available to everyone, once it is added up on the docket established for this program, following this workshop today.

Before we start on the content of the program proposal, we want to be sure to recognize the Energy Commission’s efforts to ensure diversity in our programs.

The Energy Commission has adopted a formal resolution strengthening its commitment to
diversity in our funding programs. We continue
to encourage disadvantaged communities and under-
represented businesses, and communities to engage
in and benefit from our many programs.
To meet this commitment, the Energy
Commission staff conducts outreach efforts and
activities included in the list, shown on the
screen here.
And just so everyone is aware, there’s
several different ways you can connect with us so
you can stay up to date on all of our activities
and funding opportunities at the Energy
Commission.
So a little bit of background on REAP.
Authorized with the passage of Assembly Bill 109,
referred to as the Budget Act of 2017, the
Renewable Energy for Agriculture Program, also
known as REAP, will provide $6 million from the
Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, also known as
GGRF, to assist agriculture operations with the
installation of on-site renewable energy
technologies, with an emphasis in providing
assistance in disadvantaged and low-income
communities.
REAP was established by the same
legislation that authorized the Food Processor
Investment Program, which is a research and
development grant program, also administered by
the Energy Commission.

So as we were developing the program
guidelines, there are a number of areas we’d like
to see input on. Today, we will review the
anticipated program schedule and discuss the
overall program goals. Then, we’ll move into the
areas of the proposed REAP program for which we’d
like to hear your ideas, including project
funding levels, proposed eligibility
requirements, and project types.

This is going to be a high-level overview
so we again what to emphasize that these are
initial proposals. The primary purpose of this
workshop is to hear from you guys. We would like
feedback on all of our ideas, as well as ideas of
your own.

So this slide provides a small overview
of our program schedule. As the program is
designed and implemented, the Energy Commission
staff will seek input from potential program
participants and will finalize the solicitation
and program guidelines that reflect feedback from
these community engagement efforts.

As outlined here, based on the feedback received through this workshop and the workshop scheduled for next week, in the Central Valley, staff will be preparing draft program guidelines, which will also be made available for public comment.

Staff will finalize the program guidelines and the solicitation materials, which we anticipate releasing in August of this year, with proposals due in September of 2018, and the scoring completed in October of 2018. We anticipate issuing a notice of proposed awards in late 2018 and working after that to finalize grant agreements.

First, it is important to acknowledge that the development of the REAP program will reflect all requirements for California Climate Investment Programs, as outlined in the Agency Funding Guidelines, prepared by the California Air Resources Board.

As our funding comes from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, the primary goal of the program is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. All California Climate Investment projects must
reduce greenhouse emissions and administering agencies must use a GHG qualification methodology that has been developed or approved by the California Air Resources Board.

To accomplish this, and as directed by the legislation authorizing the program, the primary goal of the program is to assist agriculture operations with the installation of on-site renewable energy technologies, with an emphasis on providing assistance in disadvantaged and low-income communities.

Projects are expected to support agricultural operations in increasing resiliency and electricity reliability, which potentially offers a number of benefits, including reliability and cost savings.

Additionally, we hope to develop a program to realize additional co-benefits, including reductions in local air pollutions and the additional benefits to the local community.

So here’s a brief funding overview of the program. The overall budget for the program is $6 million. The minimum award amount proposed is to be $50,000, with a maximum for any single award of $250,000. Staff are proposing these
funding limits to provide sufficient funding for projects, but also maximizing the reach of the funds throughout the State of California.

Staff are further proposing a single award per operation and would like to hear your feedback on potentially awarding on assessor’s parcel number basis, allowing funding for a single APN, or a group of APNs, but only one award for any single APN.

As there are a number of potential funding sources for similar or related projects, staff are further proposing that any operation submitting proposals under a REAP solicitation must identify funds provided by any other State programs. Receipt of the funds from other programs is not considered to preclude participation in REAP, however the proposal will be evaluated for effectiveness and overall expenditure.

The funding guidelines require that if an applicant is leveraging funds from multiple sources of GGRF dollars, or if the applicant is pursuing funding from multiple sources of these Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund dollars, the applicant must describe all existing or potential
GGRF sources in the application materials.

The entities that staff are proposing to be eligible for the program funding are owners of agriculture operations, including private parties and nonprofit agencies.

We are interested in hearing from you if there’s a need to support academic operations, such as demonstration in teaching facilities.

I know this slide looks a little dense, but I just want to show you some definitions for your reference. The FARMER Program, implemented by the Air Resources Board, and also partially funded by GGRF funds has adopted the definition of agricultural operations contained in ARB’s regulation for in-use, off-road, diesel vehicles as shown on this slide, up at the top.

The SWEEP Program, implemented by the California Department of Food and Agriculture, and again funded by Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund monies, uses a related, but different definition as shown here at the bottom of the slide.

And again, you guys will have a copy of this slide deck available to you, so don’t worry about writing all of this down.

Staff here are considering a definition
for the purposes of REAP similar to the
definition used in the FARMER Program, but not
including forest operations. While staff
recognizes the need for support of forest
management activities, we also feel that it may
be more efficient to focus this funding on the
areas included in this proposed definition.
Again, we would like to hear your feedback on
this proposal.

AB 1532 requires that cap and trade
auction proceeds be used to facilitate the
achievement of greenhouse gas reductions in
California and specifies additional co-benefits
to consider.

The REAP program will facilitate the
achievement of greenhouse gas reductions and
other co-benefits through incentivizing the
installation of renewable energy in agriculture
operations. This may include the installation of
renewable energy to offset grid energy, and could
potentially include replacing fossil fuel
equipment, combined with the installation of
renewable energy to provide the electricity for
upgraded equipment.

This slide here presents a list of some
of the proposed project types that could be funded through our program. This is not intended to be a comprehensive list, only a suggested list of examples.

Eligible projects are expected to include proven renewable energy resources. This could include solar PV, wind turbines, solar trees, and battery storage used on site.

Just to reiterate here, again, all of these -- everything shown here is just a proposal. So this slide here shows what we may consider to be eligible covered costs through our funding awards. We are not going to be paying for CEQA costs related to any projects you do.

SB 535 established the original requirements related to the investment of Greenhouse Gas Reduction Funds in disadvantaged communities to provide economic and health benefits to these communities.

In 2016, AB 1550 revised these requirements, increasing the share of the State’s auction proceeds that must be invested within disadvantaged communities and adding new requirements to direct additional investments to low-income communities and low-income households.
AB 1550 requires at least 25 percent of auction proceeds to be invested for projects within and benefitting disadvantaged communities. Five percent for projects within and benefitting low-income communities, or benefitting low-income households statewide. And 5 percent for projects within and benefitting low-income communities or low-income households that are within a half-mile of disadvantaged communities.

We are committed to supporting disadvantaged and low-income communities and aim to support these goals of AB 1550.

For the REAP program, we recommend allocating 50 percent of the total funds for projects within and benefitting disadvantaged communities, and 10 percent for projects within and benefitting low-income communities, based on the CalEnviroScreen 3.0 model.

We would, however, like to hear your input on this proposal and also how this program can maximize benefits to these communities.

Project implemented under California Climate Investments are also directed to maximize economic, environmental, public health, and benefits to the State. To foster job creation by
promoting projects carried out by California workers and businesses, and complement efforts to improve air quality.

Consistent with these requirements, we propose providing preference to projects that include measures that improve local air quality, achieve public health benefits, and results in the job creation and job training.

We further propose to develop a solicitation to include a preference for projects that include mechanisms for the energy cost savings from project implementation to be reinvested in the local community. And projects that provide other community benefits, such as demonstrations, to encourage additional similar investment in renewable energy or education for local residents or the business community.

Additionally, we are proposing to provide preference points to projects that provide innovative solutions that have a broad impact, and projects that provide match funding.

So match funding, in our proposal is not required, but applicants are strongly encouraged to include a 50-percent match. Applications that include matching funds will receive additional
consideration. Matching funds are defined as a portion of the project costs not covered by the grant award and can include cash and/or in-kind contributions.

In-kind contributions can include costs associated with the labor, equipment, facilities, and other property, or property improvements related to the project.

The California Air Resources Board Funding guidelines for agencies that administer California Climate Investments state that to the maximum extent feasible, administering agencies should seek opportunities to work together to provide multiple benefits and to maximize the benefits from each program.

Several administering agencies could coordinate and leverage their resources to provide funding for a project, or to fund multiple related projects in the same geographic area. This coordination may involve sharing information with applicants about the other California Climate Investment Programs that offer funding for complementary projects.

The funding guidelines also note that our investments should be coordinated with local,
state, and federal funding programs to avoid duplicative efforts.

The REAP program is coordinating efforts with the FARMER program, implemented by the Air Resources Board, as well as the SWEEP program, which is implemented by the California Department of Food and Agriculture. We would welcome your input on other efforts we can coordinate with.

So this provides a pretty general overview of our proposed elements of the REAP program. Now, we would really like to hear from all of you. We have developed a few questions for discussion and we would like to ask for feedback on these questions, as well as overall public comment.

As you develop written comments on the proposed program, we do request that you provide additional input on the questions posed here. Your comments are very important to us and will help us with developing our guidelines.

While comments in person are helpful and will become part of the public record, we encourage you to submit written comments as well. Directions for providing public comment through the docket established for this program will be
provided at the end of this workshop.

So we’re going to go ahead and open up
the questions to everyone in the room here,
first. After everyone in the room has had an
opportunity to speak, we will move to the WebEx
attendees, first taking questions from the chat
section and then given WebEx telephone guests an
opportunity to comment.

Please remember that your comments are
being recorded and they may become part of the
public record.

So here are a few questions to consider.
The next slide also has a few more questions
after this, so we will move on to that after we
are done with these kind of discussion questions
here. But take a look at the questions you see
here and really, like I said any feedback or
comments you have on this will really be helpful.

So we do have a microphone. So yeah,
when you do get the microphone please state your
name and also what you’re affiliated with.

MS. MILLS: Karen Mills with the
California Farm Bureau. Hi.

MR. DODSON: Hi.

MS. MILLS: One of the threshold
questions I have is with regard to the schedule.

MR. DODSON: Uh-huh.

MS. MILLS: Your focus is on on-site and grower-owned, operator-owned projects but you’ve got the projects due during peak harvest time in California. Is there any flexibility about when the applications will be due?

MR. DODSON: Yeah, I think we have one of our senior staff members is going to answer that question.

MS. LEE: Good afternoon. I’m Natalie Lee. I’m the Deputy Director of the Renewable Energy Division here at the Energy Commission. We were trying to meet a number of goals, but this is exactly the kind of really practical, you know, in-practice kind of information we need. We are very interested in maximizing the use of these funds, having the funds available for the longest period of the encumbrance and expenditure period for the monies.

What would -- can I ask you, if we were to try to accelerate the time frame to get the money out on the street earlier, is there an opportunity in that window or are you really feeling like we need to defer to a later time
frame?

MS. MILLS: You know, I’m just looking at the schedule and, you know, really beginning in August, operators are -- it’s a very intense period of time, really August through October.

MS. LEE: Through October.

MS. MILLS: Yeah. And so, I work on energy issues for the Farm Bureau and a lot of times we -- you know, so you’ve got some education and outreach earlier than that, but usually we look at things after, you know, beginning in November or December. Of course, it’s always hard with the holidays and things like that. But September, you know, August/September are really tough times, and even into October, really, if you’re asked -- if you’re trying to get people’s attention to do something that I anticipate will take quite a few hours to do it, unless they’ve got somebody, you know, is doing it all for them, which is not the common practice.

MS. LEE: Can I ask, I know that some programs have solicited the help of technical assistance centers, folks that can kind of come alongside the operators to complete some of the
documentation, assist them, and also streamline application processes with very focused funding, such as this.

MS. MILLS: Yeah.

MS. LEE: If we can accelerate the up-front time and accomplish these other kind of supportive efforts to provide some technical assistance and a very streamlined application --

MS. MILLS: Right.

MS. LEE: -- do you think we can craft something that where we could try to still get this money out on the street, you know, ready to final agreements by the end of this year? It’s not ideal, is it?

MS. MILLS: I don’t -- you know, I don’t know.

MS. LEE: I mean, I’m hearing you, it’s not ideal, no.

MS. MILLS: I mean, you know, I don’t know the answer to that. I mean it is particular to a lot of circumstances. You know, it just depends.

MS. LEE: Uh-huh.

MS. MILLS: But I think certainly those kinds of things do help and, you know, are really
important if you’re trying to expedite it, yeah.

MS. LEE: Yeah, I will say that one of our, you know, kind of driving recommendations is to try to have the funds awarded, at least a notice of award prior to the end of the year to meet that. Again, I really appreciate that recognition that it will be an impact to the exact community we’re trying to serve. So, you know, I think what we will do is take this feedback back, see what we can incorporate that could alleviate the burden for participating in the program and to try to maintain the timeframes. But absolutely appreciate and recognize the impact. Thank you for providing that.

MR. DODSON: We have a couple more questions to consider for discussion. Again, we’ll open it up for the room here if anyone has any specific comments or questions.

MR. NOMA: Yeah, my name is Ed Noma. I’m with Advantiv Technologies. And we’re involved in clean energy, as well as technology for agriculture and also other industries.

But yeah, in terms of the first question, I mean this is just a completely self-serving
comment but, yeah, we are definitely starting to
talk to various academic institutions about
working with them on -- for example UC
Agricultural and National Resources ANR group has
research centers. They are, I think, thinking at
least about integrated technology demonstration
sites. And those feel like they would be a great
to show a really holistic, you know, bringing
together of clean energy, of new farm
technologies like automation sensors, and things
like that. So for the first one at least, I
would vote yes.

MR. DODSON: Great. Thank you very much
for your comment.

MS. LEE: Again, this is Natalie Lee.
Can I ask in regard -- one of the areas, and if
you’d prefer to provide this by written comment,
that’s great. But we really are interested in
knowing if the funding levels are sufficient to
accomplish the goals of the program and if they
would exclude or preclude a project type that you
feel is needed in the agricultural community,
where there’s an opportunity for the use of these
funds. So right now, the proposal is $50,000 as
a minimum award and $250,000 as a maximum award
for any single operation. But we are also
looking at some of the other program models that
associate that on an APN basis. So with that in
mind, again if you have something you’d like to
share now, great. Otherwise, this is an area we
really do want some feedback from those of you
who are developing projects and working in
operations as to whether these are reasonable,
and sufficient to accomplish the goals of the
program.

MR. SALEM: Hi, Dave Salem, Brad Thompson
Company. We’re developing a few cogeneration
projects on AG sites. And to be honest, you
know, typically these projects could be $8 to $15
million. And so, you know, the award values are
pretty low. You’d get, basically, some
feasibility engineering done. I mean, and so our
goal was maybe some of this would have been a
little higher.

MR. DODSON: Thank you very much.
Obviously, one of the challenges is we only have
$6 million to work with. So as you can see, it
can be a little tough. But as far as working
within that $6 million, we can definitely
consider a different range.
It looks like we have a couple of WebEx questions, so I’m going to go ahead and give the mic to our staff member, O’Shea, who’s going to go over those.

MR. BENNETT: We only actually just had one from a gentleman named Philip, who asked: Is energy for food processing included in the program?

MR. DODSON: Asked us if -- what kind of --

MR. BENNETT: Energy for food processing is included in the program?

MR. DODSON: If you mean specifically renewable energy that helps support food processing, is that what you’re asking because --

MR. BENNETT: He said he’s a provider of renewable energy for food processors.

MR. DODSON: Okay. So as far as I can tell at this point, I mean if it kind of falls under the purview of an agricultural operation that would certainly be something that would be eligible.

It’s also important to note there actually is a similar program, administered in a different division of the Energy Commission,
called the Food Processing Investment Program. And they actually have $60 million. And I believe they had their first workshop two weeks ago.

And information about that program can actually also be found on our main webpage, too. So I would suspect that that gentleman may find eligibility in at least one of those two programs.

MR. BENNETT: Great. We actually have one more question from a Vagelis Vossos. And it says: Would you consider off-grid renewable energy projects in the program?

MR. DODSON: My belief at this point is any project would probably need to be interconnected, although I can’t say for sure if that’s a definite no. But I do believe that we’re going to require some sort of interconnection.

MR. NOMA: Sorry if you kind of covered it, but I was wondering at what point would we get maybe some more information on parameters of how you’ll be judging, you know, and selecting recipients?

MR. DODSON: Yeah, that’s a good
question. So like I said before, this is kind of the introductory workshop where we’re taking public feedback. But as noted in the proposal for the schedule, the draft guidelines would probably be a good, you know, a good solid opening way to get, you know, detailed information on that to see kind of more of the finer details of this program.

And then as we move forward with the solicitation release, that will have everything of course.

And so there will be the draft guidelines, and then that will have to be adopted at a business meeting where it will get formalized into actual program guidelines.

MS. LEE: And I’ll just clarify. You will see guidance as to scoring criteria in the draft guidelines.

MR. SASSEEN: Hi. I have a question.

MR. DODSON: Go for it.

MR. SASSEEN: I was just wondering, is the cannabis industry in any way specifically excluded or ineligible for this grant?

MS. LEE: Can I ask you to state your name and affiliation for the transcriber, and
then Jeff will respond for you?

MR. SASSEEN: Yeah, sure. Jim Sasseen with the Center for Sustainable Energy.

MR. DODSON: Great. Thank you for your question. My understanding at this point is that we’re focused mostly on the licensing of the agriculture operation and we’re not necessarily as concerned about the crop that’s being grown. So as long as all the licensing is there, then any agriculture operation should be eligible.

MR. SASSEEN: Thank you.

MS. LEE: Could you spell your name for us, please?

MR. SASSEEN: Yes. It’s S-A-S-E-N.

MS. LEE: Thank you. And I will say the proposed definition of agricultural operation is key to a couple of the questions that have been asked. So if you could please review that and in your opinion, in the written comments, provide if you feel that there’s any clarification needed in the definition.

MR. NOMA: Yeah, sorry, one more question. If, for example our company would be -- might be interested in just participating, supporting potential applicants in terms of maybe
in-kind work, labor or, you know, other types of things. So is there a mechanism with how we could, for example, link up with those types of folks as they’re putting together their application?

MR. DODSON: Yes, I believe so. I guess the applicant itself would be the, you know, the owner or the operator of the agriculture farm. But as far as who they work with, that wouldn’t necessarily preclude anyone from kind of participating and getting funding awards.

MR. NOMA: Right. And, oh, sorry that brings up another question. Certainly, the owner of the agricultural operation might be the applicant. Might other applicants be, for example, people who provide, you know, renewable energy that are -- or are you looking for applicants to be really the owners of the operation?

MR. DODSON: At this point in time our expectation is it will probably be the owners of the agricultural operation or at least, you know, someone affiliated with that land itself.

MR. NOMA: Sure.

MR. DODSON: So, you know, they would of
course work with the installation company or the solar provider. But we don’t anticipate at this point in time that the solar providers, themselves, would be eligible as an applicant.

MR. NOMA: All right, thank you.

MR. DODSON: Any other WebEx questions at this time or anything?

In case anyone hasn’t already covered, if there’s any other kind of off-topic comments not related to the questions shown, does anyone have any specific recommendations, or suggestions, or feedback that they’d like to share?

MS. MILLS: I mean, it’s in our outline. So in response to the question that was just asked regarding the entities that can apply, you have listed as potential eligible entities, you include nonprofit agencies. And I wondered if you had something in mind for that? Who that might include or who we were trying to target by including that definition.

MR. DODSON: Well, that’s actually a good question that, you know, we’d like to hear from you if you have any specific suggestions. We’re not necessarily targeting any specific type of entity in that regard. So really, if you have
any suggestions or comments on that, we’d love to hear it.

MS. MILLS: So you were just trying to be inclusive, rather than targeted. Okay.

MS. LEE: Yeah, I’ll agree with Jeff on that. We want to -- it’s the agricultural operation that we want to make sure we provide access for. So if there’s an ownership structure that -- even if it’s not common in mainstream, but it is represented in, we don’t want to exclude them based on that ownership structure of the operation. And again, working with the folks like yourself, who are deeply in this community, you can help us to refine that to make sure that again, we’re inclusive of ownership structures, and are more focused on the agricultural community.

MR. DODSON: Anything on the lines?

Well, of course, I’m sure more questions will come up down the road. So fortunately, there is an opportunity to provide written comment after this workshop is over. So don’t stress. We definitely still want to hear from you as more questions do come up which, hopefully, they do.
So since that seems to be kind of the comment that we’re going to get at this point in time, I’ll go ahead and move onto kind of the next steps and where we’re looking next.

So just so everyone is aware, we do have a public workshop planned for March 8th, which I believe is next week. And that’s actually going to be in Bakersfield. It’s going to be at the San Joaquin Air Quality Air Pollution Control District Office in Bakersfield.

And a public notice has been posted for that, so there’s information available on our website. The link here is provided on the slide, which is kind of our main program webpage. And from there you can access upcoming events and documents. We’re going to go ahead and post this workshop -- or the slide deck for this workshop as soon as we can. So again, that’s where you can find all that information.

We actually have -- we’re working on putting out a posting to announce that you can also attend our next workshop in the Modesto or Fresno Office of the San Joaquin Air Valley -- Air Quality District offices. They’re going to be doing a live videoconferencing feature that
will allow you to basically attend through videoconference for the workshop, which is in Bakersfield, itself.

So driving -- I think in the next, upcoming slide we have directions, a link for the directions to get to either of those offices. But essentially, that will allow you to more or less be there in person if you’re in Modesto, Fresno, or Bakersfield. So we really want to open that up to as many people as we can. And that will give us kind of more feedback as we move forward with the program.

I should also mention real quick, too, please subscribe to our list serve. This can also be found on our webpage. This is the best way that you will get e-mail notifications whenever, you know, documents are posted or whenever we have an upcoming event posted. That’s really the best way to kind of stay in touch and be notified whenever something changes, or moves forward with our program.

So as I mentioned before, this is the address for each of the three offices to the San Joaquin Valley Air District. Like I said, the actual workshop itself will be in the Bakersfield
office. However, you can video -- you can attend in person in the Modesto and Fresno offices, and be able to participate through a live videoconferencing. And the link in this slide provides directions to any of those three offices.

So this is some contact information that might be useful. Due to our workshop coming up on March 8th, we have a written comment deadline extended out until March 26th, at 5:00 p.m. So like I said before, you may have questions or comments that come up later. You know, when you get home and you’re resting from your long day and you realize that you have a question, please go ahead and give us a written comment. We really are counting on you guys to give us feedback so we can further develop this program. It’s very important for us to hear from all of you and, you know, any kind of comments you have would be very helpful.

So when you do have written comments, you can submit them electronically online via the link posted here. It’s our e-docketing system, where it gets posted into the public record. And you can also mail us a copy of your comment, if
you want. The workshop notice will have the
address for that. So it will give detailed
instructions on how you can do that and where to
mail it to.

And again, my name is Jeff Dodson and my
contact information is listed below, on the
bottom of the slide. You can either e-mail or
call me. And I’m the lead staff member of this
program. So any questions that you have, feel
free to contact me and, hopefully, I’ll answer
them to your satisfaction.

So unless there’s any other comments or
questions at this point in time, that pretty much
wraps everything up. Thank you again for joining
us. And for those of you online, as well, thank
you for coming. And be sure to come out on March
8th and attend again.

(Thereupon, the Workshop was adjourned at
2:38 p.m.)
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