

Pre-Application Questions, Answers, and Clarifications

PON-14-303

Advancing Cleaner, Less Costly, More Reliable Distributed Generation

California Energy Commission

October 17, 2014

**Table of Contents**

Definitions .....2

Eligible Projects .....3

Application Requirements and Formatting.....3

Budget and Match Funding.....4

Terms and Conditions.....5

Solicitation Information .....7

    Project Group 1.....7

    Project Group 2.....8

    Project Group 3.....9

    Project Group 4.....13

IOUs.....14

General .....15



Advancing Cleaner, Less Costly, More Reliable Distributed Generation  
Questions, Answers and Clarifications

**Definitions**

1. Please expand on the definition of pilot-scale.

***“Pilot scale demonstration” means a small, laboratory model-size demonstration that is larger than a bench-scale demonstration and smaller than a full-size demonstration. “Bench-scale” demonstrations are typically small laboratory set-ups used to verify certain research concepts or processes. Bench-scale demonstrations take basic research one step further, to perform preliminary demonstration tests. After basic research determines that a particular technology or strategy has demonstrated preliminary feasibility, a pilot-scale demonstration or test is used to validate results and provide proof that a concept works in practice. Pilot demonstrations test the design and validity of an approach, and adjustments can be made at this stage before full-scale demonstrations.***

2. Is there a definition for Distributed Generation? Is there some attribute that would clearly cause a project not to be distributed generation?

***Distributed generation is electricity production that is on-site or close to the load center and is interconnected to the utility distribution system.***

3. Define IOU ratepayer’s benefits with respect to greater reliability, lower costs, and or increased safety. Or please define greater reliability, lower costs and increased safety. Please give examples.

***Greater reliability refers to electricity system reliability and/or the ability of the IOUs to more reliably provide electricity to IOU ratepayers. For example, bioenergy projects able to provide an IOU with load-following generation may provide greater reliability as California reaches its mandate to produce 33 percent renewables by 2020.***

***Lower costs refer to lower costs to IOU ratepayers. Projects will be scored on their ability to reduce technology cost, improve performance and increase efficiencies.***

***Increased safety refers to a safer electricity system as a result of the project. This will protect the health and safety of the ratepayers. For additional benefits, please refer to Attachment 12.***

## Eligible Projects

4. Are projects with only thermal production eligible for this solicitation?

***No, projects that exclusively generate thermal energy from biomass are not eligible for funding. This solicitation is focused on electricity generation technologies.***

5. Is cow manure defined as a waste that is applicable for bioenergy?

***Yes.***

6. If it is a lab-scale or pilot-scale, will publicly owned utilities qualify?

***No. POU's do not qualify as Prime Applicants or Subcontractors. Page 70 of the Phase 2 decision (D.12-05-037) states: "Finally, considering the source of EPIC funds and consistent with the key guiding principle of producing IOU electricity ratepayer benefits, funds administered by the California Energy Commission may not be used for any purposes associated with POU activities..."***

***POUs cannot receive EPIC funds but may be project partners and can provide letters of support for projects. A project partner does not receive any Energy Commission funding but can provide match funding, a site, or other support for the project. For instance, a project partner can be an entity that provides technical assistance, equipment, materials or other services that will not be reimbursed with Energy Commission funding***

7. If a project is improving the efficiency of a waste-to-energy facility (but electric capacity is not changing), would this project qualify?

***It is the applicant's responsibility to determine whether or not their particular proposed project is eligible for funding, by reviewing the Eligibility Requirements in Section II of PON-14-303.***

***A project otherwise compliant with Section II would be eligible if the applicant explains how the proposed efficiency improvements result in improved performance and overall reduced cost, such as, generating same amount of electricity with lower fuel consumption (or generating more electricity with the same amount of fuel). Any application must strongly demonstrate that value and benefit is realized and can flow down to IOU ratepayers.***

## Application Requirements and Formatting

8. Some state agencies accept electronic submissions instead of requiring printed copies. Is the Energy Commission considering moving towards electronic submissions?

***The Energy Commission is discussing the feasibility of accepting applications electronically. However, for this PON (PON-14-303), the applicant must follow the submission requirements described in Part III (Application Organization and Submission Instructions), Page 16.***

9. Attachment 9. Can we list any of our current or previous CEC project managers as references?

***Yes, you may list current or previous Energy Commission project managers as references.***

10. Attachment 11. Can a check box be added for partner in-kind labor costs in the type of match funding section?

***Attachment 11 has been modified to show an option to indicate that match funds are Contractor/Partner in-kind labor costs.***

## **Budget and Match Funding**

11. If match is in cash, are we free to start the project and deploy grant funds later? Or must the grant be awarded?

***The award recipient may only spend match funds during the Agreement term, either concurrently or prior to the use of Energy Commission funds. Any funds spent outside of the agreement term will be at the applicant's risk and will not count toward match funds. Furthermore, costs incurred prior to the Agreement start date or execution date, whichever is later, are not reimbursable by the Energy Commission.***

12. Do funds spent in California only apply to EPIC funds?

***Yes, the "funds spent in California" criterion specified at Scoring Criteria 6 (EPIC Funds Spent in California) only applies to EPIC funds.***

13. Do you have any guidance on what are 'eligible costs' and 'ineligible costs'?

***Eligible costs include but are not limited to funding needed for technical development of these projects, such as the labor, equipment, and materials. Ineligible costs include but are not limited to costs such as profit for the prime contractor and costs associated with permits. Please refer to Attachment 7 (Budget Forms- Section III – Attachment B-2 Category Summary) and Terms & Conditions Section 2.***

14. The scoring for indirect vs. direct rates is based on the total indirect cost and only the labor + fringe direct cost. Why are materials and other direct costs not included in the direct half of this calculation? The current scoring heavily penalizes companies that have materials-heavy proposals and that apply G&A to materials (a very common practice).

***The goal was primarily to reward applicants with low overhead and G&A--not necessarily to compare the total direct and indirect costs. The scoring will be performed as shown in the application manual.***

15. Is funding from CSI RD&D considered cost share?

**Yes, if the funding received is partial funding for the proposed project. The funding received by the applicant for the work, unrelated to the proposal submitted to the Energy Commission, cannot be considered cost share. However, the funds counted as cost share must be spent during the approved agreement term.**

16. Section E. Screening Criteria, items 11 and 12: if a support or commitment letter is provided that is determined by the screeners and reviewers not to be required or does not meet the requirements of Attachment 11, is that one letter not considered in the scoring phase, or are all letters not considered in the scoring phase?

***If an applicant does not include all required commitment letters (i.e., match funding and deployment site letters) and/or any of the required commitment letters do not meet the requirements of Attachment 11, the applicant will fail the proposal screening and the proposal will not pass to the scoring phase. For example, if the applicant submits match funding and deployment site commitment letters and only one of the deployment site letters meets the requirements of Attachment 11, the application will fail.***

***If the applicant includes commitment letters that are not required (i.e., project partner commitment letters) and do not meet the requirements of Attachment 11, the letters will not be considered in the scoring phase.***

17. Attachment 7, Tab B-4. Could you remove the 'protection' from the "This section is for Government Entities only" field? In the past, CEC has asked us to use this field to explain the Base Calculation for Non labor Categories.

***Yes, the protection has been removed. Please check the Energy Commission website for the revised Attachment 7. Please use the updated version (with September 2014 in the footer).***

18. Attachment 7, Tab B-4b, B-4c – All headers are using the Sub#1 title, rather than the corresponding Sub#2 and Sub#3 titles we input on Tab B-1.

***The headers for the Attachment 7 spreadsheets have been corrected and the footers have been updated. The latest Attachment 7 will be posted on the Energy Commission website and the earlier version will be removed. Please use the updated version (with September 2014 in the footer).***

19. Attachment 7, Tab B-5. The cell for total commission funds in the pre-approved travel detail does not include a formula. Can it be added?

***The requested formula has been added to the Attachment 7, Tab B-5. Note that if there are more trips than the number of lines, the formula won't work. Please use the updated version (with September 2014 in the footer).***

20. Section F. Scoring Criteria, Item 6: EPIC Funds Spent in California states “Airline ticket purchases and payments made to out-of-state workers are not considered funds “spent in California”. Is this to be interpreted that any airline tickets purchased for out-of-state workers are not considered to be funds spent in California? Or that all airline tickets purchased are not considered to be funds spent in California?

***All airline ticket purchases are not considered to be funds spent in California.***

21. Attachment 7 instructions state “Airline ticket purchases are not considered funds spent in California”. What about tickets purchased from Virgin America, the headquarters of which are in Burlingame, California?

***All airline tickets, even those purchased from companies in California, are not considered to be funds spent in California.***

## **Terms and Conditions**

22. Am I understanding correctly that the primary applicant be a registered California business? Is this RFP specifically targeted to California businesses?

***The prime applicants (California business entities and non-California business entities) are required to be registered with the Secretary of State in California at the time of Agreement execution, and must be in good standing as indicated in Part II, Section A – Applicant Requirements (Page 12). While this PON is not specifically targeted to California businesses, applications that show a higher amount of funds being spent in California will receive a higher score for that criterion.***

23. In the scope of work Excel form (Attachment 6a); the draft final report is due a full 4 months prior to the end of the project. This implies that for the final four months of the project reporting and overhead costs will continue to accumulate while no technical work is performed. In the interest of minimizing overhead, can the time between the end of technical work (indicated by the draft final report submission) and the end of the project be reduced?

***No. There are a number of tasks, such as the final report review and final meeting, which need to be reviewed and completed before the end of the project. The Energy Commission expects to receive the final report before the end of the project term so that it can be properly reviewed and the contractor has an opportunity to be reimbursed for any required edits and rewrites.***

24. Section III.A. Signed commitment and support letters are often sent as PDF documents from the entity providing the letter. Can the directions be modified to allow PDF files for commitment and support letters?

***Signed commitment and support letters may be sent as PDF documents from a scan of the original (i.e. no electronic signatures). All other documents must be in the format described in Section III.A of the Program Opportunity Notice. Section III.A (Page 16) has been revised to indicate this change.***

25. Section III.A specifies 11-point Ariel (excluding spreadsheets). Is 11-point Ariel required for resumes and commitment and support letters?

***This requirement is not required for the Commitment and Support letters, but the resumes must use 11-point Arial font. Section III.A (Page 16) has been revised to indicate this requirement.***

26. CEQA (Attachments 1 and 8). If a proposer specifies that the proposed work is not considered to be a project under CEQA (thus answers “no” to Question 1 and provides an explanation as to why it is not a project), we interpret that the proposer leave question 2 of the CEQA question in Attachment 1 blank and does not include Attachment 8 in the submittal. Is this correct?

***No. If an applicant answers “no” to Q. 1 on p. 3 of Attachment 1, then the Applicant need not answer Q.2 on that same page. However, irrespective of how questions on Attachment 1 are answered, Attachment 8 must be completed and included in the application as indicated in PON Part III, Section C (page 17 of 35).***

***The Energy Commission must ensure that the appropriate level of environmental review under CEQA is complete prior to advancing a project to a Business Meeting for Energy Commission approval. Thus, no award can be approved, nor can any grant be executed, until CEQA is satisfied. The Energy Commission reserves the right to cancel proposed awards that do not meet this CEQA compliance deadline.***

## Solicitation Information

27. Will the PowerPoint slides be available?

***Yes, the presentation is available at the Energy Commission website:***

***<http://www.energy.ca.gov/contracts/epic.html#PON-14-303>***

### Project Group 1

28. Group 1, convert forest slash to bio-oil. How far should the applicant go to demonstrate how the bio-oil will be used for electricity generation?

***The pathway from feedstock to electricity conversion must be discussed. The applicant should provide details of the complete conversion process. The technical***

**scoring team will evaluate applications based on technical merit and technical approach, among other criteria, as described in the PON.**

29. Could a project that proved gasification of forest materials but focused primarily on transportation strategies and drying and compressing materials prior to transportation in lieu of making more expensive and smaller modular and/or portable systems qualify for funding under project Group 1?

**It is the applicant's responsibility to determine whether or not their particular proposed project is eligible for funding, by reviewing the Eligibility Requirements in Section II of PON-14-303.**

**No, the project described above, without any additional information, would not be eligible for funding. Projects funded under this solicitation must generate electricity and benefit IOU ratepayers.**

### **Project Group 2:**

30. Regarding project group 2 (Waste to Energy), is there a requirement for a pilot-scale testing to have a minimum threshold such as using a certain tons of waste per month?

**No. There is no lower or upper limit for the amount of feedstock to be used, but details about the feedstock, including volumes to be converted, should be provided in the application, and explained in Attachment 12 Cost and Benefit Calculations.**

31. Our technology is a novel approach to reduce energy use at wastewater treatment plants while increasing the biogas potential when waste biomass is added to anaerobic digesters. Wastewater isn't identified under focus group #2. Would a technology that makes reductions in energy use and increases in energy generation be applicable?

**It is the applicant's responsibility to determine whether or not their particular proposed project is eligible for funding, by reviewing the Eligibility Requirements in Section II of PON-14-303. The Energy Commission cannot at this time give advice as to whether or not your particular project is eligible for funding, because all details are not known.**

**A project such as the one described above, without any additional information, appears to be eligible. Please see response to Question 7, above.**

32. Provide clarity on grid parity – is it wholesale? Is it retail?

**Biomass generation includes a large number of different technologies. The goal is to achieve cost parity with fossil fuel generation. The applicant needs to provide an explanation of how the project will achieve cost parity with fossil fuel generation.**

**Please refer to the following Energy Commission document for additional information on cost parity:**

**Estimated Cost of New Renewable and Fossil Generation in California;**  
**<http://www.energy.ca.gov/2014publications/CEC-200-2014-003/CEC-200-2014-003-SD.pdf>**

### **Project Group 3**

33. For group #3 projects, can the demonstration of a smart inverter be done on a university owned distribution circuit which is located within a CA IOU service territory?

**Yes.**

34. If a bioenergy project is able to demonstrate a net benefit to one or all three CA IOUs for use in electrical vehicles in California would this kind of bioenergy qualify for EPIC funds?

***It is the applicant's responsibility to determine whether or not their particular proposed project is eligible for funding, by reviewing the Eligibility Requirements in Section II of PON-14-303.***

***A net benefit such as that described above is fine, but if that is the only benefit, then the project will not qualify for funding under this solicitation. Most important is that the application shows benefits for electricity generation; connection to EVs is a secondary benefit.***

35. How many awards are anticipated for each category?

***The estimated awards for each category are as shown below:***

***Category 1: 3 awards; category 2: 3 awards; category 3: 2 awards; and category 4: 5 awards, with an estimated total of 13 awards. These numbers may change. The number of awards is in part dependent upon the amount of funds requested for the projects that are recommended for awards.***

36. While preliminary bench-scale results would help a proposal, are they required for this PON?

***No. Bench scale results are not required. However, the application needs to include a discussion of the stage of development for the proposed technology.***

37. For project group 3, would a project that matures and demonstrates a new type of inverter be considered responsive? The solicitation makes it seem like you must evaluate existing inverters rather than a new one.

***It is the applicant's responsibility to determine whether or not their particular proposed project is eligible for funding, by reviewing the Eligibility Requirements in Section II of PON-14-303.***

***In general, new inverter topologies are allowed. The application should describe how the new inverter topology is better than, or better meets a new need than, existing technology. All inverters used in this PON must meet IEEE 1547a-2014 and must be demonstrated on an IOU distribution circuit. The applicant can be anywhere in California.***

38. In the description of Project Group #3 (p.13 and 14), there is no reference made to the power level expected for the smart inverters in either the laboratory or pilot unit scale. Is there any minimum size that is required?

***There is no minimum size requirement. However, the solicitation is focused on distributed generation. See response to Question number 39 for additional information.***

39. Is there any specific power integration level required for the inverters in the laboratory or pilot stages? Single-phase vs. three-phase and low voltage (240V/120V residential voltage) or other voltages?

***The proposed inverters should be for installation on a real-world distribution circuit located in IOU territory, either at the utility or customer side of the meter. They may be either single-phase or three-phase, depending on the installation.***

40. Is there any requirement to have specific pilot locations proposed in the submission and, if so, are there requirements for getting site approvals and site work completed as part of the project?

***For project group 3 the pilot demonstrations must be on a real-world distribution circuit located in IOU territory. Pilot locations must be specified in the application, and the appropriate commitment letters have to be submitted in the application (for details, see Attachment 11). Applicants must submit a completed and signed CEQA form (Attachment 8) to identify the necessary site approvals (e.g., permits). It is the applicants' responsibility to determine the necessary site work involved and include it in the Scope of Work and Budget documents of the application, See, e.g., Attachment 6 Task 1.8.***

41. Under Project Group #3, the solicitation mentions that "This solicitation ... uses the commercially-available 1547a smart inverter to advance PV." Would a project that uses EPIC funding to add 1547a communications functionality to an innovative pre-commercial inverter design, and then demonstrates that system, be aligned with state objectives?

***It is the applicant's responsibility to determine whether or not their particular proposed project is eligible for funding, by reviewing the Eligibility Requirements in Section II of PON-14-303.***

***A project such as that described above, without any additional information, would likely be aligned with the objectives of this solicitation. The IEEE 1547a-2014 standard became effective on May 21, 2014 and does not yet include communications requirements. A project under this solicitation can propose an inverter design that includes communications functionality that aligns with the communication functions being considered by the Smart Inverter Working Group as shown at the following CEC/CPUC Smart DER Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) Strategies and Alternative Configurations link:***

[http://www.energy.ca.gov/electricity\\_analysis/rule21/documents/communications/](http://www.energy.ca.gov/electricity_analysis/rule21/documents/communications/)

42. Is Project Group #3 looking only for PV inverter solutions, or would an integrated system that includes inverter and energy storage in one unit to reduce cost be of interest to the state?

***It is the applicant's responsibility to determine whether or not their particular proposed project is eligible for funding, by reviewing the Eligibility Requirements in Section II of PON-14-303.***

***In general, an integrated inverter/energy storage unit is eligible under this solicitation. The applicant should explain how one of the applications of this unit can "reduce PV integration costs, and enable higher penetrations of PV at the distribution level" (see Section I, Project Group 3, PON page 1), commensurate with the objectives of this group, and compare with other existing inverter technologies.***

43. For Project Group #3, two stages of research and development are outlined in the solicitation (page 14). Are both of these stages required, or is this just one possible approach?

***Both stages of research and development are required for this solicitation. The project must be a comprehensive test and demonstration project.***

44. For Project Group #3, four bullet points are outlined on page 13/14 of the solicitation. To be competitive, does a proposal need to respond to all bullet points, multiple bullet points, or just one bullet point?

***The proposal should address all four bullet points.***

45. For Project Group #3, the stated goal is to "reduce PV integration costs." What are the state's estimates for the relative installation cost of a "smart" inverter vs. a "dumb" inverter given that smart inverter hardware costs will always be higher? Does the state have any reference material to quantify the cost impact of "smart" vs. "dumb" inverters?

***The applicant must determine and show reduced PV integration costs. The application should include an explanation of how the proposed smart inverter will reduce PV integration costs and provide other benefits to customers, grid operators, and IOU ratepayers.***

46. For Project Group #3, if we propose a new technology that enables "development of zero-net energy communities and localized renewable-based microgrids" but that is not yet a "commercially-available 1547a smart inverter", how would that proposal be evaluated versus a competing proposal that developed no technology but performed a pilot demonstration of commercially-available inverters? Is the state looking for demonstration of existing technology, or development and demonstration of new technology?

***It is the applicant's responsibility to determine whether or not their particular proposed project is eligible for funding, by reviewing the Eligibility Requirements in Section II of PON-14-303. The Energy Commission cannot at this time give advice as to whether or not your particular project is eligible for funding, because all details are not known.***

***For group 3, we are looking for proposals to evaluate advanced inverter functionality and interoperability to enable high-penetration distributed PV. Applied research on both new inverter technologies and improvements to existing technologies are considered responsive to this solicitation. Microgrids and zero net energy communities are not a focus for this group, but the results of this research could potentially enable "development of zero-net energy communities and localized renewable-based microgrids" (See Section II, Project Group 3, bullet 3, page 14).***

***Information related to the microgrid solicitation - Demonstrating Secure, Reliable Microgrids and Grid-Linked Electric Vehicles to Build Resilient, Low-Carbon Facilities and Communities – is available at the following link:***

***<http://www.energy.ca.gov/contracts/epic.html#PON-14-301>***

47. Page 14 of 35 - "proposals should aim to increase solar PV penetrations at distribution above the 15% standard of IEEE" - does this mean a pilot or demonstration must be on a feeder above this 15% penetration level?

***Since this is a solicitation for applied research, a pilot or lab-scale demonstration should be able to simulate the inverters' operation under a simulated 15% or higher PV penetration level. Your proposal should explain how you are going to show that by using IEEE1547a-2014 inverters, the 15% level for a line section can be safely exceeded without triggering an undetected island, and perhaps raise the limit requiring a Supplemental Review Process under California Rule 21.***

48. On page 1, the solicitation mentions CA Rule 21 and IEEE 1547 standards. To enable participation of customer-side PV systems through smart inverter controls and integration,

can we consider interoperability with other existing grid-connection standards that are supported by the CA utilities?

**Yes.**

49. On page 2, the solicitation mentions, “solicitation entitled, Developing Technology Improvements for a Flexible and Responsive Electricity Grid, will prepare for the smart inverter Phase II communications capabilities.” Does this mean this solicitation, PON-14-303, will exclude any communication related capabilities for advanced inverter controls?

***The smart inverter Phase II communications capabilities are not required for this solicitation. However, any communication-related capabilities for advanced inverter controls are not excluded and may help strengthen the technical merit of an application.***

50. The solicitation calls out area 3 as addressing phase 1 communication plans for the smart inverter working group, and a future PON as addressing phase 2. If technology proposed addresses both phases, is this eligible for consideration under PON 14-303?

***It is the applicant’s responsibility to determine whether or not their particular proposed project is eligible for funding, by reviewing the Eligibility Requirements in Section II of PON-14-303.***

***Hypothetically, if a technology is otherwise eligible, and that addresses a phase 1 communications plan for the smart inverter working group as well as a phase 2, it would be eligible for consideration. However, the primary focus of this solicitation is a phase 1 communication plan.***

51. What is meant by “autonomous grid functions?”

***The autonomous grid functions mentioned in this solicitation are described in the link below along with additional information about activities associated with the Smart Inverter Working Group:***

***Rule 21 Smart Inverter Working Group Technical Reference Materials:***

***[http://www.energy.ca.gov/electricity\\_analysis/rule21/](http://www.energy.ca.gov/electricity_analysis/rule21/).***

52. Where can we access the “Phase I Automated Functions recommendations of the Smart Inverter Working Group assembled by the CPUC?”

***See answer to question #51 above.***

#### **Project Group 4:**

53. Regarding the Project Group 4, the PON gave an example of a low cost, high performance building integrated PV (BIPV) materials, how do you determine a “low cost” factor, when the BIPV technology is new and has not been commercialized? Do you compare the projected cost for a BIPV with a conventional PV in the marketplace?

**Yes, compare the cost to the closest possible technology with regard to your project and clearly describe the additional benefits of the proposed advanced technologies. Attachment 12 should be used as a guide on preparing cost and benefit calculations.**

## **IOUs**

54. We are not an IOU. We want to demonstrate the technology in SMUD territory, in terms of gas usage in Sacramento within PG&E territory. If we help displace natural gas, would SMUD qualify?

***It is the applicant's responsibility to determine whether or not their particular proposed project is eligible for funding, by reviewing the Eligibility Requirements in Section II of PON-14-303. The Energy Commission cannot at this time give advice as to whether or not your particular project is eligible for funding, because all details are not known.***

***An application based on the above facts, with no other facts known, would not be eligible for funding. The demonstration must be in an electric service area of the three IOU's (PG&E, SDG&E, and SCE as shown in screening criteria 8, PON page 25).***

55. Clarify about territory requirements. Can an applicant be outside of IOU territory? How much work can be done at UCR (outside territory) vs. inside?

***The applicant can be outside the IOU territory. The pilot demonstration must be located in an IOU service territory; there is no restriction on the amount of funding to be spent inside IOU territory as long as Energy Commission funding portion falls within the defined minimum and maximum Energy Commission grant amounts. The project must provide IOU electricity ratepayer benefits.***

56. Are CA IOUs eligible to lead or participate as a partner in a proposal?

**Yes.**

57. Will a POU (as a public entity) outside of IOU territories qualify as Prime Applicant to both PONs 303 and 305? (See page 136 of First EPIC Investment Plan, where it says--- Demonstration and deployment activities will typically be conducted in investor owned utility (IOU) service territories. However, projects located outside IOU service territories may be considered, if there is a strong case that the project demonstrates IOU electricity ratepayer benefits).

***No. POU's do not qualify as Prime Applicants or Subcontractors. Page 70 of the Phase 2 decision (D.12-05-037) states: "Finally, considering the source of EPIC funds and consistent with the key guiding principle of producing IOU electricity ratepayer***

***benefits, funds administered by the California Energy Commission may not be used for any purposes associated with POU activities...”.***

## **General**

58. What is the recommended number of members for TAC committee?

***This depends on the individual project; however, there are typically 5 to 7 members in a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).***

59. Has the Energy Commission published results for success rates for applicants that use professional grant writers?

**No, the Energy Commission has not performed a study of this type.**

60. Will any different information be covered at the SCAQMD meeting?

***The presentation at the southern California pre-application workshop may vary depending on questions received from the audience. Questions received at the workshops and in writing before the deadline will be posted on the Energy Commission’s website at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/contracts/epic.html#PON-14-303> . Energy Commission staff attempt to capture verbal questions, but all questions should be submitted in writing to help ensure that they were captured correctly.***