

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	18-MISC-03
Project Title:	Renewable Energy for Agriculture Program
TN #:	223954
Document Title:	Workshop Discussion on the California Energy Commission's Draft Guidelines for the Renewable Energy for Agriculture Program
Description:	N/A
Filer:	Cody Goldthrite
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	6/26/2018 3:52:36 PM
Docketed Date:	6/26/2018

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

STAFF WORKSHOP

In the Matter of:) Docket No.
) 18-MISC-03
)
Draft Guidelines for the Renewable)
Energy for Agriculture Program)
_____)

**NOTICE OF STAFF WORKSHOP
DISCUSSION ON THE CALIFORNIA ENERGY
COMMISSION'S DRAFT GUIDELINES FOR THE RENEWABLE
ENERGY FOR AGRICULTURE PROGRAM**

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
CHARLES IMBRECHT HEARING ROOM
1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 2018

9:00 A.M.

Reported By:
Gigi Lastra

APPEARANCES

CEC Staff:

Geoffrey Dodson

Sherrill Neidich

Natalie Lee

Public Comments: (* Via telephone and/or WebEx)John McMillan, San Diego State University Research
Foundation

Jennifer Gray, California Air Resources Board

Claire Warshaw

*Ed Noma

*Curtis

I N D E X

Staff Presentation Geoffrey Dodson	4
Public Comments	20
Closing Remarks	29
Adjournment	30
Court Reporter's Certification	31
Transcriber's Certification	32

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 JUNE 20, 2018

9:03 a.m.

3 MR. DODSON: Hi. Good morning, everyone. My
4 name is Geoff Dodson and I'm the Lead staff member for the
5 Renewable Energy for Agriculture Program also known by the
6 acronym REAP.

7 I need to go over a couple of quick housekeeping
8 items before we start our presentation. For those of you
9 in the room, in the event of an emergency please follow CEC
10 staff out to the nearest exit and proceed to Roosevelt Park
11 located across the street. Restrooms are located outside
12 to your right, just before the exit.

13 The presentation is being recorded and we have a
14 court reporter taking notes as well. Both the presentation
15 and the transcript from this presentation will be posted on
16 the REAP webpage.

17 For participants joining us over the WebEx, I ask
18 that you please keep your lines muted while the presenter
19 is talking. You can submit your questions privately
20 through the chat function. And after the presentation is
21 complete we will answer questions from those here in the
22 room, then we will read and respond to questions submitted
23 from our WebEx participants.

24 And finally, we will unmute lines here for any
25 remote participants that wish to ask any questions. And

1 for those of you in the room too we also have a Public
2 Adviser with blue cards to submit questions if you choose.

3 During today's workshop we'll be going over the
4 draft guidelines for the Renewable Energy for Agriculture
5 Program and then we want to hear from you. When public
6 comment is complete, we will review next steps and make
7 sure everyone has contact information to follow up on the
8 next steps.

9 The Draft REAP Guidelines were recently released
10 to the public and are available on the program webpage. I
11 will have my colleague here send out a link to those of you
12 on WebEx to access those draft guidelines in a moment. We
13 have also provided hard copies to attendees here today.

14 The purpose of today's workshop is to review key
15 highlights from these draft guidelines and solicit public
16 feedback on the proposed details. It will be helpful to
17 hold all questions until the end of the presentation.

18 As this is a draft and has not been adopted at a
19 business meeting, the details presented here are proposals.
20 We will welcome public comment on all items. When these
21 guidelines are finalized they will form the basis for this
22 program. The grant solicitation, when released, will
23 provide detailed submittal instructions.

24 Authorized with the passage of Assembly Bill 109
25 referred to as the Budget Act of 2017, the Renewable Energy

1 for Agriculture Program, REAP, will provide \$5.7 million
2 from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, also known as GGRF,
3 to assist agriculture operations with the installation of
4 onsite renewable energy technology with an emphasis on
5 providing assistance in disadvantaged and low-income
6 communities.

7 The draft guidelines presented today were
8 informed by feedback received in two public workshops in
9 February and March, public comments from these workshops
10 and those submitted to the REAP docket, as well as meetings
11 with relevant state agencies such as the Air Resources
12 Board, the Department of Food and Agriculture, and meetings
13 with industry associations.

14 The Guidelines comply with the California Air
15 Resources Board funding guidelines for agencies that
16 administer California climate investments.

17 As our funding comes from the Greenhouse Gas
18 Reduction Fund monies, the primary goal of the program is
19 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Applicants are
20 required to use GHG quantification methodology that has
21 been developed or approved by the California Air Resources
22 Board to quantify emissions reductions.

23 In addition, as directed by legislation
24 authorizing this program the primary goal of the program is
25 to assist agriculture operations with the installation of

1 onsite renewable technology. Projects are expected to
2 reduce demand for fossil fuels and grid electricity, which
3 has the potential for cost savings.

4 Additionally, we hope to fund projects that
5 realize additional co-benefits including reductions in
6 local air pollution and additional benefits to the local
7 community.

8 As with all GGRF-funded programs there is an
9 emphasis on providing assistance in disadvantaged and low-
10 income communities as defined by Senate Bill 535 and
11 Assembly Bill 1550.

12 The California Air Resources Board is responsible
13 for developing guidance on the quantification methodology
14 to estimate greenhouse gas emission reductions and other
15 co-benefits from REAP projects. The methodology is
16 currently under development. We hope to have this ready
17 prior to the Energy Commission's release of the grant
18 funding opportunity. However, if it is not available at
19 that time the Energy Commission's prescribed methodology to
20 estimate greenhouse gas reductions stated in the
21 measurement and verification section of our draft
22 guidelines will be used by applicants.

23 The Air Resources Board is developing co-benefit
24 assessment methodologies for use in evaluating project co-
25 benefits.

1 As noted earlier, the legislation authorizing the
2 funding for this program directs us to support projects
3 that install renewable energy in the agricultural sector.
4 For the REAP, funding will only be provided to projects
5 that are proposed for implementation on properties engaged
6 in agricultural operations as defined here, and located in
7 California.

8 The proposed definition of an agricultural
9 operation is provided here and in the guidelines. This
10 definition is based on the definition used in the FARMER
11 Program, which is administered by the Air Resources Board,
12 however it is not identical.

13 So here are some of the basic eligibility
14 requirements necessary to submit an application for grant
15 funding. The applicant must be the owner or operator of
16 the site for the proposed project. If the operator is
17 submitting the application the owner of any property
18 affected by the proposed project must provide written
19 support for, and approval for, the proposed project.

20 The project must reduce greenhouse gas emissions
21 through the installation and the use of the renewable
22 energy as defined in the grant solicitation.

23 MR. O'SHEA: Hold on one second.

24 MR. DODSON: Yes?

25 MR. O'SHEA: We're getting feedback and we don't

1 have audio on anything right now.

2 MR. DODSON: So I'm just hearing word that WebEx
3 participants might have a little bit of trouble with audio.
4 If you are correctly hearing audio let them know.

5 (Off mic colloquy re: audio issues.)

6 MR. DODSON: So I apologize for that. It looks
7 like we had a little technical difficulty with the audio.
8 I'm going to go ahead and go back through these slides
9 since it sounds like everyone on WebEx was unable to hear
10 us for the previous slides that were presented.

11 All right, again sorry about that. If you have
12 any further audio technical problems please let us know
13 through the chat functions, so that I can be alerted about
14 that and sorry to everyone in the room, a small little
15 difficult here.

16 All right, so for the benefit of those on WebEx
17 I'm just going to go over a few slides again from the
18 relevant beginning ones.

19 Okay. So for the participants joining us over
20 the WebEx, please keep your lines muted while the presenter
21 is talking. You can submit your questions privately
22 through the chat function. After the presentation is
23 complete we will answer questions from those in the room,
24 then we will read and respond to questions submitted from
25 our WebEx participants.

1 Finally, we will unmute the lines here for any
2 remote participants that wish to ask any questions.

3 The draft guidelines for the Renewable Energy for
4 Agriculture Program known by the acronym REAP were recently
5 released publicly and are available on the program webpage.
6 I believe my colleague already sent out a link on the chat
7 function where you have access to those guidelines.

8 We've also provided hard copies to attendees here
9 today. The purpose of today's workshop is to review key
10 highlights from these draft guidelines and solicit public
11 feedback on the proposed details. It will be helpful to
12 hold all questions until the end of the presentation.

13 As the draft has not been adopted at a business
14 meeting the details presented here are proposals. We
15 welcome public comment on all items.

16 When the guidelines are finalized they will form
17 the basis for this program. The grant solicitation, when
18 released, will provide detailed submittal instructions.

19 Authorized with the passage of Assembly Bill 109,
20 referred to as the Budget Act of 2017, the Renewable Energy
21 for Agriculture Program, REAP, will provide \$5.7 million
22 from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, also known as GGRF,
23 to assist agricultural operations with the installation of
24 onsite renewable energy technologies with an emphasis on
25 providing assistance in disadvantaged and low-income

1 communities.

2 The draft guidelines presented today were
3 informed by feedback received in two public workshops in
4 February and in March, public comments from these workshops
5 and those submitted to the REAP docket, as well as meetings
6 with relevant state agencies such as the Air Resources
7 Board and the Department of Food and Agriculture and
8 meetings with industry associations.

9 The Guidelines comply with the California Air
10 Resources Board funding guidelines for agencies that
11 administer California climate investments.

12 As our funding comes from the Greenhouse Gas
13 Reduction Fund monies, the primary goal of the program is
14 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Applicants are
15 required to use a GHG quantification methodology that has
16 been developed or approved by the California Air Resources
17 Board to quantify emissions reductions.

18 In addition, as directed by legislation
19 authorizing the program a primary goal of the program is to
20 assist agricultural operations with the installation of
21 onsite renewable energy technologies. Projects are
22 expected to reduce demand for fossil fuels and grid
23 electricity, which has the potential for cost savings.

24 Additionally, we hope to fund projects that
25 realize additional co-benefits including reductions in

1 local air pollution and additional benefits to the local
2 community.

3 As with all GGRF-funded programs there is an
4 emphasis on providing assistance in disadvantaged and low-
5 income communities as defined by Senate Bill 535 and
6 Assembly Bill 1550.

7 The California Air Resources Board is responsible
8 for developing guidance on the quantification methodology
9 to estimate greenhouse gas emissions reductions and other
10 co-benefits from REAP projects. The methodology is
11 currently under development. We hope to have this ready
12 prior to the Energy Commission's release of the grant
13 funding opportunity. However, if it is not available at
14 that time the Energy Commission's prescribed methodology to
15 estimate greenhouse gas reductions stated in the
16 measurement and verification section of our draft
17 guidelines will be used by applicants.

18 The Air Resources Board is also developing co-
19 benefit assessment methodologies for use in evaluating
20 projects co-benefits.

21 So as noted earlier, the legislation authorizing
22 the funding for this programs directs us to support
23 projects that install renewable energy in the agricultural
24 operations sector. For the REAP, funding will only be
25 provided to projects that are proposed for implementation

1 on properties engaged in agricultural operations as defined
2 here and located in California. The proposed definition of
3 an agricultural operation is provided here and in the
4 guidelines.

5 This definition is based on the definition used
6 in the FARMER Program, which is administered by the Air
7 Resources Board, however it is not identical.

8 So here are some of the basic eligibility
9 requirements necessary to submit an application for grant
10 funding. The applicant must be the owner or operator of
11 the site for the proposed project. If the operator is
12 submitting the application the owner of any property
13 affected by the proposed project must provide written
14 support for, and approval for, the proposed project.

15 The project must reduce greenhouse gas emissions
16 through the installation and the use of renewable energy as
17 defined in the grant solicitation. Battery storage for
18 electric vehicles charging must be paired with an onsite
19 renewable energy generation to be eligible for an award.

20 REAP anticipates that grants will be awarded
21 under one funding cycle with a total funding amount of \$5.7
22 million. The Energy Commission may conduct additional
23 funding cycles if funds are available or if additional
24 funds are allocated to the REAP or may increase the total
25 funding under the initial solicitation.

1 The project proposal can receive grant funding
2 anywhere in the range from \$50,000 to \$250,000 or up to a
3 maximum of \$300,000 if the proposal includes the
4 installation of a new electric vehicle charger paired with
5 renewable energy generation.

6 If the applicant is pursuing funding from
7 multiple sources of the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund then
8 the applicant will need to describe all existing or
9 potential GGRF sources in that application.

10 Here is an overview of what we consider eligible
11 technology. The proposed technology must be proven and
12 commercially available. Beta technology and research and
13 development projects are not eligible for REAP. A project
14 that installs onsite renewable energy may also include
15 other elements such as the removal or replacement of a
16 diesel pump replaced by an electric pump that is served by
17 the renewable energy system, retrofits and upgrades of
18 existing equipment that is served at least partially by the
19 installed renewable energy project, battery storage paired
20 to the installed renewable energy project or electric
21 vehicle and equipment charging paired with the installed
22 renewable energy project.

23 Our scoring committee will involve experts to
24 determine project effectiveness and potential for reducing
25 greenhouse gas emissions.

1 The CEC has two years to encumber funds from the
2 budget authorization date. And grant recipients have up to
3 four years to spend the funds. All funds allocated in the
4 fiscal year of '17-'18 budget cycle must be encumbered by
5 June 30th of 2019. All funds awarded from the fiscal year
6 '17-'18 budget cycle must be liquidated by June 30th, 2023.

7 If additional funds are allocated to the REAP in
8 the future, funding encumbrance and liquidation
9 requirements will be defined in future grant solicitations.

10 The grant solicitation will be released at the
11 CEC website. The grant solicitation will contain all
12 necessary information to submit an application and will be
13 consistent with these guidelines.

14 The solicitation will include the schedule,
15 scoring criteria, application forms and other required
16 templates. Interested parties are strongly encouraged to
17 participate in a pre-application workshop to review the
18 solicitation with potential applicants. Following a
19 workshop Energy Commission staff will provide an
20 opportunity for written comments about the solicitation.
21 Staff responses to all questions will be posted on the
22 Energy Commission's website.

23 Applications will be evaluated and scored based
24 on responses to the information requested in the
25 solicitation. To evaluate applications, the Energy

1 Commission will organize an evaluation committee consisting
2 of Energy Commission staff possessing applicable energy or
3 agriculture operations, expertise or both.

4 Subject matter experts from other agencies may
5 also be invited to serve as scorers or technical reviewers.

6 Proposals will be out and evaluated in two stages:
7 application screening and technical scoring.

8 Application screening is a series of pass/fail
9 administrative requirements as described in the draft
10 guidelines. Applications that do not pass all of the
11 administrative screening requirements are disqualified and
12 will not move on to the scoring stage.

13 Proposals that pass the application screening
14 process are then scored by an evaluation committee based on
15 the technical scoring criteria outlined in the draft
16 guidelines.

17 When scoring for solicitations is complete the
18 applications will be ranked in order of final score and a
19 Notice of Proposed Award, also known as NOPA, showing the
20 rank of each applicant will be posted on the Energy
21 Commission website. The NOPA will include additional
22 information such as the applicant name, a brief description
23 of the proposed project, funds requested and staff
24 recommended funding amount and whether the project is
25 expected to provide benefits to priority populations and

1 score status.

2 As mentioned previously, application screening is
3 a series of pass/fail requirements as described in Table 3
4 of the draft guidelines. Applications must pass all items
5 to move forward to the technical scoring.

6 The technical scoring criterion is detailed in
7 Table 4 of the draft guidelines. This includes: project
8 eligibility, which describes the agricultural operation and
9 demonstrates that the project meets all eligibility
10 requirements.

11 Technical merit and need, which justifies
12 renewable energy technology used. And that it will provide
13 a quantifiable GHG emission reduction including printouts
14 in the completed program calculator, which will be released
15 as described earlier.

16 The technical approach, which describes the
17 approach to performing the work and identifies any barriers
18 such as permitting, schedules for operations, and any other
19 limitations in completing the project.

20 Impact and benefits, which is justifiable and
21 reasonable quantitative estimate of annual GHG emission
22 reduction and a cost benefit analysis of funding relative
23 to the GHG remission and reduction.

24 Preference considerations, which describes
25 projects in underserved locations, projects that provide

1 additional co-benefits and improved air quality. And the
2 project applicant will provide matched funding.

3 Priority population considerations, which provide
4 supporting documentation that a project is located in a
5 disadvantaged or low-income community.

6 The Energy Commission anticipates that REAP funds
7 will be allocated to projects in priority populations as
8 described here in this slide. The Energy Commission refers
9 to the CalEnviroScreen 3.0 model when referencing a
10 disadvantaged community. All GGRF funded solicitations
11 will provide preference points for projects located in, and
12 benefiting priority populations. Applicants must describe
13 their efforts to determine and meaningfully address common
14 needs of priority populations.

15 Preference points will be awarded based on
16 whether the project meets the requirements indicated in the
17 guidance provided by the Air Resources Board.

18 Funding will be first awarded to the top rank
19 applicant with a passing score and then to the next rank
20 applicant until all funds have been expended. After the
21 NOPA is released all applicants will be notified of the
22 results and an Energy Commission representative will begin
23 working with each awardee to develop an agreement for the
24 awarded project. Once an agreement is finalized they will
25 be presented and approved at an Energy Commission business

1 meeting.

2 After approval at an Energy Commission business
3 meeting the grant agreement will be signed by all parties
4 and work may begin on the project.

5 This slide here shows a summary of our estimated
6 solicitation timeline and project timeline from this point
7 forward. Public comments will be due later this month.
8 Staff will use these comments to inform any changes that
9 are made before the final REAP guidelines are developed and
10 presented to the Commission for adoption at a business
11 meeting.

12 The solicitation materials are expected to be
13 available in August and proposals will be due in September.

14 We recognize that this timing impacts harvesting
15 seasons, however unfortunately to meet encumbrance
16 deadlines and allow sufficient time for project
17 implementation we were not able to delay the application
18 period to any later in the year.

19 Staff will complete the review and issue the NOPA
20 as previously discussed. As agreements are finalized with
21 awardees each final agreement will be presented at an
22 Energy Commission business meeting for approval. All
23 agreements must be executed no later than June 30th of
24 2019,

25 So that provides a summary of our current draft

1 guidelines that we have out. And at this point we'd like
2 to open it up for questions and comments from the public on
3 these draft guidelines, so anyone in the room first?

4 (Off mic colloquy.)

5 MR. DODSON: Yeah, for our court reporter please
6 provide your name and the same goes for anyone online, too.
7 Please provide your name, so that our court reporter can
8 get this down.

9 MR. MCMILLAN: John McMillan with San Diego State
10 University. We have an agricultural production that was
11 gifted to us a number of years ago. How big does the
12 operation have to be in terms of size or revenue in order
13 to qualify?

14 MR. DODSON: Good question, there is not a
15 defined size for the agricultural operation itself. Just
16 kind of our minimum funding award is \$50,000, so if you're
17 talking about too small of a farm maybe. We're looking for
18 projects that are applying for some kind of technology that
19 will at least be --

20 MR. MCMILLAN: So something that would meet the
21 20 acre, \$100,000 revenue size (indiscernible)?

22 MR. DODSON: Yeah, pretty much. I mean, there's
23 no definition at this point for a minimal or a large
24 maximum size.

25 MR. MCMILLAN: Great.

1 MS. GRAY: I'm Jennifer Gray. I work with CARB
2 and I'm wondering if the solar ag pumps that you may fund
3 through this project, do they have to be connected to the
4 grid?

5 MR. DODSON: We are not requiring
6 interconnection.

7 MS. NEIDICH: Are there any other questions?

8 MR. DODSON: All right, so we'll open it up to
9 WebEx participants. I'll ask first for any of those that
10 submitted comments through the chat function. Do you have
11 any of those?

12 MR. O'SHEA: None at the moment

13 MR. DODSON: Okay, none. If anyone would like to
14 speak through the WebEx just please use the raise hand
15 function and we'll get your question answered.

16 Do we have another question in the room?

17 MR. MCMILLAN: So on the use of the property it
18 said "non-research functions" but if it's through a use,
19 like what if we have students out there supporting the
20 endeavors of the agricultural operation, but it's also
21 being sold under the wholesale market?

22 MR. DODSON: Based on the way you described that,
23 that sounds like something that would be fine. But
24 depending on the full circumstances that might be something
25 that we need to look more carefully at. But as you

1 described it I don't see any issues immediately with that.

2 MS. NEIDICH: We do suggest that you submit
3 comments with that information and they can answer.

4 MR. DODSON: Yeah, we'll go ahead. Any questions
5 that are submitted regarding these, we'll answer them and
6 post them online as well.

7 MS. LEE: This is Natalie Lee, Deputy Director
8 for the Renewable Energy Division. Just one clarification,
9 the research and development reference is in regard to the
10 renewable energy technology being employed. The operation
11 is not limited by that restriction.

12 MR. DODSON: Thanks for that clarification.

13 MR. O'SHEA: Our first question comes from chat
14 from Ed Noma asking if energy efficiency will be allowed?

15 MR. DODSON: Strictly energy efficient projects,
16 I mean a whole range of projects could be available, but
17 the primary purpose is something that reduces greenhouse
18 gas emissions and so I'm not sure that specifically energy
19 efficiency only would meet that. But I'll have another
20 clarification on this.

21 MS. LEE: Thanks. This is Natalie Lee again.
22 Just to clarify, energy efficiency as a project component
23 is acceptable. But the project must also install renewable
24 energy technology.

25 (Off mic colloquy.)

1 MS. WARSHAW: Hi. I just wondered if
2 homesteaders are going to be considered people that could
3 apply, because they are supporting an agricultural
4 livelihood.

5 MR. DODSON: That's a good question actually.
6 That might be something I need to look more into at this
7 point. We might need to follow up on that with you.
8 That's actually a question maybe that would be helpful if
9 you could submit online as well, so that we can provide a
10 written, posted response on our website as well. Thank you
11 for your question.

12 MS. WARSHAW: As a comment or in the chat box
13 here?

14 MR. DODSON: Oh, as a comment on our docket
15 system. That way it will be part of the public record and
16 we can respond, which will open to everyone as well.

17 Which by the way I should mention, for anyone
18 that is interested in posting a comment through our
19 docketing system please be sure to include some kind of
20 contact information, so that we can follow up with you. We
21 did have a couple of comments in the past where we were not
22 given any good contact information to follow it back up on.
23 So I just want to make sure that we do need a way to follow
24 up with you, so we can help answer your question.

25 Thank you for your question and I'll move on to

1 the next one, yeah.

2 MR. O'SHEA: This is for (indiscernible) Curtis
3 (indiscernible).

4 MS. NEIDICH: Okay. Curtis.

5 CURTIS: Hello. Yes, Curtis here. I've got a
6 question about if I could use the funds to expand
7 (indiscernible) full generation site?

8 MR. DODSON: I believe that would be okay,
9 however the funding would only apply to the new portion of
10 the projects. And the quantification methodology that we
11 use will only calculate whatever new portion of the project
12 is being replaced or retrofitted.

13 So yeah, like I mentioned earlier we're okay with
14 retrofits and replacements and upgrades, but the funding
15 itself will pretty much be tied to whatever the new portion
16 is; if that makes sense.

17 CURTIS: It does. Is the funding tied to the
18 business or to a specific like generation type like
19 (indiscernible) site or partials?

20 MR. DODSON: The land parcel that the project is
21 actually installed on will pretty much be the operation in
22 question here, so whether or not that's tied directly some
23 business or another might not be -- there could be
24 different situations. Mainly the land parcel is what we're
25 looking at. I'm not sure if that's --

1 CURTIS: I only ask, because (indiscernible) full
2 generation types that I'd like to apply for projects, for
3 each or combined is kind of I guess the question that I
4 would need to do (indiscernible).

5 MR. DODSON: So sorry, can you give us a little
6 bit more specific information? It's a little hard to kind
7 of think through every scenario without full details, I
8 guess.

9 CURTIS: Yeah, so I have two full generating
10 sites on two different (indiscernible) acre grids.

11 MR. DODSON: Yeah.

12 CURTIS: And one site I would like to expand and
13 then the other site I would like to do battery storage as
14 well as an electric vehicle charging station. But is it I
15 have to put all of that up into one proposal or if I can do
16 two separate proposals?

17 MR. DODSON: If is it on the same property or
18 same kind of operation business?

19 CURTIS: Yes.

20 MS. DODSON: (Indiscernible)

21 MS. LEE: (Indiscernible) Let me ask if it's
22 possible if you can follow up with Geoff after the workshop
23 with some real specifics. That's an interesting scenario,
24 because the requirement for vehicle charging and battery
25 storage is it must be paired with the renewable energy

1 technology that is being installed under this funding. So
2 I would like to be as specific as possible in the follow
3 up.

4 CURTIS: Thank you.

5 MR. DODSON: Yeah, another question in the room
6 we're going to take.

7 MR. MCMILLAN: John McMillan again. Are multiple
8 projects allowable if they're on completely independent
9 sites?

10 MR. DODSON: Yes. And I believe if they're
11 totally different sites you would actually submit different
12 applications.

13 MR. MCMILLAN: Great. And then the second one is
14 does it have to be in an IOU service territory would an IID
15 (phonetic) count?

16 MR. DODSON: Anywhere in the state of California.
17 Do we have any questions on WebEx?

18 MR. O'SHEA: No.

19 MR. DODSON: Okay. I'll give it a second for
20 people to think about any other questions they might have
21 or comments. And just as a reminder this is not the last
22 opportunity to provide comment.

23 As noted on the coming slide actually, which I'll
24 put up now, you have until June 29th at 5:00 p.m. to submit
25 official written comments. That can be done either online

1 or through the mail. The link is posted here in our
2 presentation and the presentation itself will be posted
3 online as well. And I'll have my colleague provide the
4 link to the program webpage if she hasn't already, and from
5 that webpage you can access all documents and notices and
6 any other helpful information relevant to this presentation
7 at our workshop.

8 MR. O'SHEA: I've got one more in chat.

9 MR. DODSON: And yeah, we're still open to
10 questions and comments too, so if you have any more feel
11 free. But I will take another question right now.

12 MS. GRAY: Jennifer Gray from CARB. Do you have
13 a lot of (indiscernible) funding (indiscernible) and if
14 somebody is trying to get some equipment (indiscernible)
15 might work together? Would they apply for one before the
16 other or something like that?

17 MR. DODSON: Good question. I don't think
18 there's any need to apply for one before the other or in
19 any particular order. It is okay to utilize different
20 funding sources for projects. As mentioned earlier though,
21 in certain situations you'll have to disclose those
22 potential funding sources when you apply just so that we're
23 aware of what other potential funding might be going into
24 this particular project. But there's no exclusion at this
25 point and time of not being able to apply to our program if

1 you have other funding sources.

2 And then do you have a follow-up clarification?

3 MS. LEE: Yeah, the only thing that I will add is
4 that we are working with the other programs (indiscernible)
5 and our goal is to allow each program to serve its purpose
6 and allow the funding to reach the broadest range of
7 projects that there is. So if we see a project that comes
8 in just for the installation of renewable technology that
9 identifies they are in coordination applying for a retrofit
10 of equipment that would expand the value of that renewable
11 installation, then we'll recognize that in the project
12 evaluation. It's not dependent on receiving the FARMER
13 funding, but we do want to allow the funding under FARMER
14 to reach its highest goals as well.

15 MR. DODSON: Yeah, we're going to move to a WebEx
16 question.

17 MR. O'SHEA: This is coming from Alex on the
18 chat. He said regarding dairy digesters, other equipment
19 generally needs to be upgraded in order to build the
20 digester properly. Can those costs also be covered?

21 MR. DODSON: it does not sound like in that, the
22 way you described, something that would be covered under
23 our program. There is a separate program called the Food
24 Processor Investment Program, which sounds like something
25 that's a little bit more geared toward your questions

1 potentially. But I think we're focused a little bit more
2 on initial agriculture operations.

3 MS. NEIDICH: And (indiscernible) you can submit
4 comments and we can respond to those as well.

5 MR. O'SHEA: And that's all I've got for you.

6 MS. DODSON: Are there any other questions?

7 MS. LEE: Hello. Natalie Lee again, and I just
8 want to recognize if there are any participants that do not
9 want to submit personal information through the docket for
10 response, please reach out to Geoff directly. His contact
11 information is posted over there, but it was noted by our
12 Public Adviser that that may be a concern for some of our
13 docketing responses.

14 MR. DODSON: So while you think about any other
15 questions or comments that come up, right now just a
16 reminder again, please we do welcome any feedback that we
17 can get. These guidelines are informed in part by all
18 these comments that we get through our docketing system.
19 And as Natalie just mentioned feel free to contact me
20 directly if you have questions that involve more sensitive
21 information.

22 And I guess for now it looks like we don't have
23 any current questions, so I guess we'll kind of wrap it up
24 here. Anyone else in the room have any questions or? No?

25 Thanks for coming out and we look forward to all

1 the comments that we get up until the June 29th 5:00 p.m.
2 deadline that we have set in accordance with this program.

3 So thank you very much.

4 (Whereupon, at 9:39 a.m., the workshop
5 was adjourned)

6 --oOo--
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 26th day of June, 2018.



Eduwiges Lastra
CER-915

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 26th day of June, 2018.



Myra Severtson
Certified Transcriber
AAERT No. CET**D-852