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MR. DODSON: All right, everyone, we’ll go ahead and get started. Good morning.

First of all, if you have any audio issues or connection issues or anything, just let us know. For those of you in the other offices, just raise your hand or make a scene so we and see you and so we know to fix whatever the problem is.

My name is Geoff Dodson. I am a staff member with the California Energy Commission. I am the Lead Staff Member for the Renewable Energy For Agriculture Program, also known by the acronym REAP.

Just a couple quick housekeeping items.

We do have guests joining us. So we’re here in Bakersfield at San Joaquin Valley Air District Office. We do have guests joining us in Fresno, and also at the Modesto office. And in addition to that, we also have people on the WebEx joining us. So as we get into the public comment section and discussion time, we intend to
take questions from remote attendees as if you were kind of here in Bakersfield. So anyone in Fresno or Modesto, we’ll be kind of calling on you similarly to how we will be here in the room in Bakersfield.

And for the WebEx folks, I do ask that you please keep your lines muted while the presenter is talking. There will be time for questions. We’ll cover questions from those in the room first, and then we’ll go on to your questions over on WebEx. And for those of you on WebEx, you may also speak through the chat function, and we’ll have someone taking care of that too.

So here’s the quick agenda for today. I’ll be going over the current proposals for the Renewable Energy for Agriculture Program. And then we want to hear from you, which is one of the main reasons why we’re here.

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

At the end of our scheduled time, or when the public comment is complete, we will review
the next steps and make sure that everyone has
our contact information for follow-up questions.
This presentation will be available to everyone
when it is added to the docket established for
this program following today’s workshop, and
we’ll provide a link for that a little bit later.

So before we start the content of the
REAP program proposal, we want to make sure that
we 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 and underrepresented businesses and
communities to engage in and benefit from our
many programs. To meet this commitment, Energy
Commission staff conducts outreach efforts and
activities, including those listed here on the
screen.

As always, there are numerous different
ways to stay in touch with us, any kind of events
or funding opportunities held here at the Energy
Commission.

So a little bit of background on the REAP
program. Authorized with the passage of Assembly
Bill 109 and referred to as the Budget Act of 2017. The Renewable Energy for Agriculture Program, REAP, will provide $6 million in funding from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund to assist agriculture operations with the installation of onsite renewable energy technologies with an emphasis on 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 here at the Energy Commission.

While most information presented in the coming slides go over program proposals, these are two of the main dates that the program is bound to. What this means is that, at the very least, we will have awards selected and reserved by next June or earlier.

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

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

So this slide provided the proposed general program schedule. As the program is designed and implemented, Energy Commission staff will seek input from potential program participants and will finalize the solicitation and program guidelines that reflect feedback from the community engagement efforts. As outlined here, based on the feedback received through this workshop and the workshop that we held last week, staff will be preparing draft documentation 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 and scoring completed in October of this year, we
anticipate issuing a Notice of Proposed Awards in late 2018 and working after that to finalize the grant agreements.

First, it’s 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 gas emissions, and administering agencies must use a greenhouse gas quantification methodology that has been developed by or approved by the California Air Resources Board.

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

Projects are expected to support
agriculture operations and increasing resiliency and electricity reliability, which potentially offers a number of different benefits, including reliability and cost savings. Additionally, we hope to develop a program to realize additional co-benefits, including reductions in local air pollution and additional benefits to the local community.

The overall budget for the program is $6 million. The minimum award amount proposed is to be a minimum of $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 maximize the reach of the funds throughout the state. Please be sure to let us know during the public comment period what you think of this range, keeping in mind the kinds of projects that you envision.

Staff is further proposing a single award per operation and would like to hear your feedback on potentially awarding on an assessor’s parcel number basis, allowing funding for any single APN or 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 operations submitting proposals under a REAP solicitation must identify funds provided by any other state programs. Receipt of funds from other programs is not considered to preclude participation in REAP, but the proposal will be evaluated for effectiveness of the use of the funds.

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

The entities that staff are proposing to be eligible for the program funding are owners of agricultural operations, including private parties and nonprofit agencies. We are interested to hear from you if there’s a need to support academic operations, such as demonstration and teaching facilities.

I know this slide looks a little dense, but we just wanted to show you some definitions.
for your own reference. The proposed Farmer Program, implemented by the Air Resources Board, and also partially funded by Greenhouse Gas Reduction funding, has adopted the definition of agricultural operations contained in ARB’s regulation for in-use off-road diesel vehicles, as shown on this slide.

The SWEEP program, implemented by the California Department of Food and Agricultural, and again funded by Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund monies, uses a related but different definition, as shown here at the bottom portion of this slide. And again, we will be providing this slide online, so don’t worry about getting everything down here.

Staff, here at the Energy Commission are considering a definition for the purposes of REAP similar to the definition used in the proposed Farmer Program, but not including forest operations. While staff recognizes the need to support 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 this cap and trade auction proceeds to be used to facilitate the achievement of greenhouse gas reductions in California and specifies the 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 agricultural operations. This may include installation of renewable energy to offset grid energy and can potentially include replacing fossil-fuel equipment, combined with the installation of renewable energy, to provide the electricity for upgraded equipment.

This slide presents a list of some proposed project types that could be funded through our program. This is not intended to be a comprehensive list, just suggested examples. Eligible projects are expected to include proven renewable energy resources. This could include solar PV, wind turbines, solar trees, battery storage and battery storage used onsite.

Just to reiterate, this is a proposal of what we will consider to be eligible covered costs through funding awards. We don’t pay for
CEQA costs.

Also, it is important to note, we did state during the question and comment period of the last workshop last week in Sacramento that we were not anticipating allowing projects to not be interconnected. However, we would like to kind of modify that and just let everyone know that we are actually now considering the possibility of allowing projects that are not interconnected to the grid. And so this is something where projects, you know, far from any wires or anything, they won’t necessarily need to be interconnected. This is just a proposal, but we want to hear from you.

So SB 535 established the original requirements related to the investment of GGRF 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 added new requirements to direct additional investments to low-income communities and low-income households.
AB 1150 requires at least 25 percent of auction proceeds to be invested for the projects within and benefitting disadvantaged communities, 5 percent 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 a disadvantaged community.

We are committed to supporting disadvantaged and low-income communities and aim to support the goals of AB 1550. For the REAP project, we recommend allocating 50 percent of the total funds for the 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 definitely like to hear from you on input on this proposal, and also how this program can maximize benefits to these communities.

Projects implemented under California Climate Investments are also directed to maximize economic, environmental and public health
benefits to the state, foster job creation by promoting projects carried out in 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/or result in job creation and job training.

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

Additionally, we are proposing to provide preference to projects that provide innovative solutions that have a broad impact and projects that provide matched funding. Matching funds are 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 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 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 a maximum extent possible, administrating 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 combine funding for a project, or to fund multiple related projects in the same geographic area. This coordination may involve sharing information with applicants about other California Climate Investment programs that offer funding for complementary projects.

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

The REAP program is coordinating efforts
with the proposed Farmer Program implemented by
the Air Resources Board, as well as the SWEEP
program, implemented by the California Department
of Food and Agricultural. And we would like --
we would like to hear from -- your input on this,
as well, on other programs that we can coordinate
with.

So this provides a general overview of
the proposed elements of the REAP program.

Now we’re going to -- now we want to hear
from you. We’ve developed a few questions for
discussion in the next slides, 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
the 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 at
the back end of the slides.

So we’re going to open up to these
questions to attendees in the room and streaming
in from the Fresno and Modesto offices. After
everyone has an opportunity to speak, we will
move on to the WebEx attendees, first taking
questions from the chat section, and then we’ll
give it on to WebEx telephone guests that would
like to speak. Please remember that your
comments are being recorded and they may become
part of the public record.

So we’re going to go ahead and move it
on. These, here, are a few questions to consider
first. The next slide also has a few additional
questions to consider, so we’ll move onto that
after we are done with discussion on these
questions right here.

So please, any kind of input you guys do
have, again, like I said, the public comment is
really our best way to take input and further
develop our guidelines for this program, so if
you guys have any questions or concerns, too,
this I a good time.

So go ahead and open it up.

MS. NEIDICH: I guess we’ll go to Fresno?
MR. DODSON: Yeah. So just any of the gentlemen in the Fresno room, do you guys have any comments about what we talked about so far?

MR. RIDING: No questions from Fresno.

MR. DODSON: Okay. And Modesto, it looks like, no.

MS. NEIDICH: I don’t think there’s anyone from Modesto.

MR. DODSON: Okay. And then do we have anybody on WebEx? Okay.

So like I said, you know, I’m sure questions may arise later on. And including everyone on the WebEx, too, just remember, we would also ask that anyone provides public comment through our docketing system. We really do appreciate feedback to help bolster or program funding guidelines.

Let’s see here, a couple additional questions to consider. We’ll go ahead and open it up to the public rooms. However, if you don’t have anything to say at this point in time, just remember, we do also want to hear from you later on, as well, if anything comes up later. So I’ll give you guys a second to -- I’ll give everyone a second to kind of look over this and let us know...
if you have any public comment or questions.

Fresno room, how are you guys doing?

Yeah.

MR. RIDING: So maybe additional project types that weren’t listed, maybe electric ag UTVs, utility vehicles, funding for that. I know farmers are in need of that type of equipment. And maybe either co-funding of the equipment, or possibly, you know, charging stations that are located strategically in a farm, somewhere in the middle, you know, where they don’t have to always bring the equipment back to a barn somewhere, so like intermittent charging stations or --

MR. DODSON: Okay.

MR. RIDING: -- or just funding for that type of equipment, you know, zero-emission ag UTVs, essentially, so --

MR. DODSON: Great. Actually, a question for you.

So based on your knowledge of these kinds of projects, would you envision that they would benefit from being interconnected, or do you think these would be the kind of projects that should not be interconnected? And also, how does our -- how does our funding range kind of work
with the projects you’re mentioning?

Also, by the way, I just want to let you know, we do have a court reporter just taking this down for the public record. So it would be helpful if you could also provide your name and business, so we can get that --

MR. RIDING: Yes.

MR. DODSON: -- down on the record.

MR. RIDING: My name is Jeff Riding. I’m a specialist here at the San Joaquin Valley Air District.

MR. DODSON: Okay.

MS. NEIDICH: Okay.

MR. RIDING: And so what was the question again? I’m sorry.

MR. DODSON: I just wanted to follow up on your question.

MR. RIDING: You were asking --

MR. DODSON: Yeah, about kind of interconnection requirements, what you think about the projects you were just mentioning, if that’s something that you would foresee being interconnected or not? And also, how would funding ranges work with that type of a project?

MR. RIDING: Yeah, I think it would
definitely be something that could be interconnected. But the funding ranges, I’m trying to actually find it where you guys had that. And you said the minimum was $50,000 for awards?

MR. DODSON: Yeah. Right now our proposal is a minimum of $50,000, maximum $250,000.

MR. RIDING: Okay. Okay. So that -- that might just limit it to charging stations. I don’t know if the actual equipment would cost that much.

MR. DODSON: Okay.

MR. RIDING: But, yeah, I think that -- I think it would be beneficial for lots of farming entities here in the valley.


MS. NEIDICH: And, Jeff, this is Sherrill Neidich. I’m also here with the Energy Commission. Your first name is Jeff. Can you spell your last name please?


MS. NEIDICH: Thank you very much.

MR. RIDING: Sure.
MR. DODSON: Great, yeah, so like I said, we’re definitely interested in hearing from the public. And also, you know, anyone on WebEx who has any questions, you know, some of our important questions, definitely about our funding ranges, how that works with some projects and, you know, what types of projects you envision, given that funding range.

MR. ORLANDO: (Indiscernible.)

MR. DODSON: Yeah. We’re going to go ahead and move it to -- we’ve got a WebEx question. Just go ahead and speak up as best you can, just so we can make sure we hear it.

MR. ORLANDO: Okay. So can you hear me now?

MS. NEIDICH: Yeah.

MR. DODSON: Yeah. It’s a little light, but we can hear you.

MR. ORLANDO: Okay. So I’m Rick Orlando from a company called Brite Solar. And we’ve developed a transparent solar cell specifically targeted for greenhouse planning applications. The idea is that we allow enough light to come through or the plants to dry, and then also, we generate electricity, just like a normal PV cell.
And there are two ways -- I mean, right now we are in a pilot demonstration mode because, obviously, we can show theoretical data that shows that the light spectrum is sufficient for lots of crops, including hydroponic tomatoes, but growers are only going to believe data when they actually see growing their own local data, if you will.

And so the problems that we face is that there are two ways to do this. The first is to build new greenhouses using our technology, which is quite expensive. Modern greenhouses, 1,000 square meters, you’re looking at easily over $250,000.

A more interesting application for us would be retrofitting existing greenhouses using the structure that’s already there, replacing the glass or plastic with our product.

And so, you know, the problem with renewable energy is if you’re trying to move the needle, you need to do things big. And so is the funding, the criteria, more for demonstration, rather than actually moving the needle, or are we actually looking at trying to do something that’s
MR. DODSON: Thank you for your question, first of all.

I guess it’s important to recognize, first of all, that with a budget of $6 million, we are kind of limited somewhat in that regard, since it’s not, you know, a ton of money to use for, you know, big, huge projects, like you were kind of mentioning. While we do kind of have -- we can work within the range of funding, so we -- you know, these are just proposals at this point, so we can potentially change those ranges, at this point in time we’re going to be looking mostly at, you know, kind of proven technologies.

We haven’t, you know, as -- until we release the guidelines, we don’t have specific criteria against kind of demonstration of beta projects. But kind of given our funding limits at this point in time, we’ll have to kind of work within that range, if that helps at all.

MR. ORLANDO: Okay. Now -- and one more question, if I may?

MR. DODSON: Yeah. Go for it.

MR. ORLANDO: You know, obviously, if we can -- if you can do this project in an
economically depressed area, that would be best. I was recently down at a greenhouse complex on tribal land that is interested in doing a conversion. But, you know, part of our problem is we have the technology, we actually have a pilot being built right now in the Netherlands. We have one that’s actually been completed in Greece through two crop cycles. So it’s not, you know, it’s not a research type of thing. It’s more or less a utilization of the technology in certain geographical areas with certain crops --

MR. DODSON: Uh-hmm.

MR. ORLANDO: -- is the -- what we’re trying to (indiscernible).

MR. DODSON: Okay.

MR. ORLANDO: So --

MR. DODSON: All right.

MR. ORLANDO: So my question would be, is there anything within your organization that would help us identify potential people to work with for these grants?

MS. NEIDICH: Hey, Rick, this is Sherrill Neidich with the Energy Commission. And it sounds like you’re looking more for some research funding. I’m not -- I think that’s what you’re
talking about.

We have, through the California Energy Commission, we do have, if you check the California Energy Commission, there’s a funding section in our website. And it lists a lot of opportunities through our research unit through like EPIC funds, so you might want to check that out.

This is more, well, this program is more for onsite, somewhat proven renewable resources. And -- but we’re really curious of what you’re trying to demonstrate, and we would love to have you submit some comments on this, as well.

MR. ORLANDO: Well, again, for us it’s not research, it’s -- our biggest challenge of deploying it commercially is a farmer that has a greenhouse is going to want to know, first of all, what the economics of deploying the technology are, which is very geographical in terms of the amount of sun that you get (indiscernible) energy market. And more importantly, the tomatoes that he’s growing under our glass do as well as the tomatoes he’s growing under normal grass.

So it’s not a technology that’s set.
It’s more of a case use type of situation.

MR. DODSON: Okay.

MS. NEIDICH: Yeah. We’d be interested -- we would be interested in seeing more information about this, so I would really encourage you to submit comments.

MR. ORLANDO: Okay.

MR. DODSON: Yeah.

MS. NEIDICH: Thank you.

MR. DODSON: Yeah. Thank you for your comment. Appreciate that.

Anyone else on WebEx or anything, either Fresno or Modesto? It looks like, no.

So while we’re at it, I’ll just kind of open it up to any other comments that aren’t necessarily related to those questions previously posed. If you guys do have any public comment or questions, this is kind of a good time. I’ll give people a minute to collect their thoughts too.

And just to remind again, you know, obviously, if questions do come up later, we really do still want to hear from you. And so we do have a public comment period where you can submit your comment through the docketing system.
And, you know, that will really help kind of beef up our comments so that we can put together some guidelines.

MS. NEIDICH: That’s all for comments.

MR. DODSON: Okay. Well, we’ll go ahead and move onto keeping everyone in the loop for what’s next.

So over the next few weeks, staff will be developing draft program guidelines. And as these are developed and ready, we will post for comment. So again, once this is posted, that will kind of open up a new round of people -- give everyone a chance to kind of give comments on that and provide feedback.

So we do urge you to provide written comments to the link above, shown on this slide. And even if you provided some comments in person today, we also still would benefit from having those comments also submitted online through the docketing system. This is really kind of our hard paper copy version of everything that was done here and said here, and so we definitely want to make sure that we have captured everyone’s feedback regarding this program. So this slide is just some useful links and contact
information here.

We have set March 26th at 5:00 p.m. as the deadline to submit public comments regarding this opening — these opening workshops for the program development. The link is available to you right here and should be posted on the Energy Commission website shortly, hopefully by the end of this week, maybe early next week. And then our web page, you will also have access to more information, upcoming events, and also a link to provide public comment through our web page.

And again, my name is Geoff Dodson and my contact information is listed here for your reference. And if you have any additional questions or anything, feel free to get in touch.

MS. NEIDICH: Hi. This is Sherrill again. We really thank you for participating today. We’re very -- we really need to encourage you to submit comments. And after we develop and post the draft guidelines, we will be going out again with those guidelines, those draft to workshops to present and to, hopefully, get some more feedback from you. So thank you very much.

MR. DODSON: Also, just mention, too, anyone that was here listening today,
participating or anything, if you know of anyone, you know, any other farmers or any kind of groups of organizations that would benefit from this program, please refer them to, you know, more information, give them the link or something. You know, I guess one of the biggest challenges with starting a new program is want to make sure we get outreach -- or we do outreach as best we can, so that we can maximize the use of these dollars and make sure that, you know, it does its job as best as we can.

So thank you very much and we appreciate everyone that attended, both in person and online. And we hope to hear from you soon.

(The workshop concluded at 9:37 a.m.)
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