DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	21-SOLAR-01
Project Title:	California Automated Permit Processing Program (CalAPP)
TN #:	241593
Document Title:	CalAPP Workshop Transcript
Description:	Transcript from Feb 2022 Workshop
Filer:	Lucio Hernandez
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	2/18/2022 12:10:21 PM
Docketed Date:	2/18/2022

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

In the matter of:

Request for Comments on Proposed Design of the California Automated Permit Processing (CalAPP) Program	)	Docket No. 21-SOLAR-01

STAFF WORKSHOP ON THE California Automated Permit Processing (CalAPP) Program

REMOTE VIA ZOOM

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2022

9:00 A.M.

Reported by:

Martha Nelson

APPEARANCES

CEC STAFF

Geoffrey Dodson

Adam Van Winkle

Natalie Lee, Deputy Director for Renewable Energy

Elizabeth Giorgi

PRESENTERS

Jeff Cook, NREL

Seth Crew, NREL

PUBLIC COMMENT

James Gill

Eric Miller

Chris Lee, California State Association of Counties

Ben Davis, California Solar and Storage Association

Benjamin Grundy, Environment California Research and Policy Center

Oscar Diaz, City of Modesto

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato, SPUR

INDEX

P R O C E E D I N G S

9:02 A.M.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2022

MR. DODSON: Well, good morning everyone, and welcome to today's California Energy Commission workshop to present Staff recommendations and gather public feedback on the upcoming funding opportunity for the California Automated Permit Processing Program known by the acronym CalAPP. So thank you for those of us -- or for those of you that are able to join today on our Zoom webinar.

My name is Geoffrey Dodson and I'm the supervisor for the Program's unit. I'm going to briefly cover the agenda and housekeeping items. And then I'm going to turn it over to our staff to cover our program recommendations.

So I want to briefly highlight the agenda for today's workshop.

Following a brief overview of key program details, we're going to turn it over to Jeff Cook with the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, or NREL, to give us a presentation on the solar permitting software called SolarAPP+ developed by their organization.

Following this guest presentation, Energy Commission Staff will present initial staff recommendations for our upcoming funding program here at the Energy Commission. And the rest of the workshop will be devoted to a question and answer session and opportunity for public feedback and comment on our staff recommendations.

And, lastly, we will cover the next steps as program development proceeds.

So please note that the agenda and slide presentation order here differs slightly from the agenda that was provided in the notice for this meeting. The titles of the program design proposals have changed slightly but include the same range of information as identified in the notice for the workshop.

And as we get into the public feedback section, I just want to go over some basic housekeeping items for today's workshop.

So we are coming to you entirely remotely today, so there's no in-person session for this workshop. The workshop is using Zoom. And the event is being recorded. The slides, audio, and transcript for today's workshop will be posted on

our program webpage, and it's usually done within about a week or so.

We will present first, so please hold questions until the end unless prompted. But once we open it up to Q&A there are three different ways to comment, as reviewed here on the slide.

So we encourage you to please use the raise-hand feature in Zoom. If you're joining us over the telephone, you can dial star nine to raise your hand and star six to either mute or un-mute your phone. And you can type your question, as well, into the Q&A window. And, lastly, we just ask that you limit your comment to three minutes per commenter or organization.

So just for now, if the chat -- oh, I'm going to turn it over to Adam. He's part of our staff team on CalAPP.

So Adam, it's all on you.

MR. VAN WINKLE: Thank you, Geoff.

I'm Adam Van Winkle with the CEC CalAPP Team. I want to highlight some of the key statutory elements of our upcoming funding opportunity.

For the CalAPP Program, $20 million has

been allocated through the Budget Act of 2021 to support a grant program for cities and counties to establish online solar permitting. Up to five percent of those funds, equal to $1 million, may be used for administrative costs.

Staff anticipate funds will be awarded upon approval of a complete application and distributed as reimbursement for eligible costs after completion of all grant activities and proof of adoption of an online solar permitting system.

The statute requires that funding must be encumbered no later than June 30th, 2023. And funds must be liquidated by June 30th, 2027.

Following today's workshop, we plan to refine the requirements for participation and issue a grant funding opportunity requesting applications in June of this year. This timeline may change. And official notice of the release of the grant funding opportunity will be issued when the application period opens.

Funding for this program is intended to support cities and counties to adopt an online automated solar permitting platform. An example of this is SolarAPP+ which is a software tool

developed by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, or NREL, and made available to all jurisdictions in the United States at no cost. CalAPP proposes to provide funding for the adoption and launch of SolarAPP+, as well as other software that provides similar capabilities.

To highlight the capabilities of SolarAPP+, we have a guest presenter from NREL, Jeff Cook, to cover what SolarAPP+ is, what it does, and how this is useful.

MR. COOK: Hello everybody. And I'm really happy to be here and speak with you all about the SolarAPP. And excited, certainly, for the grant program and what it can mean for all the jurisdictions on the line that are interested in improving their solar permitting processes.

For those of you who do not know who we are, we are a part of the U.S. Department of Energy, so we are a part of the research arm of the federal government, specifically around renewable energy is the mission of NREL in particular. And so we are the project lead for SolarAPP. And I'm going to be walking you through an overview of what SolarAPP is and how

you can adopt it, what the performance of it has been so far, et cetera.

Of course, if you have any questions for me, throw them in the chat, et cetera, we'll cover them today. But the important thing is to let you know more about what this free tool can do for you to help and streamline solar permitting and allow you to utilize this grant in relation to this.

So let's move to the next slide.

Again, SolarAPP was developed in a collaborative consensus-based manor where we brough together code official organizations, contractors, and local governments all together to discuss how to develop solar permitting software that aligns with California's Title 24 Building Safety Requirements that also aligned with the 2017 National Electrical Code and the 2018 International Building and International Residential Codes.

So some of the key organizations you see here, of course, that were partners on the application are UL, International Code Council, the National Fire Protection Association, IAEI, the International Association of Electrical

Inspectors, as serving as some of those code-related experts and, also, experts in this field broadly, in addition to jurisdictions that have subsequently piloted and adopted the app, along with a variety of contractors. Bringing all of these groups together was critical for us to develop a software system that can standardize and permit solar projects instantly.

And we brought this to jurisdictions free of charge. And so the SolarAPP doesn't charge jurisdictions for adoption but it does charge $25.00 per permitted system that a contractor runs through the application. And those revenues will be used to expand the application going forward, which we've already done to align with the 2020 National Electrical Code and the 2021 I-Code, that will also be implemented in the context of California when we get into 2023. So we're already ready to go from that respect, in that respect, in the context of California.

So let's move forward to the next slide.

And again, when we developed the application, we built it with local governments, of course, in mind, and also with the idea that the application will continue to evolve and

expand based on the evolution of technology and the evolution of model code, in Title 24 in particular.

So we, ultimately, are here working towards the same end. So there is a lot of interest in California and across the country in deploying more solar to achieve various economic and emission-related goals. And the goal of SolarAPP is to help do that but ensure it's done in a safe and efficient manner.

And so, again, the important thing here is that SolarAPP is committed to ensuring every project that goes through the application is code compliant, and then ensuring at the time it's inspected. Of course, there's still the critical need for inspectors to go out and validate the system as approved in SolarAPP was actually installed in that way such that it is ensured to be safe once it's actually turned on. And so we have those committed and shared goals with jurisdictions that we continue to carry forward with you today.

So moving forward to the next slide.

We've already discussed a little but of what SolarAPP can cover and what it can't.

SolarAPP is not designed to streamline and approve every solar project, nor every solar residential rooftop project, which is what SolarAPP is currently designed to address. And so there are parameters around what is eligible.

And the idea of SolarAPP isn't to review plan review, as I said, for any system. And in addition, it's not able to address all applications that are going to come to a jurisdictions desk. Rather, what SolarAPP can do is take those easier projects, those more typical systems, get them off of your plan review plate such that jurisdictions can focus on some of their other more challenging applications, whether it's commercial systems, whether it's systems with mixed and matched equipment, things like that, that are code compliant and can be code compliant, they just can't be approved in the context of SolarAPP.

So what is approvable in SolarAPP? You already heard me say the key words, being residential rooftop solar at current. We are also piloting solar and storage, we well, and we look forward to releasing that suite of products later this year. And I also mentioned, we're

expanding to the 2020 Code cycle. So we're excited to meet California when they make the switch to those codes going forward.

And so we'll dig in, in more detail, if you'd like, and any questions about where we're going and what the roadmap is going forward. But we are, as I said, committed to expanding the application to cover as many systems as possible and as many configurations and possible.

So moving to the next slide.

How does -- or where is SolarAPP adopted so far?

So in California, it's already available for all contractors to use in the cities you see here. And some of you are already on the line, as well, and so good to see you all here. And it's been piloting in a variety of other communities, as well. And there are many, many more California jurisdictions that are in the process of considering or implementing SolarAPP today that aren't on this list.

And those that you see there, San Ramon and Stockton, actually, just recently Stockton put out their press release that they have gone live for all permits to go through SolarAPP that,

again, are eligible, so that is really exciting to see. And any one of those jurisdictions, of course, would be happy to speak with you about their experience adopting SolarAPP so far.

In addition, SolarAPP, of course, is a national product, and so it's also available in Arizona and across the country, again, because it's based on those national model codes.

So moving forward to the next slide.

How are we doing?

So SolarAPP was piloted over the past year and has now moved to full launch for a variety of those communities you saw on the previous slide. So, so far, we've permitted over 3,300 projects and counting. We've also piloted 200-plus storage projects so far. So what have we learned in the process of doing that? A few things.

One, we've resulted -- we've added no time added to the inspection of PV systems, so we've not moving plan review aspects from the front end where SolarAPP is doing those code compliance checks to the backend and requiring the inspector to do those. Instead, the inspector is just verifying what was approved in

SolarAPP was actually installed in the field. So no time is being added at the time of inspection which is very important as inspectors' time is valuable.

At the same time, projects submitted through SolarAPP+ are installed and inspected, on average, 12 business days faster. So homeowners are getting their projects installed two-and-a-half weeks faster because we are streamlining permitting. How are we doing that? We've reduced permitting timelines from as many as 24 business days in Tucson to zero or same-day instant permitting in all those jurisdictions which is resulting in that savings you're seeing to the homeowner.

In addition, every time SolarAPP reviews and approves a project the jurisdiction doesn't have to review and approve that project. And so we estimate every project that's submitted through SolarAPP to save one hour of review time, so 3,300 hours across all of those jurisdictions so far and counting.

In addition, we're also streamlining the revisions processes, so every project that's revised. And you -- as many of you know, a lot

of solar permits are revised. Those are also reviewed and approved by SolarAPP, as well, so that's additional time savings beyond the initial permit submittal.

So, in summary, it's a win-win-win here. The contractor gets business certainty of when they're going to get a permit and what's going to be approval. The jurisdictions save time and resources on every project that needs to be permitted while still collecting their permit revenue and fee for that project. And then, finally, the homeowner is getting their project installed two-and-a-half weeks faster, generating more revenue for them, which is really exciting.

So where do we go from here? You can move up to the next slide. Let's chat a little bit about how SolarAPP works.

So the installer submits their application with design specifications through SolarAPP. SolarAPP, again, checks the application for code compliance and rejects it, importantly, rejects it if it is not code compliant. And it tells the contractor why it's not compliant so they can go back and revise it. So instead of the permitting personnel having to

reject the project several times for either a typo or other errors, SolarAPP can do that instantaneously and get that information to the contractor quickly.

Assuming the project is code compliant, they get an approval project -- or approval document and SolarAPP approval I.D. that they would either use to get their permit job card in our standalone model, or they would submit it into a current system or online permitting system that the jurisdiction operates. And so let's talk a little bit more about how that works on the next slide.

So there are two ways to adopt SolarAPP. Many of you already have some type of online permitting system, whether it's Accela, whether it's Tyler Technologies, ENERGO products, Central Square eTRAKiT, and a host of other government software vendors, many of you have the opportunity to already permit some solar projects online. And so in that case, SolarAPP would just perform the plan review and your system would be able to deliver the permit instantly.

In comparison, for those of you who do not have an online software presence or ability

to permit systems instantly by an online platform that accepts .pdf documents, there is another option for SolarAPP and that is the standalone product where SolarAPP, in this case, issues the permit job card on your behalf after the contractor has paid the fee for that and the permit fee for you. And so there is a requirement to set up a fee payment vendor stripe (phonetic) account to be able to do the standalone model. And then there are some administrative steps that the jurisdiction needs to carry out to maintain the record of that permit in your system.

Either way, SolarAPP can deliver an instant permit and can work. And we're happy to work with you for which one makes sense for you. To understand which way make sense for you, let's go to the next slide.

There are four basic steps for adopting SolarAPP. And the first one is to register online at solarapp.nrel.gov and let us know you have interest in SolarAPP. That's all registering does.

And what it also does is allow you to understand what is needed to adopt either the

standalone model or the integrated model. And so first it will ask you a set of questions about local customization fields. So we, of course, customize for local geographic, climatic, and topographical, and seismic feature or characteristics. And so that's all updated -- provided by the jurisdictions.

Then, importantly, we'll ask you a set of questions to help set up your instant permit workflow, whether that's in the integrated model or your standalone model. And then, ultimately, there's the launch opportunity where we can set up a pilot to carry out SolarAPP from there. And then you can start benefitting from SolarAPP delivering permits instantly in your jurisdiction.

Moving to the next slide.

Those steps, again, you can do by registering at the link that you see here. Of course, I didn't have time and don't have time to walk through a full demonstration of SolarAPP and every code compliance check it is doing. But we do those on a standing regular basis every other Thursday and Tuesday on the regular schedule you see here through the end of this month and, of

course, continuing on beyond that.

Of course, if you can't attend these and would like to have your own technical demo, we're happy to meet with you and your team directly. There are a variety of other ways to get involved and learn about SolarAPP beyond the technical demo. And, of course, these slides will all be available to you to be able to peruse after the presentation.

And so with that, we can go to the final slide. And I'll thank you all for your time today. Of course, there's a lot of resources on our website, including the pilot results that I summarized for you today. And, again, we're happy to put you in touch with any community using SolarAPP to discuss their experience so far.

And with that, I'll pass it back.

MR. VAN WINKLE: Thank you, Jeff. We appreciate you covering SolarAPP+.

Before we move forward to staff proposals, we would like to use this period to open it up to questions specific to Jeff's presentation on SolarAPP+. Jeff is available for any technical questions related to SolarAPP+ at

this time. Please hold any other questions until later, after we present staff proposals.

MR. COOK: I do see there's a question from Ron in the chat. Should I just take that one right off the bat, which I will do here.

So thanks, Ron, and good to hear from you. His question is:

> "Are there statistics to show the time of inspection using SolarAPP+'s review versus the traditional paper plan check?"

And, yes, that is in our solar pilot analysis results. And I also briefly discussed it here. Overall, it's a wash. The SolarAPP permit -- or the SolarAPP inspection process in some communities has added one or two minutes to the plan -- to the inspection. In other communities, it's a couple of minutes faster.

But on balance it's the same, so we're not adding time at the inspection process in our piloting communities, but it does take a little understanding of the checklist to be able to perform that. So the first inspection for most inspectors does take a little bit longer than their typical inspection. And that's because they need to get used to the checklist and how it

operates.

And so, Staff, if you wouldn't mind showing that inspection training, as well, that we've developed, we can put that in the chat, too, so that you can access that. Because we require inspectors to take that training ahead of time to also improve their understanding of the checklist.

The other question I see that's related is, "How does it check single-line diagrams and fire aisle clearances?"

SolarAPP does not require an upload of a single-line diagram or a three-line diagram. Instead, we ask the contractor to input information about their design that the software can interpret and conduct code compliance checks because it's much more -- it's much easier to evaluate a set of calculations and inputs than it is to evaluate a thousand different pictures that, as you all know, contractors develop differently.

As far as fire access pathways go, we require the contractor to tell us what the area of the roof area is, then we calculate the array of the array that covers the roof, and then we

tell them what their fire setback requirements are. And then the inspector has to verify that the 3-foot or 18-inch setbacks are out in the field. And, if not, the contractor would fail their inspection.

MR. DODSON: Jeff, we have a raised hand from James Gill. I have unlocked his audio line.

MR. GILL: Yes. Good morning. Thank you. Can you hear me?

MR. COOK: I can.

MR. GILL: Okay. I was going to go back to the beginning with what you were talking about, when the contractor submits the information and then it determines if the code requirements are met.

What about the other requirements for like local utility companies and local jurisdiction requirements that aren't necessarily NEC or CEC codes but are stuff that we look for?

MR. COOK: And so I'll take those and divide them up.

So starting with the utility aspects of it, SolarAPP does not portend to be an interconnection software product, and so we separate permitting and inspection completely.

And it is on the contractor, the licensed contractor that has the ability to submit projects within SolarAPP, to complete all of the necessary interconnection-related agreements and requirements separately from that of SolarAPP's.

So we do not assess local utility requirements here in SolarAPP. That is a separate process that we require the contractor to do separately, which they have to do anyway to get PTO of their system.

Now as it relates to local customizations or requirements to the code, we of course, as I said, already have customizations for variations and jurisdictions that relate to temperatures, wind speed, snow loads, et cetera. So those are still applied and are unique to every jurisdiction.

For other requirements or amendments to the code, we discuss those on a case-by-case basis with every jurisdiction that's adopting to understand why they've gone beyond the California State Code and what public health and safety requirements have they identified that required going beyond the code, to identify if SolarAPP should actually be updated so that every

jurisdiction complies with that same requirements because, in fact, there is a public health and safety challenge.

However, SolarAPP does not adopt or implement local amendments that would relate to aesthetic design requirements or such as, you know, a good example is painting the conduit to match the property's paint color, for example. That's something that SolarAPP wouldn't approve because it's not a public health and safety issue.

Does that help answer the question, James?

MR. GILL: Yeah, it does, but I wasn't talking specifically about aesthetics. I was talking about like our utility company here in Sacramento, they want the power production meter wired differently than almost every other jurisdiction around our area. And that's just for their -- for purposes of how they read. So it's not necessarily a life and safety issue, and it's not an aesthetic issue either, it's just their requirement.

MR. COOK: Um-hmm. Right. And so it is on the contractor in this case to know what

they're going to need to do on the interconnection side to be approved and get their PTO and commissioning date set up. So that interconnection -- those interconnection aspects are not covered in SolarAPP.

MR. GILL: Okay. Thank you.

MS. LEE: Hi there. I just wanted to -- oh, sorry, Mr. Gill. This is Natalie Lee. I support the team here at CEC as Deputy Director for Renewable Energy. And this is just a couple of technical participation comments.

If you'd like to ask a question, you can use the raise-hand feature and the staff will call on you. You're not required to type your questions into the question and answer.

I do -- and I welcome my technical team correcting this, but I see a couple of comments coming into the question and answer. It is my understanding that only those parties acting as panelists will see those comments. This isn't a chat function that allows communication between parties.

So just a comment there that I believe only the panelists are seeing the information entered here. But Geoff, please correct me if

I'm wrong, or Adam.

And I do see a couple of resources referenced I the Q&A section that we're happy to docket in the program docket.

Or to the NREL partner that has referenced them, the resources, you can also docket those materials into the program docket to make them available to everyone. Jeff, you may want to reference those materials. And then we'll make -- we'll work with you to make sure they're available.

And again, yes, you can raise -- use the raise-hand feature and we will call on you. We're going to do all raised hands first. And then anyone who has typed in a question, we're happy to support you by reading that question for Jeff to address after we've handled all the raised hands.

So moving back to the team, if anyone does want to ask a question, please use the raise-hand feature. We'll wait just a moment and then we'll move back to reading questions that have been entered in the Q&A.

MR. DODSON: All right, we have a raised hand from Eric Miller.

And I am opening up your line, Eric.

MR. MILLER: Can you guys hear me?

MR. DODSON: Yes, we can hear you.

MR. COOK: We can.

MR. MILLER: Oh, perfect.

So my question is, I understand the data side where we're inputting the information for, let's say in this instance, the single-line diagram, is there plans, as well, that are submitted that are going to be cross-referenced with that? Because we kind of need a pretty picture of how it's being built.

MR. COOK: And so that is what most folks have said about SolarAPP when they first started is I don't understand how there can be no diagrams, and there is no diagrams of any kind in SolarAPP. And instead what it is is a step-by-step checklist that the inspector uses and goes from the main panel to the invertor and follows the system up to the roof to where the panels are and checks every aspect of that system step by step.

And so the inspectors using it have confirmed that they actually don't need a diagram and they continue to use that checklist and

understand it. So we don't provide those diagrams --

MR. MILLER: Well --

MR. COOK: -- and they aren't --

MR. MILLER: -- well, what about equipment layouts? In, you know, our jurisdiction we require an AC disconnect located within ten feet on a site of the main service panel. That's our requirement here at the City of Redding. And you know, planning and the panel layout is an important thing, too, which always changes after permit.

MR. COOK: Right. And we don't check layouts of panels in particular. So there's a certain number of modules that they put in and we calculate all of the electrical aspects from the amount of modules that are up on the roof. We don't need to know -- and how many roof planes their using for the array. But we don't need to know that for -- on, you know, one plane and the other (indiscernible) are on the other plane. We calculate that differently in SolarAPP, or we don't use the layout or need that layout for that.

So -- and I'm happy to talk with you,

too, Eric. And probably a technical demonstration would be beneficial for you to see how this system works. Because we do require -- have requirements specifically around AC disconnects that we can walk through in one of our technical demonstrations in more detail.

MR. MILLER: And we have --

MR. COOK: Plus, we'd love to meet with you.

MR. MILLER: -- we have a 30-pound roof snow load up here, too, so we have specific attachment requirements. So how do we apply that?

MR. COOK: So we do have requirements around making sure the racking and attachment equipment can withstand the local wind and snow load requirements. So we don't have a cap on snow load requirements but we wouldn't be able to permit flat roofs, likely, in that -- in Redding, so if there are a lot of flat roofs. But in most cases where you have your snow load, there often are far fewer residential flat roofs out there, so that wouldn't necessarily impact that.

But we'd be, also, interested to hear what your more in-depth requirements are specific

to the racking attachment equipment beyond being rated to withstand the local snow load. So that would be an area that we'd love to chat with you, as well.

MR. MILLER: Okay. Sounds good. Thank you.

MS. LEE: Geoff, do we have any other raised hands?

It's possible Geoff is having some audio --

MR. DODSON: Sorry.

MS. LEE: Oh, there he is.

MR. DODSON: Sorry. No, there are no other raised hands at the moment. So if we have no other questions, then we can move forward.

MS. LEE: Let's move to --

MR. VAN WINKLE: There's a couple

MS. LEE: -- any submitted in the Q&A. Yeah. Thanks.

MR. COOK: Yeah. And I just can read one out here that I see that we haven't yet touched on.

So again, from Ron Takiguchi,

"For the jurisdictions that have implemented SolarAPP+, were there eligible projects where

the contractor or a homeowner chose not to use SolarAPP+ and, instead, went through the traditional paper process?"

First, every homeowner, if they're doing their own project, would have to go through the traditional process. Homeowners are not allowed to use SolarAPP. It is only licensed contractors that can do it. So if a homeowner had a license, then they could it but, otherwise, it wouldn't be allowed to move through SolarAPP.

In addition, in every jurisdiction, this is a voluntary program because a contractor does have to pay $25.00 to get the instant permit. And so everywhere, it's just voluntary. And contractors can submit outside of this process if they would like to do so. In addition, any project that is not eligible for SolarAPP would have to go through that regular process.

Unfortunately, two things, actually. We are also tracking this past year to see how much solar volume SolarAPP is capturing in every jurisdiction that has gone fully -- or has fully adopted it to get a better sense of how much volume is going through, so jurisdictions can understand what amount of time savings they may

get. But we do not know if there were certain contractors that had an eligible project that could have gone through SolarAPP that they ended up submitting the regular way. We didn't -- we don't really have a way to track that beyond knowing that a solar project was submitted, so I don't have data specifically on that.

And now the other question in the chat I'm going to move onto now is from Nathan Lippenoff (phonetic), a question there.

"Are we able to use SolarAPP for new home development that are permitted with master plan standard plans?"

Currently, SolarAPP is not capable of permitting new construction. We're having issues around address validation. But are working to expand to the new construction space, so hopefully we'll have some exciting news for that in the coming year.

Then there's Raymond Chang in here.

"Is SolarAPP+ in compliance with California Building Codes or is basis for approval only for national codes?"

It is the California Building Code. It is applying the California Building Code. And we

are implementing those in all of the ten jurisdictions already that have adopted -- that have agreed that SolarAPP is implementing the California codes.

So, again, we're happy to discuss that with you directly. And you can always chat with every jurisdiction that had to do the same comparison, code comparison, as every -- as you, likely, would want to do to make sure that the code matches with the California State codes.

And then another one here from Marisol Lotski (phonetic), perhaps.

"Has SolarAPP been updated to address the fire classification, structural, and bonding capability to ensure that the system components at permit issuance meet code and manufactures requirements?"

We do require that the racking and module equipment are rated to be used together under UL 2703. And that also has to then be verified, of course, at the time of inspection, that the modules and racking equipment matches what was put in SolarAPP, and then also is rated for those aspects of 2703.

Mark Abbott has a question.

"You mentioned SolarAPP charges $25.00. Can you give examples of how cities are achieving cost recovery for inspection time?"

SolarAPP still requires the charging of your permit fees. So I'm going to just say hypothetically, the jurisdiction's permit fee is 100 bucks, you would still charge the $100. So whether it's charged in your own software or whether SolarAPP charges it on your behalf, you would still charge the permit fee. SolarAPP doesn't replace that. There is a $25.00 fee for SolarAPP to do its plan review function.

Some jurisdictions have decided to adjust their permit fees to remove plan review components given the jurisdiction is no longer doing plan review. But that is dependent on the jurisdiction making its own decisions.

A couple other questions in here.

"How does SolarAPP help with public records requests?"

Again, the jurisdiction is still the -- it still maintains its requirement to hold permit records in perpetuity. And so in both situations the jurisdiction must either input the permit information produced from SolarAPP into your

backend system, or the permit is already populated and tracked within your own permitting system online such that any public records request that you would require would follow that same process that you already have for tracking permits and for applying to public records requests.

And then finally, another question from Eric Miller.

"How does it address structural issues for roof framing? We already require them to tell us the attachment spacing. And then we have them -- we require them to install per the manufacturer's instructions, and then that needs to be verified at the time of inspection that that was done appropriately."

A pretty quick answer to that but happy to talk through in a technical demonstration about exactly how we are requiring structural aspects to be reviewed, and then also what we require inspector's to verify at the time of inspection.

All right. I see a couple more questions.

"What if there's a minor change subsequent to

permitting but prior to inspection, example, changing racking manufacturer or model and invertor model. Can minor changes be made to existing permitting systems -- to existing permitted systems?"

Yes, you can revise projects in SolarAPP. A contractor can revise for free three times before having to pay again. That doesn't mean that a jurisdiction doesn't charge permit revision fees. Of course, if that's the case, those would still be charged. But SolarAPP can do those kind of changes within the application.

Of course, if you result in a situation where you've changed the design subset, it's no longer compliant with SolarAPP+, you would have to submit that by the regular process. So it is important to know the eligibility requirements of SolarAPP and to know whether a contractor may have a risk of changing a project design such that it's ineligible. Ineligible designs cannot be re-reviewed in SolarAPP and they'd have to go through the regular process.

And then Jenna Haskins, a new question, "Does this include the Tesla solar roofing system where the roofing material is the

actual array?"

Right now, we are considering. We also consider that as building integrated photovoltaic, BIPV. And SolarAPP has already tested a proof of concept of a couple of BIPV products, like the Tesla roof, within SolarAPP, and we're continuing out what that would look like. It is not available today at a wide scale but we are considering expanding to that.

All right. Mark Abbott, another question, "Who does the plan checks?"

SolarAPP performs the plan check. The software automatically does those compliance checks. For example, we evaluate whether the project is going to stay under the 600 volt requirement within SolarAPP. We require what the minimum wire gage is going to be needed for the system. We also assess what their point of interconnect method is and whether it is compliant based on their main breaker and box, as well as probably 100 more other calculations that SolarAPP is doing. And that's the value of the SolarAPP app, is that it does those plan check aspects on your behalf.

In addition, as I said before, it already

tells the jurisdiction what -- or the contractor what their fire setbacks need to be based on what the array design is on the roof. And so, again, SolarAPP software does that which is why -- and not only does it do it but we give an approval document that lays out why we approved the project, all the calculations that were done. So unlike some third-party plan reviewers that they may have now where they just approve the plan and don't document why, SolarAPP documents why it made the decisions it did.

We also have a set of evaluation materials that are available online so you can see how SolarAPP approves various different hypothetical systems.

And I might have gotten through all the questions.

MR. DODSON: Yeah. I don't see any other raised hands. It looks like we're good on the chat questions, so I think we're ready to move forward.

So thank you for everyone who asked questions for Jeff Cook. Just also want to encourage everyone to submit those, if you have questions, to go ahead and submit those, as well

as a written comment. While we may not always be able to address them with an individual response, it still helps with kind of still receiving the information so we know what kind of information that we need to help provide as we move forward with the program.

And also, just a reminder, too, that we will have the contact information available following this workshop so that you can get in touch with either us or NREL and Jeff Cook's team. So just wanted to remind you of that as we move forward.

MR. VAN WINKLE: Okay, program design proposals. We will now get into CEC Staff proposals for CalAPP funding. The initial recommendations have been developed with feedback from permitting jurisdictions and other parties involved in the development of the SolarAPP, including NREL. Following this overview, we would like to hear feedback on the proposals, and seek your written comments, as well.

The applicant pool for the Grant Funding Program is open to all cities in counties in California, as defined in the legislation authorizing funding for this program. This

includes any incorporated towns, such as Biggs or Los Gatos, for example, as well as each county. For purposes of program planning, Staff understand there are 482 incorporated cities, 58 counties, and one city/county.

We intend to accept application forms electronically, which will be accessible through the program webpage. Exact details will be outlined through a Grant Solicitation Manual which will be made available before accepting new applications. We intend to offer a simple checkbox-style application form that can be completed quickly with minimal administrative burden. It will focus on basic applicant details and other items needed to reserve funding per the requirements of the program.

As mentioned earlier, it is our goal to issue notice of grant funding opportunity by June of this year. This time frame could change and details will be available on our program webpage. We also encourage you to sign up for our email LISTSERV to receive important updates related to this. Applications for funding will generally be processed on a first-come-first-served basis.

Upon releasing Notice of Grant Funding

Opportunity, the application due date will be specified but will be before June 30th, 2023 to allow time for application processing ahead of the statutory funding deadline.

Once funds are awarded the awardee must complete all grant activities so that funding is expended and final invoices are processed prior to the statutory liquidation deadline of June 30th, 2027. Due to the statutory funding encumbrance deadline of June 30th, 2023, we cannot award any grants after this date. Since we anticipate releasing the grant funding opportunity in June of this year, that leaves about 12 months for this funding opportunity. Timing is important, so be sure to apply promptly once available.

Our goal is to offer a streamlined and simple application, including a structure to facilitate increased participation. The flow of the program begins with submitting the application.

Upon application approval, CEC Staff will reserve funding for your jurisdiction. We will discuss the proposed award amounts in the next slide. Once funding is reserved, the applicant

will complete all activities to adopt an online automated permitting tool, such as SolarAPP+.

Upon full adoption and completion of all related activities, the awardee can then invoice the CEC for reimbursement of all eligible costs. The CEC will verify its successful adoption.

In an effort to develop a simplified funding approach, we recommend offering maximum funding award amounts based on the applicant population size.

This table shows proposed funding amounts divided into four population ranges with a maximum grant award of $40,000 for applicants below 50,000 residents, rising to a maximum award of $100,000 for those applicants with a population over 200,000 residents. This approach takes into account input received that indicates large municipalities have a more complex permitting and I.T. infrastructure and greater staffing and training needs.

These are a portion of the proposed eligible costs and which we will review in the next slide.

The funding award sizes are our maximum funding amount. The actual amount paid will be

based on the actual costs encountered during the term of the grant and must be supported by proof of eligible expenditures in the final invoice documentation. We do encourage feedback on these proposed award sizes.

CalAPP funding is intended for expected one-time adoption costs to establish an online automated solar permitting platform, such as SolarAPP+. For the most part, these costs are expected to come from staff time, including I.T. staff resources necessary to integrate and launch the software. Some applicants may use a third-party consultant to handle the adoption process, so we proposed allowing funding to cover consultant costs so long as they are specifically tied to the implementation of the solar permitting platform.

Additionally, we propose including training time, both inhouse and for local installers, to be included as a reimbursable cost. At this time, we can only provide reimbursement for activities that occur during the grant term, meaning for those adoption activities after an application for funding is approved and the awardee enters into a grant

agreement with the CEC.

We currently recommend excluding all other costs not mentioned on the previous slide, such as hardware and other tangible office items or third-party consultant fees not directly related to the adoption and integration of an automated solar permitting tool.

We also recommend excluding ongoing maintenance and subscription costs that preceded the establishment of a new software, such as SolarAPP+. This is because state agencies, like the Energy Commission, can only act within the authority provided by the legislature. The legislature and authorized funding for this program states the CEC can use the funds, quote, "to establish online solar permitting."

After funding is reserved for the awarded applicant, the CEC will distribute funds upon receiving an invoice from the applicant. Grant funds can pay up to 100 percent of eligible costs. Final payment will not exceed the total award amount. The applicant will invoice the Energy Commission after the adoption of an online automated solar permitting platform. Generally, this will come as a reimbursement for eligible

expenses through the full adoption of the permitting platform. Payments can only be issued to the grantee. All costs must be incurred during the grant term.

Also, we would like your feedback on your jurisdiction's capability to fully adopt a permitting platform prior to CEC reimbursement.

This wraps up our initial Staff recommendations on the basic program elements. Full grant funding details will be described in a grant funding solicitation that will be made available upon accepting new applications for funding.

We now want to open it up to you, our interested stakeholders, to ask questions and provide feedback on our proposals. Staff have proposed a variety of recommendations here and there are some specific areas where we are looking for additional information.

The next three slides are questions we have for you. I will display each of these slides, first, to give you a sense of what questions we have for you, and then we will open up the lines for you to ask away. We hope to hear from you on these questions first, followed

by questions and comments on your staff -- on the staff proposals, as well as any other public feedback.

As you can see on this slide, we are curious to know what other software platform options there are that might be used in place of SolarAPP+ as an automated online permitting solution?

While thinking about SolarAPP+ and potential alternatives, what is the process for your jurisdiction to move forward to get this adopted? What is the approval process to get this up and running? And how might this be impacted from our application time, as well as our funding encumbrance deadline?

We'd also like your thoughts on our proposed funding levels and whether they are sufficient or, perhaps, too much to complete the objective of this program? Thinking about these funding levels, are the proposed eligible costs comprehensive to meet the key program purposes or are there other important thoughts we should know about that are critical to adopting an automated online solar permitting solution, such as SolarAPP+?

For our last set of questions, we want to hear from you on the impact of our program plans in relation to your plans to adopt an automated permitting platform? Who in the audience was already planning to adopt SolarAPP+ or something similar? How would your plans be impacted if we cannot pay for the activities that occur prior to entering into a grant agreement with the CEC? Are you able to adopt the software on your own and receive reimbursement after the fact? Please let us know if this might pose a critical hardship.

Lastly, we are aware that SolarAPP+ does not currently support permitting for new homes. Until this feature is ready, how might this impact your plans?

The previous slides are critical questions that we'd like more information on from you, so we're happy to go back to them for visual purposes.

With that, we'd like to open up the lines for comment on these questions, our staff proposals, and other general comments you might have related to this program. Please use the raise-hand --

MS. LEE: Question. I'm sorry to interrupt you, Adam. Could we please close the public comment slide? We're not in that part of the agenda quite yet. Go ahead and shut down the slides for our Q&A session, please. Thank you, Adam.

MR. DODSON: So, yeah, we'll go ahead and move into a Q&A situation -- session. First, I'm going to take the raised hands up online, and then I'll address the questions on the chat. I do see -- oh, I think somebody took it away. I saw a raised hand a second ago.

One question that we have here from Jessica Cornejo. "Can CCAs apply for the grant funds on behalf of cities with their service territory?"

So the short answer to that is, no. The applicants must be a city or county jurisdiction within California. And they would be the ones that would apply for and also receive payment for funds. And that's partly due to the statute.

I see a raised hand from Chris Lee. I'm going to open up the line.

MR. LEE: Hi there. This is Chris Lee. I'm a Legislative Representative for the

California State Association of Counties.

One thing I was wondering is whether the Commission has looked at some of the recent over-the-counter application processes from the Department of Housing and Community Development? There's a lot of costs involved in applying for grants. And if you look at the SB 2 Planning Grants and the Permanent Local Housing Allocation Grants, there was a pretty streamlined process not involving a lot of steps for over-counter awards of funding.

And then, second question. I know some of our counties have been leaders in adopting this streamlined permitting technology. And there's some interest in whether there might be a retroactive ability? You know, there are a lot of costs in setting up these things. And if it's not recouped through a grant, it's going to be passed on in fees to other applicants. So really, retroactivity, and then a streamlined over-the-counter process.

Thank you.

MR. DODSON: Yeah. Thank you for your question.

So in regards to your first part, that is

something that's very helpful for us to be aware of, so we thank you for bringing that to our attention.

While we are trying our -- you know, making sure that we're aware of everything that's out there, we also do want to receive information from you all on what does exist. So we do definitely encourage you to kind of just -- you know, if you can submit a written comment on that with kind of showing us what other alternatives are out there, we'd just like to be aware of what, you know, what there is out there.

And then regarding the second part of the question, so payments, retroactive payments, is something that, you know, there's -- at this time, it's not really something that we can recommend, partly due to some legal consideration. But we still want to hear from you all on that, so we do encourage written feedback for how this might impact your plans to move forward. Just based on, you know, what kind of response we get to this, it kind of helps us, you know, analyze and see, you know, how critical this is and where we can maybe try to find some, you know, avenues to, you know, help out wherever

we can.

And so, you know, like I said, at this time, though, there's some legal considerations that we need to consider before we can definitely, you know, say one way or the other if we can provide payment for something that happened in the past.

And I don't see any other raised hands at the moment.

I do see a question from Ben. Oh, Ben Davis is raising his hand. I'm going to open up the line for Ben.

MR. DAVIS: Hey Geoff. I had a couple comments. Is this now the appropriate time to give those or is this -- are you asking for questions?

MR. DODSON: So, yeah, we're taking questions but, also, you know, we'll move to a public comment, you know, open it up for public comment shortly. So if you --

MR. DAVIS: Okay. I'll --

MR. DODSON: -- can just provide --

MR. DAVIS: -- I'll hold off then.

MR. DODSON: Sure.

MR. DAVIS: That's fine.

MR. DODSON: Okay. And just another reminder, too, also for general public comments, we also highly encourage anyone to submit those as written comments, as well. That just helps collect a full record of, you know, what kind of comments and questions are out there so we can fully be aware of what we need to be thinking about.

No raised hands at the moment on the questions I see.

So Ben also asked a question. "Can Geoff or Jeff Cook share how folks can join a technical demonstration of SolarAPP?"

I believe Jeff's -- one of Jeff's slides earlier had some links on that of where they can join.

But Jeff Cook, if you have any additional information on that, aside from what was already posted on your slide, just let us know.

MR. COOK: Yeah. What we encourage folks to do is reach out to us directly at solarapp@nrel.gov, that email address, or you can email me directly at jeff.cook@nrel.gov, and we can get you set up with those standing demonstrations that are upcoming.

And then I think, too, Geoff, what we can do is send over, as the follow-up, we've got some standing demos planned out through March. And the consensus has been linked out for those two after, as a follow-up to this cong. So plenty of opportunities to participate in one of those events.

MR. DODSON: Thanks Jeff.

And I'll just use this opportunity again to remind everyone that we will be posting these slides after the workshop. And one of the slides that we'll get to -- or one of the slides after this also has contact information directly for myself of Jeff Cook. And, of course, there was also some slides up above that Jeff presented earlier, so these will all be made available. So if you missed any links or anything like that, fear not.

Let's see. We have a question from Noah. "If the application process is burdensome to a given city/county can city staff simply start adopting? And can cities be trained at the same time as other cities? Will there be classes that multiple agencies can attend?"

Okay, so regarding the first part of the

question, the application is burdensome, so if this is in regards to our grant -- our grant program specifically, so first of all our goal is to, you know, make sure that the application form itself is not burdensome. But once -- you know, if you were to be adopting SolarAPP+ specifically, that's a process that you would work with NREL directly on.

In terms of the trainings that are offered, that's something that they do have a lot of resources on already. But as far as trainings that could be done together with multiple jurisdictions, that's not something that we currently have as arranged. But we're definitely open to suggestions on how we can, you know, assist with training together so we can, you know, help collaborate with cities and counties to, you know, encourage training successfully for this to get adopted.

Let's see. We have a question from Ron. "Is there a specification sheet for SolarAPP+ that can be shared with jurisdiction I.T. departments. They are likely to have many questions, such as integration with operating system? Who will address software bugs?"

So what I can at least say is that NREL -- if you choose to adopt SolarAPP+, you'll be working with NREL through that process. So they're, you know, very helpful. They will assist with all that.

I don't know, unless Jeff Cook wants to jump in and say anything on that, I can at least say that they will help you the whole way through. So any questions like that, technical questions, that would be part of the early entry adoption process that you would get started on.

Let's see. Just a comment from Eric Miller. "Please add the links in the chat."

Let's see. I can -- I don't believe we have a chat feature. But like I said, we will be posting the slides shortly. And we can also flip back to certain slides with the links at some near point in time.

Let's see. Yeah, so just to follow up with Eric, we don't have a chat feature. But we -- if there's a specific slide you wanted to see the links again on, just maybe let us know so we can show that on screen. And again, we will post the workshop slides shortly after the workshop.

We have a question from Paloma.

"Will there be any funds allocated under this program for other purposes, for example, funding for organizations to encourage adoption and support jurisdictions in adopting SolarAPP+?"

So that's a great question. At this point in time our funding is targeted for just the funding directly for the applications. Although we do encourage, again, comments on this if there's a strong need, we can, you know, take consideration of how else, you know, funding could be used, but not at this time.

We also have a message, just a FYI from NREL, that they provided an email address to schedule a demo of SolarAPP. So for those of you who aren't looking at it, it's team@solar-app.org, is an email address that you can reach out to schedule a demo for SolarAPP+.

All right. I don't see any other questions at the moment.

I think we can go ahead and just kind of move into just an open comment period for general questions and comments and anything else.

All right. We have -- we also have a

quick question, or let's see, a question from David Chung.

"Without a roof plan, what -- how do the inspections confirm the location is installed at the intended roof location, not anywhere on the roof? Can a roof plan be included and uploaded as part of SolarAPP as part of the permit?"

I'm going to go ahead and see if Jeff Cook is able to answer that one if it's a specific SolarAPP one.

While we wait on that, we do see -- I do see a couple raised hands here. I'm going to open it up to Benjamin Grundy. He has a raised hand.

MR. GRUNDY: Hello. Thanks for allowing me to speak today. My name is Ben Grundy. I'm the Global Warming Solutions Associate with Environment California and Environment California Research and Policy Center.

Thanks again for your work to make the SolarAPP available in more jurisdictions quickly in California. For too long, burdensome paperwork has slowed down building departments from approving routine solar installations.

SolarAPP can liberate building departments from hours of paperwork, processing and, as a result, massively cut the cost of solar.

Capitalizing adoption of this clean energy technology, we want to ensure that building departments who adopt SolarAPP today can also access the grant funds. And the more jurisdictions that can adopt SolarAPP now the better off we are.

Please make the funding available as soon as possible and ensure that grants are sizeable enough for building departments to see value in adopting. Accelerating to 100 percent clean energy is more urgent now than ever.

Thank you.

MR. DODSON: Thank you, Ben. Thank you for that encouraging comment.

And just another reminder, too, to everyone that, in addition to today's workshop, we also highly encourage comments to be written, submitted through the written docket. We do have a slide with information on how to do that that we can display shortly after this. Thank you again.

I see a raised hand from Oscar Diaz. I'm

going to open up your line.

MR. DIAZ: Hey. Good morning everybody. This is Oscar Diaz. I'm with the City of Modesto. We are an early adopter of SolarAPP. We worked with Jeff's team over at NREL and they're very professional.

My question is it sounded like there's still some uncertainty on whether the grant was going to be retroactive. And we haven't fully adopted yet. We haven't incorporated the storage systems into our automated permitting.

And so since there's some question as to whether the grant is going to be retroactive, I'm wondering, should we hold off on adopting or allowing storage systems for now until like the June grant day so that we can maybe get some of that grant money if we, you know, offer our training to our inspectors later on in June on the storage systems?

MR. DODSON: Yeah. Thank you for your question. Yeah, that's definitely an excellent question. And we, you know, we have been getting that already in some of our meetings.

Basically, you know, we can't recommend what you should or shouldn't do. But as we've

moving forward, there are some kind of legal constraints and barriers that we have to keep in mind as we think about this just based on the statute, and also just what our authority is at the Energy Commission for paying for things in the past. So there's some consideration that we're trying to, you know, consider here.

The current, at this current moment in time, though, our recommendation is not to do anything in the past, partly because, you know, paying for something that occurs before a grant agreement is entered into is just -- you know, like I said, there's some legal barriers to that.

So we, you know, basically, we want to kind of put it on you guys to give us public feedback on this would impact your plans, what it would change for you, our ability to, you know, move forward and get a program out, you know, hopefully by June. We want to hear from you through -- here today, and also in the written comments, on how, you know, impactful this would be.

The more feedback we get on this, you know, this would kind of help in analyzing how critical this is and, you know, where we can

maybe try to, you know, find some kind of middle ground here or common ground to make something happen and help you all. We definitely are interested in making sure that we can assist in any way we can and we have to find that balance somewhere.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you.

MR. DODSON: Thank you. Thank you for your comment.

Let's see. So a raised hand from Ben Davis, so I'm going to open it up for Ben.

MR. DAVIS: Thanks Geoff. This is Ben Davis with the California Solar and Storage Association. We just wanted to say, we're really excited about this program. And we see SolarAPP as a gamechanger for getting more solar onto more roofs.

When San Jose automated their approving process, which is basically just a homegrown version of SolarAPP, solar annual installs in San Jose increased sixfold. So if we could replicate that or get anywhere near to replicating that statewide, that would be incredible.

I just had a couple big-picture comments.

First, we are really hoping that the

grant applications and the funding distribution process can be as simple as possible. And it looks like that is where the program is heading so that's exciting.

Geoff, we totally recognize that there -- it sounds like there are some hurdles. But if it is possible to figure out a way to cover -- that the funds can cover what building departments are doing today, that would be great. It would, obviously, be unfortunate if a building department, you know, ended up waiting six months to get -- to adopt SolarAPP so they could be eligible for the grants.

And then lastly, and I realize this isn't anything groundbreaking, but the sooner this program can roll out the better. And just thank you, CEC Staff, for -- it sounds like the program is going to roll out late spring, early summer, so that's great.

And thanks for holding this workshop and all the work the CEC is doing.

MR. DODSON: Thank you, Ben. Appreciate that comment.

Let's see. I'm not seeing any raised hands at the moment. Oh.

MS. GIORGI: Geoff, I can take a question from the chat.

MR. DODSON: Sure. Go ahead.

MS. GIORGI: From Ben, the question is, "Does the CEC have any plans to coordinate CalAPP with the CEC's Energy Storage Permitting Guidebook Project?"

So we do coordinate internally on other CEC programs across the agency. If you could please submit a written comment if you have more detail on which aspects of the Storage Permitting Guidebook that you're referring to, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

MR. DODSON: And I see a raised hand from Paloma.

I'm going to open up your line.

MS. SISNEROS-LOBATO: Hi there. This is Paloma Sisneros-Lobato with SPUR, a public policy thinktank in the Bay Area.

And I also just wanted to thank everyone who's been involved in this process so far. On behalf of SPUR, we're very excited to see this coming to fruition and are just really excited about the progress to date so far.

So I'll just say that we're definitely

encouraged by the proposed grant amounts based on the size of jurisdiction. And I really want to echo some of the previous comments made about encouraging a way to have retroactivity for jurisdictions who have already adopted SolarAPP or a similar program. And so we really, yeah, hope to encourage you to find a way to make this possible. You know, we understand that there's current constraints under that but just wanted to echo that it was a desire, along with others.

And then, lastly, I'll just say we also would love to see additional funds, maybe from this program, become available for organizations to support this effort. We really foresee an opportunity for organizations, potentially such as SPUR but not necessarily just SPUR, to help and encourage the adoption and support jurisdictions throughout the process of adopting SolarAPP.

So thank you very much.

MR. DODSON: Thank you, Paloma. Appreciate that comment.

Let's see. So is Jeff Cook on the line still, or Seth? We do have a question that's specific to one of you on SolarAPP. Just let me

know if you're around.

Also, I see a question here from Mark Abbott.

"To confirm, funding is only eligible to reimburse staff time spent on installing a solar permitting system? Getting my permitting system provider to upgrade or do the programming to implement SolarAPP is not eligible."

So -- shoot. So our proposed recommendation at this time is to provide funding for, basically, the resources needed to adopt a permitting system. So I'm trying to figure out, getting the permitting system provider to upgrade or do the programming, that, what you're suggesting in your question, I think that would qualify as eligible. I'm just trying to interpret this.

Yeah, so I think from your question, it does appear that it could potentially qualify as an eligible cost, just based on our recommendations. What we've proposed so far is, you know, just a broad outline, so the, you know, the fine-point details we'll ultimately discuss once we release the solicitation manual. But as

far as what you're mentioning, that seems like it could fit into the category of what we did recommend as eligible. So I think --

MS. GIORGI: Hi Geoff. Let me add to that. This is Elizabeth from the CEC.

Thanks, Mark, for your comment. These are the types of things that we are looking for feedback on.

So you know, pertaining to your specific needs in your jurisdiction, if there are some costs that you think would need to be covered by this grant to get this adopted, we would love to hear from you. So that's what we're looking for in this public comment.

MR. DODSON: Thanks Elizabeth. Appreciate that.

So Seth Crew is here from NREL.

Seth, I just opened up your line. We do have a question from earlier, from David Chung. I'll go ahead and read it out. It's in the question box.

"Without a roof plan, who do the inspectors confirm the location is installed at the intended roof location, not anywhere on the roof? And can a roof plan be included and

uploaded as part of SolarAPP as part of the permit?"

MR. CREW: Okay. So I'll answer the second part of that question first.

So SolarAPP does not require any roof plan, and that's consistent with any plan set. We don't require any type of physical diagram of the roof layout.

So what SolarAPP does is we outline the fire access pathways and bridge setback rules that need -- that would apply to a project based on the amount of the roof area that the PV array occupies, and whether the home has sprinkler systems. And so we have documentation that outlines to the inspector and the installer which setback and access pathway rules that the project needs to adhere to or it's going to result in an inspection failure.

And since SolarAPP doesn't automatically calculate the roof layout, what it does -- what we're doing is we're asking the contractor to make an attestation that the project installed will meet all of the fire requirements. And in the inspection checklist the inspector has to verify that those setbacks and access pathways

are actually present. And so the onus is put on the installer to make sure that the project will allow for these elements or will be a failure in the inspection in the field.

I hope that answers your question.

MR. DODSON: Thank you, Seth. Appreciate that.

All right, so there's no raised hands at the moment, no open questions, so we'll just give it a second here to see if anything else comes up.

But I will, again, use this time to just remind everyone that we are taking written comments up until February 22nd. We encourage anyone, even if you spoke today, encourage anyone to submit written comments, just to give us any of your thoughts or feedback on any of the proposals or anything that we -- that would be helpful for us to consider.

Also, as well, just, you know, responses to some of the questions that were posted on the earlier slides. We're, you know, we're looking to hear information from you on those. Those are very helpful for us to help consider as we move forward and when we get this out.

And so the link to that e-commenting system is provided here on this slide. And it's also accessible, as well, on our program webpage.

I'll show a link to the program webpage in a second here, once we move forward, but just waiting real quick to see if any other questions come up. I guess if there are no current questions or comments at the moment, we can move to the next slide.

MR. VAN WINKLE: Okay. Here are some next steps. We thank you all for the wonderful feedback and comments. Looking ahead, here are our goals for the next few months for CalAPP.

We will be taking additional written comments up until 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 22nd. These can be submitted on our e-commenting system, accessible directly from our program webpage.

In the months ahead we will review feedback and further develop grant-funding materials with a goal to release this by June. Please sign up for our email LISTSERV to stay in the loop on these announcements. Once applications are available, we encourage you to apply promptly, well before the statutory

encumbrance deadline in June 2023.

Here is some key information to stay informed and to follow-up with other questions related to this program. We thank you for joining us today.

MR. DODSON: Let's see. You can go back to the other slide.

Thank you, again, for everyone joining, we'll leave it on this slide for a little bit, just to take this information down. And, again, this will all be posted on our program webpage.

MS. GIORGI: Thank you everybody for joining today. And thank you to NREL for partnering in this workshop with us.

MR. DODSON: Yes. Big thanks to Seth and Jeff Cook.

I don't see any new questions come up at the last second. I think that we'll wrap it up for today. So thank you, again, for everyone joining.

(The workshop concluded at 10:21 a.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

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 17th day of February, 2022.

MARTHA L. NELSON, CERT**367

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

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.

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

MARTHA L. NELSON, CERT**367

February 17, 2022