

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	18-MISC-03
Project Title:	Renewable Energy for Agriculture Program
TN #:	223051
Document Title:	Transcript of 03082018 Staff Workshop
Description:	STAFF WORKSHOP DISCUSSION ON THE CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION'S PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RENEWABLE ENERGY FOR AGRICULTURE PROGRAM
Filer:	Cody Goldthrite
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	3/26/2018 1:52:57 PM
Docketed Date:	3/26/2018

APPEARANCES

ENERGY COMMISSION STAFF

Geoffrey Dodson

Sherrill Neidich

Elizabeth Hutchison

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jeff Riding (via WebEx), San Joaquin Valley Air District

Rick Orlando (via WebEx), Brite Solar

AGENDA

	<u>Page</u>
<u>PRESENTATION</u>	
Geoffrey Dodson	4
Public Comment	20
Closing Remarks	30
Adjourn	32

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

P R O C E E D I N G S

9:06 A.M.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 2018

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

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

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

Just a couple quick housekeeping items. We do have guests joining us. So we're here in Bakersfield at San Joaquin Valley Air District Office. We do have guests joining us in Fresno, and also at the Modesto office. And in addition to that, we also have people on the WebEx joining us. So as we get into the public comment section and discussion time, we intend to

1 take questions from remote attendees as if you
2 were kind of here in Bakersfield. So anyone in
3 Fresno or Modesto, we'll be kind of calling on
4 you similarly to how we will be here in the room
5 in Bakersfield.

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

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

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

24 At the end of our scheduled time, or when
25 the public comment is complete, we will review

1 the next steps and make sure that everyone has
2 our contact information for follow-up questions.
3 This presentation will be available to everyone
4 when it is added to the docket established for
5 this program following today's workshop, and
6 we'll provide a link for that a little bit later.

7 So before we start the content of the
8 REAP program proposal, we want to make sure that
9 we recognize the Energy Commission's efforts to
10 ensure diversity in our programs. The Energy
11 Commission has adopted a formal resolution
12 strengthening its commitment to diversity in our
13 funding programs. We continue to encourage
14 disadvantaged and underrepresented businesses and
15 communities to engage in and benefit from our
16 many programs. To meet this commitment, Energy
17 Commission staff conducts outreach efforts and
18 activities, including those listed here on the
19 screen.

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

24 So a little bit of background on the REAP
25 program. Authorized with the passage of Assembly

1 Bill 109 and referred to as the Budget Act of
2 2017. The Renewable Energy for Agriculture
3 Program, REAP, will provide \$6 million in funding
4 from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund to assist
5 agriculture operations with the installation of
6 onsite renewable energy technologies with an
7 emphasis on providing assistance in disadvantaged
8 and low-income communities.

9 REAP was established by the same
10 legislation that authorized the Food Processor
11 Investment Program which is a research and
12 development grant program, also administered here
13 at the Energy Commission.

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

20 As we are developing the program
21 guidelines, there are a number of areas we would
22 like to see input on. Today we will review the
23 anticipated program schedule and discuss the
24 overall program goals. Then we'll move into
25 areas of the proposed REAP program for which we

1 would like to hear your ideas, including project
2 funding levels, proposed eligibility requirements
3 and project types.

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

10 So this slide provided the proposed
11 general program schedule. As the program is
12 designed and implemented, Energy Commission staff
13 will seek input from potential program
14 participants and will finalize the solicitation
15 and program guidelines that reflect feedback from
16 the community engagement efforts. As outlined
17 here, based on the feedback received through this
18 workshop and the workshop that we held last week,
19 staff will be preparing draft documentation
20 guidelines which will also be made available for
21 public comment. Staff will finalize the program
22 guidelines and the solicitation materials, which
23 we anticipate releasing in August of this year.

24 With proposals due in September and
25 scoring completed in October of this year, we

1 anticipate issuing a Notice of Proposed Awards in
2 late 2018 and working after that to finalize the
3 grant agreements.

4 First, it's important to acknowledge that
5 the development of the REAP program will reflect
6 all requirements for California Climate
7 Investment programs, as outlined in the Agency
8 Funding Guidelines prepared by the California Air
9 Resources Board. As our funding comes from the
10 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, the primary goal
11 of the program is to reduce greenhouse gas
12 emissions. All California Climate Investment
13 projects must reduce greenhouse gas emissions,
14 and administering agencies must use a greenhouse
15 gas quantification methodology that has been
16 developed by or approved by the California Air
17 Resources Board.

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

25 Projects are expected to support

1 agriculture operations and increasing resiliency
2 and electricity reliability, which potentially
3 offers a number of different benefits, including
4 reliability and cost savings. Additionally, we
5 hope to develop a program to realize additional
6 co-benefits, including reductions in local air
7 pollution and additional benefits to the local
8 community.

9 The overall budget for the program is \$6
10 million. The minimum award amount proposed is to
11 be a minimum of \$50,000, with a maximum for any
12 single award of \$250,000. Staff are proposing
13 these funding limits to provide sufficient
14 funding for projects, but also maximize the reach
15 of the funds throughout the state. Please be
16 sure to let us know during the public comment
17 period what you think of this range, keeping in
18 mind the kinds of projects that you envision.

19 Staff is further proposing a single award
20 per operation and would like to hear your
21 feedback on potentially awarding on an assessor's
22 parcel number basis, allowing funding for any
23 single APN or group of APNs, but only one award
24 for any single APN.

25 As there are a number of potential

1 funding sources for similar or related projects,
2 staff are further proposing that any operations
3 submitting proposals under a REAP solicitation
4 must identify funds provided by any other state
5 programs. Receipt of funds from other programs
6 is not considered to preclude participation in
7 REAP, but the proposal will be evaluated for
8 effectiveness of the use of the funds.

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

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

24 I know this slide looks a little dense,
25 but we just wanted to show you some definitions

1 for your own reference. The proposed Farmer
2 Program, implemented by the Air Resources Board,
3 and also partially funded by Greenhouse Gas
4 Reduction funding, has adopted the definition of
5 agricultural operations contained in ARB's
6 regulation for in-use off-road diesel vehicles,
7 as shown on this slide.

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

16 Staff, here at the Energy Commission are
17 considering a definition for the purposes of REAP
18 similar to the definition used in the proposed
19 Farmer Program, but not including forest
20 operations. While staff recognizes the need to
21 support forest management activities, we also
22 feel that it may be more efficient to focus this
23 funding on the areas included in this proposed
24 definition. Again, we would like to hear your
25 feedback on this proposal.

1 AB 1532 requires that this cap and trade
2 auction proceeds to be used to facilitate the
3 achievement of greenhouse gas reductions in
4 California and specifies the additional co-
5 benefits to consider. The REAP program will
6 facilitate the achievement of greenhouse gas
7 reductions and other co-benefits through
8 incentivizing the installation of renewable
9 energy in agricultural operations. This may
10 include installation of renewable energy to
11 offset grid energy and can potentially include
12 replacing fossil-fuel equipment, combined with
13 the installation of renewable energy, to provide
14 the electricity for upgraded equipment.

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

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

1 CEQA costs.

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

15 So SB 535 established the original
16 requirements related to the investment of GGRF
17 funds in disadvantaged communities to provide
18 economic and health benefits to these
19 communities.

20 In 2016, AB 1550 revised these
21 requirements, increasing the share of the state's
22 auction proceeds that must be invested within
23 disadvantaged communities, and added new
24 requirements to direct additional investments to
25 low-income communities and low-income households.

1 AB 1150 requires at least 25 percent of auction
2 proceeds to be invested for the projects within
3 and benefitting disadvantaged communities, 5
4 percent within and benefitting low-income
5 communities or benefitting low-income households
6 statewide, and 5 percent for projects within and
7 benefitting low-income communities or low-income
8 households that are within a half-mile of a
9 disadvantaged community.

10 We are committed to supporting
11 disadvantaged and low-income communities and aim
12 to support the goals of AB 1550. For the REAP
13 project, we recommend allocating 50 percent of
14 the total funds for the projects within and
15 benefitting disadvantaged communities, and 10
16 percent for projects within and benefitting low-
17 income communities, based on the CalEnviroScreen
18 3.0 model. We would definitely like to hear from
19 you on input on this proposal, and also how this
20 program can maximize benefits to these
21 communities.

22

23 Projects implemented under California
24 Climate Investments are also directed to maximize
25 economic, environmental and public health

1 benefits to the state, foster job creation by
2 promoting projects carried out in California
3 workers and businesses, and complement efforts to
4 improve air quality. Consistent with these
5 requirements, we propose providing preference to
6 projects that include measures that improve local
7 air quality, achieve public health benefits
8 and/or result in job creation and job training.

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

18 Additionally, we are proposing to provide
19 preference to projects that provide innovative
20 solutions that have a broad impact and projects
21 that provide matched funding. Matching funds are
22 not required, but applicants are strongly
23 encouraged to include a 50 percent match.
24 Applications that include matching funds will
25 receive additional consideration. Matching funds

1 are defined as a portion of project costs not
2 covered by the grant award and can include cash
3 and/or in-kind contributions. In-kind
4 contributions can include costs associated with
5 labor, equipment, facilities, and other property
6 or property improvements related to the project.

7 The California Air Resources Board
8 Funding Guidelines for agencies that administer
9 California Climate Investments state that to a
10 maximum extent possible, administrating agencies
11 should seek opportunities to work together to
12 provide multiple benefits and to maximize the
13 benefits from each program. Several
14 administering agencies could coordinate and
15 leverage their resources to combine funding for a
16 project, or to fund multiple related projects in
17 the same geographic area. This coordination may
18 involve sharing information with applicants about
19 other California Climate Investment programs that
20 offer funding for complementary projects.

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

25 The REAP program is coordinating efforts

1 with the proposed Farmer Program implemented by
2 the Air Resources Board, as well as the SWEEP
3 program, implemented by the California Department
4 of Food and Agricultural. And we would like --
5 we would like to hear from -- your input on this,
6 as well, on other programs that we can coordinate
7 with.

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

10 Now we're going to -- now we want to hear
11 from you. We've developed a few questions for
12 discussion in the next slides, and we would like
13 to ask for feedback on these questions, as well
14 as overall public comment. As you develop
15 written comments on the proposed program, we do
16 request that you provide additional input on the
17 questions posed here. Your comments are very
18 important to us and will help us with developing
19 the guidelines.

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

1 the back end of the slides.

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

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

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

24 So go ahead and open it up.

25 MS. NEIDICH: I guess we'll go to Fresno?

1 MR. DODSON: Yeah. So just any of the
2 gentlemen in the Fresno room, do you guys have
3 any comments about what we talked about so far?

4 MR. RIDING: No questions from Fresno.

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

7 MS. NEIDICH: I don't think there's
8 anyone from Modesto.

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

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

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

1 if you have any public comment or questions.

2 Fresno room, how are you guys doing?

3 Yeah.

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

14 MR. DODSON: Okay.

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

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

20 So based on your knowledge of these kinds
21 of projects, would you envision that they would
22 benefit from being interconnected, or do you
23 think these would be the kind of projects that
24 should not be interconnected? And also, how does
25 our -- how does our funding range kind of work

1 with the projects you're mentioning?

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

7 MR. RIDING: Yes.

8 MR. DODSON: -- down on the record.

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

12 MR. DODSON: Okay.

13 MS. NEIDICH: Okay.

14 MR. RIDING: And so what was the question
15 again? I'm sorry.

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

18 MR. RIDING: You were asking --

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

25 MR. RIDING: Yeah, I think it would

1 definitely be something that could be
2 interconnected. But the funding ranges, I'm
3 trying to actually find it where you guys had
4 that. And you said the minimum was \$50,000 for
5 awards?

6 MR. DODSON: Yeah. Right now our
7 proposal is a minimum of \$50,000, maximum
8 \$250,000.

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

13 MR. DODSON: Okay.

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

17 MR. DODSON: Good. Yeah. Definitely.

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

22 MR. RIDING: Yeah. Riding, R-I-D-I-N-G,
23 like riding a bike.

24 MS. NEIDICH: Thank you very much.

25 MR. RIDING: Sure.

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

9 MR. ORLANDO: (Indiscernible.)

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

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

16 MS. NEIDICH: Yeah.

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

19 MR. ORLANDO: Okay. So I'm Rick Orlando
20 from a company called Brite Solar. And we've
21 developed a transparent solar cell specifically
22 targeted for greenhouse planning applications.
23 The idea is that we allow enough light to come
24 through or the plants to dry, and then also, we
25 generate electricity, just like a normal PV cell

1 would.

2 And there are two ways -- I mean, right
3 now we are in a pilot demonstration mode because,
4 obviously, we can show theoretical data that
5 shows that the light spectrum is sufficient for
6 lots of crops, including hydroponic tomatoes, but
7 growers are only going to believe data when they
8 actually see growing their own local data, if you
9 will.

10 And so the problems that we face is that
11 there are two ways to do this. The first is to
12 build new greenhouses using our technology, which
13 is quite expensive. Modern greenhouses, 1,000
14 square meters, you're looking at easily over
15 \$250,000.

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

20 And so, you know, the problem with
21 renewable energy is if you're trying to move the
22 needle, you need to do things big. And so is the
23 funding, the criteria, more for demonstration,
24 rather than actually moving the needle, or are we
25 actually looking at trying to do something that's

1 significant?

2 MR. DODSON: Thank you for your question,
3 first of all.

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

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

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

23 MR. DODSON: Yeah. Go for it.

24 MR. ORLANDO: You know, obviously, if we
25 can -- if you can do this project in an

1 economically depressed area, that would be best.
2 I was recently down at a greenhouse complex on
3 tribal land that is interested in doing a
4 conversion. But, you know, part of our problem
5 is we have the technology, we actually have a
6 pilot being built right now in the Netherlands.
7 We have one that's actually been completed in
8 Greece through two crop cycles. So it's not, you
9 know, it's not a research type of thing. It's
10 more or less a utilization of the technology in
11 certain geographical areas with certain crops --

12 MR. DODSON: Uh-hmm.

13 MR. ORLANDO: -- is the -- what we're
14 trying to (indiscernible).

15 MR. DODSON: Okay.

16 MR. ORLANDO: So --

17 MR. DODSON: All right.

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

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

1 talking about.

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

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

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

25 So it's not a technology that's set.

1 It's more of a case use type of situation.

2 MR. DODSON: Okay.

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

7 MR. ORLANDO: Okay.

8 MR. DODSON: Yeah.

9 MS. NEIDICH: Thank you.

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

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

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

21 And just to remind again, you know,
22 obviously, if questions do come up later, we
23 really do still want to hear from you. And so we
24 do have a public comment period where you can
25 submit your comment through the docketing system.

1 And, you know, that will really help kind of beef
2 up our comments so that we can put together some
3 guidelines.

4 MS. NEIDICH: That's all for comments.

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

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

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

1 information here.

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

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

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

24 MR. DODSON: Also, just mention, too,
25 anyone that was here listening today,

1 participating or anything, if you know of anyone,
2 you know, any other farmers or any kind of groups
3 of organizations that would benefit from this
4 program, please refer them to, you know, more
5 information, give them the link or something.
6 You know, I guess one of the biggest challenges
7 with starting a new program is want to make sure
8 we get outreach -- or we do outreach as best we
9 can, so that we can maximize the use of these
10 dollars and make sure that, you know, it does its
11 job as best as we can.

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

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

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 March, 2018.



Eduwiges Lastra
CER-915

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

March 26, 2018