

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FROM THE 2012 TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM RFP WORKSHOP

Approximately 32 people in attendance (11 Fresno, 0 Bakersfield, 1 Modesto, 9 EPA San Francisco, and 11 EPA Los Angeles)

BYD Company Limited (BYD)
California Clean Air Technologies (CCAT)
Complete Coach Works (CCW)
Gladstein, Neandross & Associates (GNA)
Medical Waste Services (MWS)
Propel Fuels (PF)
RCM International LLC (RCM)
Sustainable Conservation (SC)

1. **QUESTION:** Are the local funds available through the program an eligible match for state funds? (SC)

ANSWER: That question should be directed to the state agency from which you are seeking funding since it is a requirement of that funding source.

2. **QUESTION:** Can state funding be considered leveraged funding for a proposal? (SC)

ANSWER: Yes, that is considered to be leveraged funding.

3. **QUESTION:** Can federal funding be considered leveraged funding for a proposal? (SC)

ANSWER: The District utilizes multiple funding sources to fund Technology Advancement Program projects, including local funds and an EPA grant. EPA cannot leverage their funding with any other federal funding sources (i.e. Department of Energy, etc.) so please identify any federal funding sources your project will be utilizing in your proposal. The District will do its best to allocate local funding sources to projects that are utilizing other federal funds in their project.

4. **QUESTION:** Is there a maximum percentage of project funding that the District can fund for a project? (RCM)

ANSWER: While there is not a maximum percentage of funding that the District can contribute to a Technology Advancement Program project, there are some expenses

which are not eligible uses of program funds. Those expenses must be cost shared by the applicant, please refer to the RFP section 4.2.2 for eligible expenses. The District prefers to see that there are other partners involved in its projects, which is why “Program Funding Required and Resource Leveraging” is one of the project evaluation criteria.

5. **QUESTION:** How can you measure directly emitted PM2.5 emissions from a mobile source? We have methods of measuring total PM emissions, but we are not familiar with methods for measuring directly emitted PM2.5. (CCAT)

ANSWER: There are EPA approved testing methods for measuring directly emitted PM2.5 emissions. If you have methods of calculating total PM emissions, that information can be included in your proposal. You are not restricted to only including directly emitted PM2.5 emissions reductions.

6. **QUESTION:** For an electric vehicle technology advancement project, should we use the California grid mix or assume zero emissions? (CCW)

ANSWER: You can assume zero emissions for an electric vehicle project.

7. **QUESTION:** Can a proposed project take place outside of the San Joaquin Valley? (MWS)

ANSWER: The District generally prefers that its Technology Advancement Program projects take place within the Valley because it demonstrates that the technology has significance for Valley sources and could be utilized within the Valley when it is ready for commercialization. However, demonstrations that take place outside the Valley will not be automatically eliminated if you can demonstrate that the Valley has a need for the technology.

8. **QUESTION:** Would Cal Poly San Luis Obispo count as a local university in the evaluation criteria for “Building Capacity at Local Colleges and Universities”? (CCAT)

ANSWER: Cal Poly San Luis Obispo would not count as a local university since it is not located within the Valley. However, it would be better to have some level of involvement from a California University than to either involve an out-of-state university or no universities at all.

9. **QUESTION:** Does the “Building Capacity at Local Colleges and Universities” evaluation criteria include collaboration with Valley community colleges? (CCAT)

ANSWER: Yes, we encourage any involvement with any Valley colleges or universities (including city or community colleges).

10. QUESTION: Would a project proposal score be reduced for something that has been done before but is not widely accepted yet? (PF)

ANSWER: A project proposal score may be reduced as many technologies that have been demonstrated but have not been widely adopted are better suited to other funding sources designed for technology adoption rather than demonstration. For example, an E85 fuel project may be better suited to the California Energy Commission's Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program.

11. QUESTION: Will there be any advantage or preference given to projects using United States made parts or projects utilizing Valley contractors? (BYD)

ANSWER: No, there will not be an advantage since that does not fall under any of the evaluation criteria. The District would encourage the use of local contractors.

12. QUESTION: If our current Authority to Construct (ATC) has annual testing requirements mandated by the Valley Air District and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, would research practices be held to the same emissions limits under the current ATC? (SC)

ANSWER: As far as source testing or testing during a research project like this, the District does not generally hold research testing periods as full compliance tests and would not hold the facility subject to the ATC or PTO limits during that period. However, any new equipment being utilized needs to be permitted through the District or exempted from permitting (per Rule 2021) prior to any testing.

13. QUESTION: Could we present an alternative fuel engine project as a potential project? (GNA)

ANSWER: Yes, but you should ensure that the proposed technology is cleaner than engine technologies that are readily available and are currently being utilized.

14. QUESTION: For an alternative fuel engine project, is it helpful to compare the baseline emissions of existing technologies to the emissions from the new technology we are proposing? (GNA)

ANSWER: Yes, if the technology demonstration project you are proposing is a new version of an existing technology it is very helpful to compare the potential emissions reductions that could be achieved by switching to your technology. One tool that

could be helpful for some projects is EPA's Diesel Emission Quantifier (DEQ). This tool may be useful for calculating emissions from existing engine technologies.

The web page for the DEQ can be found here:

<http://www.epa.gov/cleandiesel/quantifier/>

15. QUESTION: Does the District prefer to have emissions reductions quantified rather than stating the emissions standards of the technology? (GNA)

ANSWER: The program requires you to quantify the emissions reductions from a typical project per section 7.1.8 of the RFP. Stating the emissions standards of the technology without quantifying emissions reductions would be insufficient to meet this proposal requirement.

16. QUESTION: Since many new technologies are not EPA certified, can they be sold to fleets for utilization? Our understanding is that uncertified technologies cannot be utilized over a certain period of time. (GNA)

ANSWER: The California Air Resources Board can issue an exemption to fleet operators for research periods where they need to utilize uncertified equipment.

17. QUESTION: Would job creation in California count as a co-benefit or would this be restricted to job creation in the Valley? (CCW)

ANSWER: Job creation would not be a factor in evaluating the co-benefits of a project. Emission related co-benefits will be evaluated as per section 5.2 of the RFP.