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All questions marked with in asterisk (\*) were submitted to the previous FPIP solicitations, GFO-18-901 GFO-18-903, and GFO-19-901, and have been included here. Some responses were modified to be consistent with solicitation, GFO-20-307.

# Table 1. Project Eligibility

| No. | Project Eligibility Question/Answer |
| --- | --- |
|  | I was wondering if I would like to replace an old chiller with a used one that could show greenhouse gas savings, would this qualify for the Food Production Investment Program (FPIP)? |
|  | No, used equipment is not an eligible FPIP cost. |
|  | 1. Can we apply for this grant if we are looking to add emission-reducing equipment to new machinery? There are a few “eligible technologies” listed in the Solicitation Manual, Section II.B that don’t explicitly state that it must be for “retrofit or replacement of existing” equipment (i.e., machine drive controls, internal metering, etc.). As we are a new company and won’t be operational until early spring next year (soon after the application deadline), it’ll all be new equipment that we’re obtaining and adding from the start to strive for “higher efficiency than current industry standards” (Solicitation Manual, Section II.B). We’re hoping to have this in place as soon as we start running, but if this is the requirement, we’ll have to run without them for three months. 2. On a similar note, if we wish to purchase more efficient equipment (i.e. boilers) that state they must be replacing existing equipment (same Section II.B), do they strictly have to be replacing old equipment? Again, since we are a new company and are trying to start with the right equipment… 3. If we wish to consolidate multiple types of equipment in one application and it turns out a couple of them are not actually eligible, is it possible to get grants for the pieces that do qualify or will the entire application be turned down? 4. Lastly, our facility isn’t exactly located in a priority population-occupied area, but it is very close to one (literally, probably just a few blocks away). The scoring schedule seems to be an “all or nothing” type in this particular field, but do you believe it would be worth mentioning that we wish to hire locally, including that neighboring low-income community? |
|  | 1. Retrofit or replacement of existing technologies is applicable to all eligible technology categories as listed in Solicitation Manual, Section II.B. New facilities are ineligible for FPIP funding. Facility must be existing and operational at the time of application submittal. See response to questions 49 and 50. 2. The proposed equipment must replace existing equipment at a food processing facility. 3. Please refer to Solicitation Manual, Section II.B for a complete list and definitions of eligible technologies and their definitions. You may consolidate eligible technologies under one application. 4. To receive priority population points the food processing facility must be located in a disadvantaged and/or low-income areas that meet the definition given in Section II.A.4 of the solicitation manual, and meet other requirements as listed in Section III.D.9. |
|  | Will refurbished equipment furnished with new high efficiency motors, e.g. centrifuges, be eligible for the grant? |
|  | Retrofit and replacement of existing inefficient motor-driven systems are eligible for FPIP funding. Purchase of used equipment that is refurbished with high efficiency motors is not eligible for FPIP funding. The installed equipment must be new and result in GHG emissions reductions. |
|  | Would replacing burners qualify under the new GFO-20-307 solicitation? Specifically, would changing out the burners on the boilers for new ones, to get a reduction in Nox and natural gas, without also changing the boilers, be a qualifying project? |
|  | Yes, burner replacement for an existing boiler is eligible under “boilers, economizers” technology category. |
|  | Our Thermal Energy Storage solution includes "drop-in" addition of Phase Change Material (PCM) within low temperature refrigeration systems, such as food production and distribution freezers, and the additional of supplemental intelligent controls to optimize the operation of the existing refrigeration systems, reduce energy consumption, and GHG emissions. We will also be operating sites under California’s Self Generation Incentive Program (SGIP) based on the new GHG generation stack forecast system to further minimize GHG emissions.    The 2016 CA ETCC study documents the technology (report attached). Our technology combines advanced refrigeration controls with phase change material which improves energy efficiency by the following:   * PCM reduces the need to cool space temperature below target temperature as compared to conventional dead-band set-points. * Evaporators can operate more efficiently correlating to higher evaporator suction temperatures achieving between 2-3 percent thermal capacity per degree of suction temperature relief. * Intelligent temperature controls can accommodate for envelope conductive heat transfer rates, i.e. Q=U\*A\*∆T. * Larger surface area and lower R-value of the PCM results in significantly increased heat transfer rate as compared to stored product. PCM can therefore be "charged" and "discharged" specifically to support the product temperature within the Freezers while minimizing the use of energy depending on time of day or GHG impact. * Reduced compressor runtimes and equipment optimization deliver net Energy Efficiency savings. * The improved temperature control also reduces defrost requirements. Defrost Cycles, either electric, hot gas, or otherwise, force heat into the space which must eventually be removed. Any reduction or optimization of defrost then reduces the total refrigeration requirement of the site: reducing energy consumption.   Currently there are 11 of our TES systems in place in CA, demonstrating market adoption beyond an emerging technology, and we request to be included in this grant to further assist the food production industry in reducing energy use and GHG emissions. |
|  | Yes, this technology could be eligible under “Refrigeration system optimization” category if it can show result in GHG emissions reductions. |
|  | We are working with the Del Monte's fruit processing facility in Modesto and they have thousands of tons of waste material, such as peach pits, grape stems, apricot pits, plus peach, pear peels and cores. Traditionally these rot, generating methane and CO2 which is returned to the atmosphere as greenhouse gases. We plan to submit a proposal that can process these waste streams in a gasifier to generate a syngas that can be fed into the boiler at the facility, displacing fossil fuels. The remainder of this feedstock is biochar (basically pure carbon), that is a soil amendment and sequesters a very significant amount of CO2. The unit can also be configured as a combined heat and power configuration, where the fuel can be processed in a turbine-generator, generating electricity and then using the heat at the facility.    Would this biomass to fuel carbon sequestering gasifier technology be eligible for this program? |
|  | No, this technology is not eligible for funding under this solicitation. For a complete list of eligible technologies, please refer to the Solicitation Manual, Section II.B. |
|  | Is there a restriction on the eligible fuel used to power the upgraded system? |
|  | There is no restriction on the eligible fuel, however the project must reduce greenhouse gas emissions and fall under an eligible technology category (See Solicitation Manual, Section II.B.). In addition, the FPIP Calculator Tool only has inputs for electricity, natural gas fuel, renewable electricity, and renewable natural gas. Supplemental calculations should be provided if the proposed fuel is not one of these options. Please refer to the Solicitation Manual, Section II.B for a complete list of eligible technologies. |
|  | Knowing that food processing and packaging consume and waste large amount of produce wash water. R.O (reverse osmosis) filtration consume 9,100 kWh per acre foot of treated water. Would an energy input free, zero GHG emissions qualify for treatment of food processing waste/ wash water treatment and recycling qualify for GFO 307 grant? |
|  | No, technologies which focus on wastewater treatment are not eligible for funding. |
|  | 1. Does the calculation of metric tons CO2e include the indirect gassing associated with electric power use at the utility company? 2. Would a solar project be eligible? |
|  | 1. Yes, the GHG emissions reduction calculated in Attachment 8 accounts for reduced emissions associated with decreased use of grid electricity. For more information, please refer to the FPIP Quantification Methodology, equation 2, available at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/cci-quantification-benefits-and-reporting-materials> 2. No, solar projects are not eligible for this solicitation. |
|  | Is replacing a wastewater treatment equipment by an energy efficient one in the Food Industry allowed for funding? |
|  | No, technologies which focus on wastewater treatment are not eligible for funding. |
|  | Our company, Rebound Technologies, has a cooling technology that does indeed add capacity, but in doing so increases frozen food production output per kWh. So, this isn’t an overall decrease in energy use, but instead a decrease in energy use per lb. of product produced. Is FPIP funding available for such a technology? |
|  | No, projects which decrease energy use per amount of food produced but do not reduce overall GHG emissions are not eligible for funding. |
| 1. \* | Would the replacement of freeze dryers or freeze concentrators with energy-efficient membrane concentration technology qualify if it has been shown to reduce GHG emissions? |
| 1. \* | This technology may be eligible for Tier I under the “mechanical dewatering” category if it meets all of the Tier I requirements listed in the Solicitation Manual, Section II.B. |
| 1. \* | 1. If production volume increases, whether due to normal business changes or improved equipment performance, during the project, can the emissions reductions be normalized to units of sales? 2. Would upgrades or replacement of existing process equipment that reduce product waste and overages be considered if those reductions eliminate the energy consumption associated with their creation (e.g. elimination of energy consumed to cook and/or freeze products that are ultimately scrapped for quality reasons or energy invested in the cooking and/or freezing the portion of a product unit that is over its intended size or weight)? Would they fall under a currently listed eligible technology? 3. Would upgrades or replacements that reduce energy consumption of existing ovens, fryers, cookers, etc. and their associated heating systems (e.g. higher efficiency heat exchangers or reduced infiltration loads) be considered? Would they fall under a currently listed eligible technology? |
| 1. \* | 1. No. GHG emission reductions must be isolated to each piece of equipment (rather than the unit of sales). 2. Waste reducing technologies are not eligible for FPIP unless the technology can fit under a currently listed eligible technology, and directly reduce GHG emissions. The description provided is insufficient to determine whether it would fit under any existing category. 3. Replacements of ovens, fryers, and cookers with higher efficiency equipment is eligible. High-efficiency heat exchangers would be a listed project that would fit under the “steam traps, condensate return, heat recovery” category. |
| 1. \* | Are off-road vehicles eligible for funding? For example, replacing a diesel-powered yard hostler or forklift with a zero-emission all-electric yard hostler or forklift? This would be for vehicles/equipment that do not leave the facility boundary. |
| 1. \* | No, electric conversions for mobile sources is not eligible for FPIP. |
| 1. \* | There is an emerging technology to improve the boiler combustion efficiency, by optimizing air/fuel ratio, not by oxygen trimming, which is listed in Tier I, but by the online measurement of fuel btu value. This technology is known to be more efficient than oxygen trimming, since the fuel quality of natural gas is varying by season and region. There are several companies to develop so-called “online Wobbe Index analyzer” or “online calorimeter”. Here are some links for the these product.   * <https://www.hobre.com/files/products/Wobbe_Index_general_information.pdf> * <http://www.ankersmid.com/default.aspx?language=english&menuid=6356>   I am suggesting to add this emerging technology to the eligible technology list. |
| 1. \* | This technology may be eligible under the “Internal metering and software to manage and control electricity, natural gas and/or fossil fuel use if part of a larger project that reduces energy usage” category if it meets all of requirements listed in Section II.B. This includes greater GHG emission reductions and higher efficiency than current industry standard and commercially available and drop-in ready. Please note that this technology category must be paired with other eligible technology(ies) and cannot be funded as a standalone measure. |
| 1. \* | We are evaluating the possibility of retiring (3) 1950 vintage natural gas only fired boilers each with a 62 MMBTU/hr burner and replacing them with (2) new water tube boilers. The new boilers would be dual fired (natural gas and biogas when available). The biogas is currently generated onsite and is being used in a different boiler. The new boilers will deliver higher efficiencies than the current boilers. They will also be equipped with low-NOx burners, an economizer, automatic oxygen trim, automatic burner turndown that follows load, variable speed drives on combustion air fans, and automatic blowdown controls. Would this project be eligible for funding? |
| 1. \* | This project may be an eligible project under the “Boiler, economizers” category if it meets the requirements. |
| 1. \* | Do you know if moving to an ammonia chilling system would be a project that could potentially obtain funding? |
| 1. \* | This project may be an eligible project under “refrigeration system optimization” and/or “low-GWP refrigerants” if it meets the requirements as described in Section II.B of the Solicitation Manual. |
| 1. \* | Are freezers and quick-freezing eligible for funding? |
| 1. \* | Yes, freezers are eligible for Tier I funding under the “Refrigeration system optimization” and/or “Low-GWP refrigerants” technology categories. Any refrigeration/freezer replacements must use low GWP refrigerants as defined in Section I.B. |
| 1. \* | Would freezer insulation or a rebuilt freezer qualify for funding? |
| 1. \* | Both may be eligible for Tier I funding if they meet the requirements under the “Refrigeration system optimization” and/or “Process equipment insulation” technology categories in Section II.B. There is not enough information provided to determine what “rebuilt” is referring to. Please note, used equipment is not an eligible FPIP cost. |
| 1. \* | Do LED lighting upgrades and/or advanced network lighting controls qualify for this program? |
| 1. \* | No, lighting is not an eligible technology for FPIP. |
| 1. \* | Under Tier I, there is an eligibility for internal metering and software to manage and control electricity, natural gas and/or fossil fuel use if part of a project that reduces energy usage. Is that “if part of” referring to being part of a larger project proposed to the California Energy Commission (CEC) or if part of a larger project conceived at the corporate level as campus-wide energy efficiency enhancement program? |
| 1. \* | The “if part of” does not refer to being part of a corporate level or campus-wide project but part of a Tier I project under the same FPIP application. Internal metering must be part of a larger project that involves other energy efficiency measures; otherwise, there would not be any measurable GHG emission reductions. Thus, an internal metering project must be combined with another Tier I technology in the application form and the energy savings and GHG emission reductions of this combined project discussed in the project narrative. |
| 1. \* | For steam traps, is only replacement of failed open steam traps eligible or is upgrade to higher efficiency (advanced technology) steam traps eligible too? |
| 1. \* | Upgrading existing, operating steam traps to higher efficiency steam traps is eligible for funding. Retrofit and replacement of existing equipment is eligible for funding if it fits within the technologies listed in the solicitation manual, Section II.B.1 Project Focus. |
| 1. \* | Most of these food processing facilities have fleets transferring products; does CEC consider hydrogen based EVs for transportation? |
| 1. \* | No, this project is not eligible under FPIP. |
| 1. \* | If we have a project that eliminates 1,200,000 road miles from CA highways, are we able to provide that emission reduction calculation as part of the project? |
| 1. \* | No. The emissions reductions must be from the facility. This program is for on-site reductions for food processing facilities. Therefore, emissions from transportation are not eligible. |
| 1. \* | Would bio filter technology (which could reduce the need to truck in compost) be eligible for the grant? |
| 1. \* | No, the GHG reductions have to occur onsite at an eligible food processing facility as defined in Section II.A of the Solicitation Manual. |
| 1. \* | Are Selective Catalytic Reducers an eligible equipment? |
| 1. \* | Selective Catalytic Reducers (SCR) are eligible for reimbursement **ONLY IF** it is a required component to the GHG reducing technology being installed. NOx reductions will be considered as a co-benefit and would not count towards GHG reductions. |
| 1. \* | Is the following an eligible technology? Dissolved Air Flotation (DAF) to replace conventional clarifiers or solids separation to increase the solids concentration in the sludge for disposal or further processing. This higher solids content with the DAF will reduce the NG costs for sludge dryers and reduce hauling related GHG emissions. |
| 1. \* | No, technologies which focus on wastewater treatment facilities are not eligible for funding. Any technologies focused on reduction in vehicle miles traveled is not eligible for FPIP. |
| 1. \* | If the technology has been proven in pilot scale eligible? |
| 1. \* | A technology that has only been proven in pilot scale will not qualify as an eligible technology. Please refer to the technology requirements as listed in Section II.B of the Solicitation Manual. |
| 1. \* | Is it a requirement that technology be used outside of CA? |
| 1. \* | No. There is no requirement on where the technology has been used to be eligible, the technology must meet the requirements listed in Section II.B. |
| 1. \* | Does a project that produces renewable electricity from food production byproducts for sale to the utility grid via the BioMAT tariff qualify? |
| 1. \* | No. This type of project is not eligible. The purpose of FPIP is to reduce on-site GHG emissions at eligible food processing plants. |
| 1. \* | I was hoping to get Mechanical Vapor Recompression (MVR) added a qualified project type. MVR’s are large systems that require site specific designs (therefore not “drop-in ready”). |
| 1. \* | This technology would be considered under heat recovery. GHG emission reductions must be shown. |

# Table 2. Applicant and Facility Eligibility

| No. | Applicant and Facility Eligibility Question/Answer |
| --- | --- |
|  | We grow and package culinary herbs at our facility in a potted version and clamshell version. Are we considered a food manufacturer? |
|  | Greenhouse operations do not fall under the eligible NAICS codes, and therefore it would not be eligible for FPIP funding. Only food processors with NAICS codes that begin with 311 (Food Manufacturing) and 3121 (Beverage manufacturing) would qualify for FPIP. |
|  | Can the technologies be installed at a university or does it have to be at an industrial facility? |
|  | All technologies must be installed at a food processing facility in California that meets the required NAICS codes. See the response to question 32. |
|  | Can you give examples of some approved past projects? |
|  | Please use the links below to access previous notices of proposed awards for the FPIP program:  GFO-18-901: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2019-05/GFO-18-901_NOPA_Revised.pdf>  GFO-18-903: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2019-05/GFO-18-903_NOPA.pdf>  GFO-19-901 Round 1: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-01/GFO-19-901%20NOPA_ADA.pdf>  GFO-19-901 Round 2: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-06/GFO-19-901_Addendum_2_NOPA_LTR_TBL.docx> |
|  | Would you consider the target technologies for the controlled environment facilities like greenhouses? |
|  | No, controlled environment facilities such as greenhouses are not eligible for funding. |
| 1. \* | 1. Can you please specify which fuel types are eligible as part of this solicitation? 2. Is this funding able to be combined with other CEC programs and/or 3rd party funds? Are there any restrictions on combining funds? 3. Are there any specific operational requirements within or beyond the grant agreement period? 4. Are there restrictions on incurring expenses before the execution of the grant agreement? Or for example, can match funds be expended after the NOPA? |
| 1. \* | 1. The FPIP funds technologies that reduce GHG emissions associated with food processing plants. Technologies that reduce on-site use of electricity, natural gas, or other fossil fuels are eligible if they are listed as eligible technologies in the Solicitation Manual, Section II.B. Project Requirements. 2. Other CEC programs funds cannot be combined or used as match for FPIP. Solicitation Manual, Section I.F.2 states that match funds do not include: Energy Commission awards, future/contingent awards, or, the cost or value of all non-eligible project costs such as labor, permitting, overhead, etc. If the applicant is leveraging or pursuing funding from multiple sources of the GGRF, the applicant must describe all existing or potential GGRF sources in their application materials. Third party funds from non-CEC sources could be considered as eligible match funds if it meets the requirements of Section I.F.2. 3. Yes. For the purpose of this FPIP application, GHG emissions reductions must be estimated as part of the application process and will need to be verified after installation of the funded equipment (please refer to section II.B.2, Measurement and Verification Plan). The CEC reserves the right to audit and verify savings for up to three years after the project term ends. 4. Yes, in addition to any other requirements in the FPIP Terms and Conditions or this solicitation, the CEC is only obligated to reimburse the Recipient for incurred and paid costs that are (1) incurred during the agreement term; (2) invoiced within the required timeframes of this Agreement; (3) made in accordance with the Agreement’s Budget; and (4) actual and allowable expenses under this Agreement (please see the FPIP Terms and Conditions document, section 8.c, Reimbursable Cost Requirement).   Match funds, like CEC reimbursable funds, must be spent during the agreement. Please refer to the Solicitation Manual, section I.F.2, which states in part, “Match funds must be spent only during the agreement term, either before or concurrently with Energy Commission funds. Match funds also must be reported in invoices submitted to the Energy Commission.”  All reimbursable and match funds must occur within the approved term of the agreement. |
| 1. \* | Is it possible to find out if a cannabis or hemp operation that meets NAICS 311 Food Manufacturing or 3121 Beverage Manufacturing category would be able to apply to this grant? |
| 1. \* | Cannabis or hemp operations will not be eligible at this time under this funding opportunity. |
| 1. \* | The craft beer industry has been identified as a growing energy-intensive industry, and there are several small-to-medium companies in this space that might not meet the threshold (nor potentially have the bandwidth) to participate in this type of a grant individually. However, it might be possible to bundle a number of these companies under a single “aggregator”. This aggregator would submit the grant to implement certain energy efficient technologies across a group of interested companies and serve as the point of contact and administrator. Is this arrangement possible under this GFO? |
| 1. \* | Only bundling of sites under the same ownership is allowed for FPIP grant funding. The applicant must be a California food processor and an “aggregator” arrangement will not be eligible for FPIP funding. |
| 1. \* | Please clarify the following:   1. If we end up bundling multiple opportunities at one site into a single application, does it decrease our chances of qualifying for the overall package relative to multiple separate applications? 2. How far into a project can we be for it to qualify for the program? Obviously it is not a retroactive grant process so past projects aren’t eligible. But what about projects currently in development? Can a project be eligible if a purchase order has been issued but the equipment has not yet been received? |
| 1. \* | 1. Bundling of technologies at one site into one application is allowed, and encouraged. 2. No, the described project would not be eligible for funding. Purchase order(s) must be issued after the grant agreement has been executed (during the agreement term). |
| 1. \* | I am a start-up company. I propose to build 300+ Biomass Powered Greenhouses distributed around the state. Each site is 100 tons/day of Biomass Powering a 10 acre Greenhouse. The Greenhouse space would be Triple Net Leased to individuals. The greenhouses would grow food using 10X less water and use Biomass as the Fuel Source. Am I able to apply for the grant? Am I able to find the matching funds after I win? Banks and Venture Capital have not invested in Gasifies in CA unless there is a power purchase agreement with utilities. I power a Greenhouse. I don't sell Expensive Electricity to the Grid. As a byproduct of powering the Greenhouse I also produce Hydrogen for SuperChargers for EV Transportation. |
| 1. \* | Greenhouse operations do not fall under the eligible NAICS codes, and therefore it would not be eligible for FPIP funding. Only food processors with NAICS codes that begin with 311 (Food Manufacturing) and 3121 (Beverage manufacturing) would qualify for FPIP. |
| 1. \* | 1. Would a Facility be qualified to apply for funding for a project which would reduce electricity use at the Site even if the Company already purchases a community choice 100% sustainable energy at that site location? (For example, MCE Community Choice purchased energy in Napa County). 2. For bundling of technologies and facilities, would the technology have to be the same for all facilities in the bundle? Or if a Company had multiple Facilities in which they wanted to install various GHG reducing technologies, the entire project could be bundle? |
| 1. \* | 1. Yes, the project would qualify if it fits under the eligible technology categories. Statewide emission factors (as set by CARB) must be used to calculate current energy use (baseline) and the resulting energy savings (For more information, please refer to the FPIP quantification document (Attachments 8). 2. No, when bundling facilities, the technologies do not need to be the same. Bundling of technologies and sites (under one ownership) are encouraged. |
| 1. \* | Is the applicant required to be a food processor itself, or can the applicant (and receiver of the funds) be a third party, spending the funds entirely to fund the project benefiting the food processor by delivering lower costs and GHG reduction? If the applicant and receiver of the funds must be the food processor, can they partner with a third party who builds, owns, and operates the resulting facility long term? |
| 1. \* | The applicant must be a food processor, as defined by NAICS codes 311 (Food Manufacturing) and 3121 (Beverage Manufacturing). The food processor must hold title to the equipment purchased with the FPIP grant. However, the food processor can hire a firm to build and operate the project—but these costs are not covered by the grant. All projects must meet the requirements of the solicitation and Section 14 of the FPIP terms and conditions. According to Section 14 of the Terms and Conditions for the FPIP, “*Title to equipment acquired by the Recipient with grant funds will vest in the Recipient*”. Any transfer of ownership during the term of the grant must be approved by the CEC. The FPIP Terms and Conditions can be found at: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/funding-opportunities/funding-resources>. |
| 1. \* | If we have multiple projects, are we to submit multiple applications? |
| 1. \* | It is encouraged to bundle multiple eligible technologies and facilities under the same ownership into one application. Please see Section II.B.3. for additional information. |
| 1. \* | Are bread production facilities which produce food for inmate populations using steam, can we combine them as they are all located at the same institution. Would only the bread production facility qualify? |
| 1. \* | The bread production facility must have the correct NAICS code – NAICS code beginning with 311 (Food Manufacturing) or 3121 (Beverage Manufacturing). You can access the latest NAICS Manual to find the right category codes at: <https://www.census.gov/eos/www/naics/>. In order to look up a company’s NAICS code, you can visit: <https://www.naics.com/> or <https://siccode.com/>. |
| 1. \* | Are Wineries eligible? And if so, is equipment in the field, pumping systems, and other vineyard equipment eligible? |
| 1. \* | Wineries are eligible under NAICS code 3121 for Beverage Manufacturing. Equipment in the field is not eligible. |
| 1. \* | Does this program include food waste in fields, pomace or orchard removal? |
| 1. \* | No, food waste removal is not eligible for funding under FPIP. |
| 1. \* | Is this GFO open to academic institutions? If so, are you open proposals which are basic and/or applied research in nature? |
| 1. \* | No, applicants to this GFO must be food processors. Basic and/or applied research type projects are not eligible under FPIP. |
| 1. \* | If you have an existing facility that generates Greenhouse Gases but is landlocked and you need to move to a larger facility to install new equipment, would new equipment to reduce Greenhouse Gases be eligible at the new location if the old equipment is eliminated/destroyed and not moved? |
| 1. \* | No, all projects must be located at existing food processing facilities and must result in reducing GHG emissions at the existing facility. |
| 1. \* | Regarding measure and monitoring; we are moving into a new location and we will not have three months’ worth of utility history. Can we apply to FPIP funding? |
| 1. \* | No, the project described is ineligible for funding. The program is for existing facilities which have known GHG emission values where projects can provide a measurable reduction in GHG emissions. |
| 1. \* | We are retrofitting a brownfield site that has been out of commission for some time, access to the previous businesses records are not available. What would be an acceptable strategy for determining GHG? |
| 1. \* | The project described is ineligible for FPIP. Only existing, operating facilities qualify for funding. Expansion of existing facilities and re-opening of closed facilities are not eligible. |
| 1. \* | Does a capped facility included in a bundle need to have GHG emissions? |
| 1. \* | Yes, the capped facility included in the bundle must implement projects that reduce GHG emissions if it wants to receive points under Criteria 5 (Section IV.F of the Solicitation Manual). |
| 1. \* | In the eligibility requirements, it says applicant must own or operate one or more food processing facilities. If host partner that is capped applies and receives the grant, but project goes to sister site that’s not capped, would that be eligible? |
| 1. \* | All food processing facilities, under NAICS codes starting with 311 and 3121, are eligible to apply. Refer to Section IV.F Scoring Criterion 5 of the application manual; projects must also be located in the capped facility to obtain full possible points. For example, if a capped facility applies for projects to be implemented at its facility and that of a sister facility (not capped), and this application is awarded a grant, then both projects will be funded. However, if the capped facility later decides to only implement the project at its sister facility, this could result in cancellation of the entire grant award. |
| 1. \* | 1. Can a project qualify for funding if used in an uncapped facility? 2. If the same company has multiple facilities and is also applying for projects? |
| 1. \* | 1. Yes. This project can qualify for funding. However, this project will not receive capped facility points for criterion 5 (Section IV.F of the Solicitation Manual) because the project will be in an uncapped facility. 2. Yes. One entity can apply for multiple projects. |
| 1. \* | Can facilities emitting less than 10,000 metric tons annually be considered for funding? |
| 1. \* | Yes, they are eligible. You would get zero points for Criteria 5 (Section IV.F of the Solicitation Manual) for that criterion if the facility emits less than 10,000 metric tons of CO­2e. |
| 1. \* | Would refurbishment or upgrade of a facility be eligible? Does it have to be brand new? |
| 1. \* | Yes, if the existing facility is operational, then refurbishment or upgrading of this facility would be eligible for FPIP. The installed equipment must be new and result in greater GHG emission reductions than current industry standard. |

# Table 3. Cost Eligibility

| No. | Cost Eligibility Question/Answer |
| --- | --- |
|  | 1. Funding Section 2 Match Funding Requirements – Can match funds come from Utility rebates? 2. Does electrification of equipment with internal combustion propulsion (electric forklifts and charging infrastructure) qualify? 3. Does installation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure for employees and/or food transportation/transfer qualify? 4. Although not listed in the NAIC, grocery stores (food retail) with food prep, food processing, and/ or in-store manufacturing, i.e. masa and tortilla manufacturing and cooking, eligible? 5. On the pre-application call, we believe we heard the funds could cover either the equipment OR the M&V if completed by an outside source. The bid document states it could cover both. Did we misunderstand what was said on the call? 6. Section 2, bullet four, (4) states: "provide a strategy for replacing the funds if they are significantly reduced or lost"    1. Presumably, some or all of matching funds would be paid by the end user. If the end user declines to participate after approvals, what is the repercussion? 7. Section 10. CA based vendors. If a national manufacturer is not based in CA, but operates a CA based branch of operations, does this count? |
|  | 1. Yes, utility rebates are eligible for match funding, but must meet the requirements as specified in the Solicitation Manual, section III.D.7, Commitment and Support Letter Form. 2. No, this technology is not eligible for funding under this solicitation. 3. No, this technology is not eligible for funding under this solicitation. 4. No, the FPIP solicitation specifically targets food production facilities with NAICS codes starting with 311 (food manufacturing) and 3121 (beverage manufacturing). 5. Eligible FPIP cost include equipment and M&V costs if completed by an outside party; however, FPIP covers 65% of these costs as indicated in Section I.F.1 of the solicitation manual. 6. If match funds are lost or reduced during the course of the agreement, the recipient must secure alternative funding to replace the lost funds, or the grant could be in jeopardy. As indicated in the solicitation manual, applicants must submit a match funding commitment letter signed by each representative of the entity, including themselves, or an individual that is committing to providing match funding. This letter must specify the source(s) of match funds (e.g., utility incentive) and a contingency plan should the funds be significantly lost or reduced. In addition, please note that for entities selected for awards, Scope of Work subtask 1.7 states in part, “Match funds must be identified in writing, and the Recipient must obtain any associated commitments before incurring any costs for which the Recipient will request reimbursement.” 7. Yes. A national manufacturer with a CA based branch that provides the equipment used in the grant would be eligible. CA based vendor is defined as a vendor that has the equipment manufactured or has a distribution center in California. |
|  | "Tech Transfer” is identified as a Task. So, can this cost be included in the funding request? |
|  | No, only equipment and measurement and verification costs can be included in the funding request. Please refer to the solicitation manual, Section 1.F.1 Funding and Attachment 4A Prime Budget Form for more information on cost eligibility. |
|  | Should the budget form include installation cost etc. that are not funded by CEC? |
|  | No, installation costs are not eligible for CEC funding or match funds. |
|  | If the headquarter of a company is out of California, but the budget request is for a facility in CA, is this considered a CA-based entity? |
|  | Yes, if the food production facility is located in California it is eligible for funding regardless of the company headquarters location. Please refer to Section II.A.1 Eligibility for more information on eligible facilities. |
|  | Can we apply for qualified work done on boiler in the last 6 months? |
|  | No, all work performed and expenses incurred must occur during the agreement term which follows the awarding and signed approval of the grant agreement. |
|  | What are the limits on funding per proposed project? How many proposed projects may each industry entity submit? |
|  | Award sizes can range from $100,000 to $6 million per project. Any eligible food processor (see Section II.A.1.) can submit one or more applications for Tier I. However, each application must be for a distinct project with no overlap with respect to the tasks described in the Scope of Work, Attachment 3. In addition, the maximum award amount per entity under this solicitation is a total of $6 million. |
| 1. \* | If the utility company does not provide commitment letters stating the value of custom incentivized projects, is the incentive/rebates portion of match funding best addressed by the applicant stating that they are expecting a certain amount from the utility company but are willing to cover that amount even if the utility company does not support it. |
| 1. \* | Applicants must submit a match funding commitment letter signed by each representative of the entity, including themselves, or an individual that is committing to providing match funding. If the match funds are provided by the applicant, a commitment letter from the applicant is needed (please refer to the Solicitation Manual, section III.D.7, Commitment and Support Letter Form). This letter must specify the source(s) of match funds (e.g., utility incentive) and a contingency plan should the funds be significantly lost or reduced. In addition, please note that for entities selected for awards, Scope of Work subtask 1.7 states in part, “Match funds must be identified in writing, and the Recipient must obtain any associated commitments before incurring any costs for which the Recipient will request reimbursement.” |
| 1. \* | 1. When it comes to control related equipment costs, much of the controls are low voltage wiring labor and programming, can those costs be included as part of the project grant? 2. Can the change out of refrigerant of higher GWP with refrigerant of lower GWP be included in the eligible project or in the GHG calculator if it is a high stage refrigerant, tied to a refrigerant retrofit with a low GWP alternative for the low side. E.g. Two stage of the two-stage refrigeration system? |
| 1. \* | 1. No. Labor associated with M&V is eligible if the work is performed by a subcontractor. Installation costs are not eligible along with labor costs from the applicant 2. Change out of refrigerant alone would not be a qualifying project under FPIP funding.   To qualify under Low-GWP Refrigerant category, the project must involve replacement of existing, high-GWP refrigeration system with refrigerants with a GWP of less than 150. Please refer to Solicitation Manual, Section II.B.1.a for further details. |
| 1. \* | Can secondary equipment, materials or supplies necessary for the eligible equipment operation therefore indirectly related to direct GHG savings be included as eligible costs? E.g. vessels and piping, new structural (new concrete pads, bracing, steel infrastructure, etc.), or safety required equipment (containment, etc.). |
| 1. \* | Infrastructure improvements may be an eligible cost only if directly related to the equipment reducing GHG emissions. |
| 1. \* | With reference to the Budget Forms, it states: “Use of in-house staff for M&V is not reimbursable.” Is it safe to assume that “not reimbursable” means “not allowed for either match share or reimbursable components”? I.e., is something that’s not reimbursable also not allowed for match share expenses. In other words, expenses are either "eligible costs" or "non-eligible costs", and in-house M&V is a non-eligible cost. |
| 1. \* | Correct, eligible match share and reimbursable costs follow the same criteria. |
| 1. \* | Can vendors bundle O&M and equipment installation into the equipment cost? |
| 1. \* | No, operations and maintenance and equipment installation costs should not be included in equipment costs charged. |
| 1. \* | Can we utilize surplus equipment, which we would remove and transfer to the target facility, as part of the FPIP project? We’ve got surplus equipment (a boiler) that’s required for our FPIP project, currently installed at a different factory. With normal maintenance, it probably will be able to operate for another 30 years. |
| 1. \* | Used equipment is not an eligible FPIP cost. |
| 1. \* | Would a capital lease model be allowed under the program? |
| 1. \* | No, this would not comply with Section 14 of the Terms and Conditions that requires title to the equipment acquired with grant funds to vest with the Recipient. The Recipient may not sell, lease or encumber the property during the term of the Agreement without prior approval. Additionally, rental fees are not an eligible cost (see response to questions 75 and 76). Please refer to the terms and conditions, section 8 Payment of Funds, for requirements of reimbursable costs: [https://www.energy.ca.gov/media/2249](https://gcc01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.energy.ca.gov%2Fmedia%2F2249&data=01%7C01%7C%7C68d20f21dae947b3192d08d74b435b12%7Cac3a124413f44ef68d1bbaa27148194e%7C0&sdata=HHO6erfCQSWHqni0uFCL4z90d73Qy7ml8w4lnOecL4g%3D&reserved=0) |
| 1. \* | We understand no labor costs are allowable from CEC funding or cost share. What types of non‐installation labor costs can be included? (e.g., meetings to develop strategies for enhanced controls, implementing new control strategies, equipment configuration to operate under enhanced controls, site audit for optimizing operations and capturing more savings, and developing plans for deployment). |
| 1. \* | The labor costs described would not be eligible if incurred by the prime recipient.  The labor costs described would be eligible for funding if:   1. They are incurred by a subcontractor and not in-house staff; **and** 2. They are related to measurement and verification. |
| 1. \* | Could the 3rd party M&V request funds for test and measure equipment and sensors? |
| 1. \* | No, 3rd party measurement and verification subcontractors cannot include costs for equipment and sensors. Eligible costs for subcontractors are limited to the following categories: Direct Labor, Fringe Benefits, Travel, Subcontractors, and Indirect Costs.  The prime recipient may purchase instrumentation and controls equipment if the following conditions are met: the equipment is required for the system to function properly; and is intended to be a permanent component of the system (i.e., not removed after the project is complete).  Please refer to the budget instructions in Attachment 4A, Prime Budget Form, and Attachment 4B, Major Subcontractor Budget Form. |
| 1. \* | If funds are expended through borrowing (debt), can they be reimbursed through grant proceeds? |
| 1. \* | There is insufficient information regarding how the debt is incurred to respond to this question.  If the debt was incurred before the Agreement term, the answer is “no”. For example, funds borrowed to perform a project now cannot be reimbursed after a grant is awarded. All expenses must be incurred during the agreement term in order to be considered reimbursable.  If debt was incurred during the agreement term, the answer may be “yes”. For example, if a short-term loan is taken to pay for equipment, CEC could reimburse for equipment costs because the equipment has been paid for. No reimbursement for fee or interest.  Under Section 8.d of the terms and conditions, the recipient must pay all incurred costs for which it has invoiced the CEC within 14 calendar days of receiving payment. Incurred costs means an expense for which the recipient has become legally obligated to pay. Please refer to the terms and conditions, section 8 Payment of Funds, for requirements of reimbursable costs: [https://www.energy.ca.gov/media/2249](https://gcc01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.energy.ca.gov%2Fmedia%2F2249&data=01%7C01%7C%7C68d20f21dae947b3192d08d74b435b12%7Cac3a124413f44ef68d1bbaa27148194e%7C0&sdata=HHO6erfCQSWHqni0uFCL4z90d73Qy7ml8w4lnOecL4g%3D&reserved=0) |
| 1. \* | For FPIP project, labor costs are ineligible.   1. Do you mean the applicant’s labor costs? 2. Are the subcontractor’s labor costs eligible? |
| 1. \* | 1. Yes, the owner of the facility must be the applicant and the facility’s labor costs are ineligible. 2. Yes, the labor associated with M&V activities is eligible if these costs are performed by a subcontractor. Installation costs are not eligible along with labor costs from the applicant. |
| 1. \* | Qualifying M&V costs will be shown in Attachment 2. If the application is accepted then those are the acceptable M&V costs? |
| 1. \* | If selected for an award, the measurement and verification costs shown in your application in Attachment 4B may be negotiated. |
| 1. \* | If the project has no equipment that was purchased from CA based vendor, would it still qualify? |
| 1. \* | Yes, the project is still eligible for funding but it will not receive preference points for California Based Vendors, Criterion 7 (Section IV.F, Solicitation Manual). |
| 1. \* | If a cap and trade facility has a vendor that is going to install equipment and the vendor will own 80% and the equipment we will own 20% of the joint venture, will the facility portion be eligible for the FPIP funding? |
| 1. \* | Yes, if the 20% covers the cost of the equipment to be purchased by the CEC grant and meets the requirements of the solicitation and Section 14 of the FPIP terms and conditions. Equipment rights will be given to the recipient and the CEC is not responsible for any agreement with a third party. Rental fees are not an eligible cost. |
| 1. \* | A California Food Processor has a covered entity facility. The covered entity facility would like to do a Joint Venture with a vendor, where significant GHG reduction would occur, and the covered entity is minority partner 80/20.   1. Would the covered entity be eligible to submit for FPIP funding for a portion of their investment if the joint venture project was on the covered entities land? 2. If the answer to the above is yes should the application include the full project cost and disclose that the majority partner will be providing 80% investment for the project and we, the covered entity, list our 20% investment in the project?   Or do we only list our 20% as the total project cost given that we will only apply for funds against this 20%? |
| 1. \* | 1. If the food processing facility will take title to 20% of the equipment, then the facility would be eligible to submit for FPIP funding for that 20% of equipment costs. Equipment rights must be held by the recipient and the CEC is not responsible for any agreement with a third party. Rental fees are not an eligible cost. 2. The 80% investment by the applicant’s partner is eligible as match only for eligible costs as defined in Section I.F of the Solicitation Manual, but would have to show the match funding in the Prime’s budget. |
| 1. \* | Would the cost of the delivery of the components be covered under grant funds? |
| 1. \* | Yes, delivery costs are eligible under this solicitation. |
| 1. \* | Would the cost of components such as electrical wire, electrical conduit, and plumbing be covered under the grant funds? |
| 1. \* | Yes, those costs are eligible under equipment costs. |
| 1. \* | Could infrastructure improvements made to secure an eligible project be considered for grant and/or matching funds? |
| 1. \* | Infrastructure improvements may be an eligible costs only if directly related to the equipment reducing GHG emissions. |
| 1. \* | Are the following expenses incurred for equipment considered eligible costs?   1. CA sales tax 2. Equipment shipping & delivery 3. Equipment customs clearance charges 4. Equipment Installation supervision & start-up support provided by equipment supplier 5. Training provided by equipment supplier |
| 1. \* | a., b., c.: Eligible equipment costs include the following: CA sales tax, equipment shipping & delivery, and equipment customs clearance charges.  d., e.: Ineligible costs: Equipment Installation supervision & start-up support provided by equipment supplier and training provided by equipment supplier. |
| 1. \* | Under FPIP funding, Can the applicant apply construction costs to meet the match funding requirement?  For example: If the equipment cost is $3,000,000 and construction costs are $2,000,000, Can the $2,000,000 in construction costs be applied as match funding to meet the 35% match requirement of the grant award. |
| 1. \* | No, construction costs cannot be used as match funding because it is not an eligible cost per Section I.F of the Solicitation Manual. |
| 1. \* | What is considered eligible cost share? |
| 1. \* | Section I.F describes the eligible costs. The eligible cost share would be match funding provided for those categories (equipment and M&V). |
| 1. \* | Tier I equipment often requires installation by vendor, and is often quoted as an installed price. Commissioning that is sometimes legally required, and that would also in price quote.   1. Are all those meant to be stripped away from the equipment price and is that really the objective? 2. Would a price quote that included commissioning costs, etc. be thrown out? |
| 1. \* | 1. Yes, only equipment and M&V can be funded under Tier I. Other costs such as permits, installation, etc. are not included. 2. Yes, applicants must separate the various line item costs and the grant only covers equipment cost which includes delivery costs and taxes, along with M&V. |
| 1. \* | Does direct labor include payroll taxes? |
| 1. \* | Those are generally under indirect overhead, but it depends on your organization’s payroll structure. |
| 1. \* | If a piece of equipment from a supplier has a total flat cost that includes delivery and installation (think purchasing a refrigerator from Home Depot), can an applicant seek reimbursement for that total flat cost? |
| 1. \* | No, the applicant must separate the equipment and delivery, which are eligible costs, and invoice the CEC for only for these two costs. Installation is not an eligible cost. |
| 1. \* | * 1. Can incentive money from utilities such as PGE count as matching? We are working on some on some incentives and would it be double dipping to get an incentive and a grant?   2. Would you be willing to consider open farm land, a nursery, and/or or greenhouse as a food production facility? |
| 1. \* | * + - * 1. Rebates from utilities would count towards match funding if they provide a commitment letter as described in Attachment 7. It would not be double dipping.         2. The FPIP solicitation specifically targets food production facilities under NAICS codes 311 and 3121. Your facility must fall under one of these classifications to be eligible for FPIP. |
| 1. \* | Is FPIP funding considered taxable income? |
| 1. \* | The applicant should consult their accountant or legal adviser to determine if grant funding is subject to Federal or State taxes. |

# Table 4. Definitions

| No. | Definitions Question/Answer |
| --- | --- |
|  | 1. Could you review what Tier 1 means? 2. Are new uses of existing technologies qualifying - for example, the use of solar energy to eliminate boiler fuel use and emissions? |
|  | 1. Tier I focuses on commercially available, energy efficient equipment upgrades that are drop in replacements or additions to existing equipment or processes that provide greater GHG emission reductions than current best practices or industry standard equipment. Technologies that can be funded under Tier I are described in Section II. 2. No. Solar energy to eliminate boiler fuel is not eligible for funding. Please refer to the solicitation manual, Section II.B.1 Project Focus for a description of eligible technologies. |
| 1. \* | Clarify equipment vs installation. Typically, installation has a core piece of equipment and periphery equipment (pumps, motor starters). Would the periphery be considered equipment? |
| 1. \* | Yes, pumps and motor starters are considered equipment. Installation is not an eligible cost. |
| 1. \* | What sorts of activities specifically around M&V count? |
| 1. \* | Refer to “Measurement and Verification”, Section II.B.2, of the Solicitation Manual. Part A refers to providing estimates, not actual monitoring, and is not reimbursable. Post-award is where M&V actually comes in; it is used to verify whether your estimates in your application are accurate. When calculating GHG emissions, use Attachment 8. |
| 1. \* | Related to installation, there’s some statements on prevailing wages. The facility is paying for installation—would that have to undergo the prevailing wages requirement? |
| 1. \* | Projects that receive an award of public funds from the CEC involve construction, alteration, demolition, installation, repair or maintenance work over $1,000. For this reason, projects that receive an award from the CEC are likely to be considered public works under the California Labor Code. If you accept a CEC grant, the entire project is covered by prevailing wage unless you get a determination from the Department of Industrial Relations as described in Section III.D.4.5, of the Solicitation Manual. |
| 1. \* | Any single facility or company might have multiple NAICS codes used in the past. One person’s compost facility is another’s food processing. So how does an entity assert—is the agency going to check that and by what protocol does CEC check that? |
| 1. \* | Applications are limited to only the portions of the applicant’s facility with NAICS codes starting with 311 (food processing) and 3121 (beverage manufacturing). NAICS designations falling under the general “Manufacturing” category even though other manufacturing or non-manufacturing activities having different NAICS codes might be occurring there. The NAICS code indicated by the applicant in Attachment 1 will be used to determine eligibility and this will be checked by the CEC during its prescreening of applications. |
| 1. \* | On page 31 (criteria 5), it suggests that GHG emissions are added together.   1. Are facilities added together that are all similarly regulated? 2. What if they are the same company? |
| 1. \* | 1. No, the GHG emissions identified in Criteria 5 are based on one facility. For instance, to get the full 10 points for Tier 1, you must have one facility that emits more than 25,000 metric tons of CO2 annually. CARB has a list of mandatory reporting facilities (<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/mandatory-greenhouse-gas-emissions-reporting>). We are using this list to determine whether it is a capped (>25,000 metric tons of CO2/year) or a mandatory reporting facility (10,000 to 25,000 metric tons of CO2/year). The GHG emissions are not additive (e.g., adding GHG emissions from multiple facilities). So, if you and a sister facility are applying, and you generate 45,000 metric tons and a sister facility generates less than 10,000 metric tons, then you will get the full 10 points for Criteria 5. 2. If you’re a capped facility emitting 45,000 metric tons of GHG and a sister facility owned by the same company is emitting less than 10,000 metric tons, you are allowed to “bundle” both facilities under Tier I into a single funding application. Projects in a capped facility, bundled along with any facilities under the same ownership, are awarded 10 points in the scoring criteria. |
| 1. \* | Will the term “Industry Standard Practice” be held to the same level of scrutiny as the IOU energy efficiency programs by the CPUC? Or is this a less strict definition for the sake of the success of this program? |
| 1. \* | For the purposes of FPIP, industry standard practice is defined as typical equipment, technology or process commonly used in current practice. Standard practice is meeting current standards, such as meeting current Title 24 or other code or standards requirements (e.g., energy). To be eligible for FPIP, grant funded equipment must exceed these current industry standards. |

# Table 5. Proposal Evaluation, Reporting, and Other Information

| No. | Proposal Evaluation, Reporting, and Other Information Question/Answer |
| --- | --- |
|  | Would MT CO2e (facility emission status) points eliminate some of smaller businesses for winning scores? |
|  | Criterion 5, Capped and Uncapped Facilities, allocates 10 points based on current facility emissions. While uncapped (lower emitting) facilities will receive fewer points compared to capped (higher emitting) facilities, this only accounts for 10 points out of 100 and does not eliminate smaller businesses from contention. |
| 1. \* | Regarding preference points, how can the 10 percent of project work hours being performed be included by residents within the disadvantaged or low-income area if eligible costs to not include labor? Does this include current employees that are from the local area or must they be recruited for this specific FPIP project through the subcontracts? |
| 1. \* | Proposals will receive preference points for project(s) located within an identified disadvantaged or low-income community and benefiting individuals living within that community, or directly benefiting residents of low-income households. Applicants must describe their efforts and justify how they will provide direct, meaningful and assured benefits and addresses an important community need. Please refer to Solicitation Manual, Section III, D.9. for further details. |
| 1. \* | We identified some issues with AirMaster+ in the last round and submitted that to CARB, has there been any feedback on adjustments to that tool or the CARB tool? |
| 1. \* | No, there have not been updates to the AirMaster+ tool or CARB tool to accommodate modern air compressors (i.e., with variable frequency drive controls). Applicants proposing air compressor systems whose energy savings cannot be adequately captured using AirMaster+ may use an alternate third-party tool or provide backup calculations and should note their alternate calculation method in the “Notes” column of the CARB Benefits Calculator Tool. |
| 1. \* | Are past proposals available online? |
| 1. \* | All previous proposal documents are available and may be requested from the Commission Agreement Officer Angela Hockaday at [Angela.Hockaday@energy.ca.gov](mailto:Angela.Hockaday@energy.ca.gov). |
| 1. \* | If we are approved what is the timeline for starting the project? |
| 1. \* | Anticipated agreement start date is 6/30/2021. Please refer to the solicitation manual, section I.G for the key activities schedule |
| 1. \* | How should the Benefits Calculator Tool be used considering baseline M&V does not start until after the award? |
| 1. \* | Applicants should use the best available information to fill out the baseline portion of the Benefits Calculator Tool. If baseline data is not available, equipment specification sheets for the existing equipment can be used in conjunction with the MEASUR tool to estimate baseline energy use. |
| 1. \* | What are the allowable indirect costs? Does FPIP specify the maximum allowable profit margin on the subcontract budget form? Are indirect costs and profit eligible grant costs for subcontractors providing equipment? |
| 1. \* | Please refer to Attachment 4B, Indirect Costs & Profit tab for limits and definitions regarding subcontractor indirect costs and profit. |
| 1. \* | One client is installing equipment on a Tier I project that requires an enclosure—is this an allowable expense? |
| 1. \* | Yes, any hardware necessary to complete the project is an allowable expense. |
| 1. \* | Site Preparation and Procurement is a mandatory task in the Scope of Work. Is this eligible for reimbursement? |
| 1. \* | No, only equipment and subcontractors are eligible for reimbursement. |
| 1. \* | Is used equipment allowed? |
| 1. \* | Used equipment is not an eligible FPIP cost. |
| 1. \* | Can you please show the capped versus un-capped link to CARBs excel spreadsheet. |
| 1. \* | To access the list of capped and mandatory reporting facilities in California, Please visit CARB website at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/mrr-data> |
| 1. \* | For determining capped and uncapped, etc. status of the pilot site, what emission sources are included in the calculation of emissions (e.g., the emissions associated with just onsite emissions or also attributed to grid purchased power that site uses)?  Or another way of saying this is…Are onsite emissions only considered for this solicitation versus grid power connected/purchased emissions? |
| 1. \* | Yes, emissions from grid-purchased electricity are included in calculating a facility’s GHG emission status.  Capped and mandatory-reporting facilities are identified by the California Air Resources Board through the Cap and Trade program. For a complete list of capped facilities and the methodology to determine facility GHG emissions, please see: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/mrr-data> |
| 1. \* | Regarding bundling, priority is given to capped facilities—if some facilities are capped and some not, how are the scoring criteria applied? |
| 1. \* | As long as your application has a capped facility or has one that has to do mandatory reporting, you will receive points for Criterion 5 (Section IV.F.). The capped facility must be one of the sites implementing the project. Facilities need to be under same ownership. |
| 1. \* | Can we count VOC reductions as a benefit? |
| 1. \* | The grant pays for projects that reduce GHG emissions. If it is a part of the overall project, reduction in VOCs can be a co-benefit. |
| 1. \* | What is the GHG emission reduction goal or requirement for each project? |
| 1. \* | No requirement, but the project needs to show reductions. The more reductions per CEC dollar spent the more points you’ll get. See Section IV.F Criteria 3 of the Scoring Criteria. |
| 1. \* | If we have multiple uncapped facilities that have mandatory reporting but are only performing the project at one facility, do you count combined emissions or individual facility by that ownership? |
| 1. \* | Only facilities that are actually participating in FPIP would count. Do not combine CO2 emissions from multiple facilities to determine GHG status. |
| 1. \* | In the GFO scoring, there are 40 points allocated to impacts. When evaluating, how does that work? Do more GHG reductions lead to more points? |
| 1. \* | There are three parts to Scoring Criteria 3 and we want justification for the GHG savings and benefits for your project. We compare the reasonableness of the claimed savings to the overall grant amount requested. For part A, we review the reasonableness of the estimates of energy savings, GHG reductions and co-benefits. Part B focuses on calculating the ratio of the CEC funds to GHG reductions. This is an automatic calculation that is done in Attachment 8, under GHG Summary page. In Part C, you provide the actual calculations, timeframe within which the project(s) will be built, and explain the reasonableness and justification of all assumptions used in the calculation. Thus, a project that provides more GHG emission reductions relative to the amount of grant funds requested could get more points under this criteria. |
| 1. \* | Does higher cost sharing receive any preferential points? |
| 1. \* | No. However, it is to your benefit to provide more cost sharing. The more funds you put into your project, the amount of grant funds requested could be less. This could be beneficial under Scoring Criteria 3 since Part B compares CEC dollars requested to the estimated amount of GHG emissions reductions. It is to your advantage to ask for less grant funds, to be more competitive. The match numbers are minimums, so feel free to provide more than the minimum 35% match indicated in Section I.F of the Solicitation Manual. |
| 1. \* | When you say other segments can take advantage (market potential points), are you referring to those NAICS codes you mention or related to other industries, say the chemical industry? |
| 1. \* | Compatibility of the technology in other food processing facilities is preferred. We want to see that the technology has the potential for broad application. Technologies with limited application may not score as well as those with greater potential. |
| 1. \* | Regarding priority populations, can an applicant only receive 0 or 10 points, even if bundling facilities? |
| 1. \* | Yes. If you bundle them in order to get 10 points for priority populations, all of facilities in your bundle must meet all requirements in Section III.D.9. |
| 1. \* | Would it negatively impact an application if more than one company applies with the same technology or same subcontractor? |
| 1. \* | No. It will not negatively impact your application. Multiple applications from one entity must be for distinct projects with no overlap with respect to the tasks in the scope of work. Using the same subcontractor is allowed. |
| 1. \* | Are savings associated with added load as a result of a proposed project allowed to be accounted for by normalizing baseline energy usage to reflect that of the post installation load thus resulting in greater GHG emission reductions as a result of the project? |
| 1. \* | No, adding electrical or thermal load would increase GHG emissions regardless of whether efficiency measures are installed or not. The facility total emissions output would still be higher than it was before the load was added. |
| 1. \* | Can the CEC help connect technology vendors and companies with food processing facilities? |
| 1. \* | You can use the resources provided, such as Empower Innovation to find potential partners: [https://www.empowerinnovation.net/en/custom/funding/view/18182](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.empowerinnovation.net%2Fen%2Fcustom%2Ffunding%2Fview%2F18182&data=04%7C01%7C%7C6be0dd7d50374484b4fe08d88fe3cc02%7Cac3a124413f44ef68d1bbaa27148194e%7C0%7C0%7C637417555823610471%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=d7h4f%2BCX9HCWflyZcvH37VrKxbzmIMr4Q2hJ75teywQ%3D&reserved=0). Sign up as an Empower Innovation member and create (or join) your organization’s profile. Then click “Find a Partner” at the top of the page to show your interest in this opportunity, view and message other interested members. |
| 1. \* | Also, in the RFP, the "Documentation of Benefits to Priority Populations" is listed as item #8. Should that be included as a separate attachment or just covered in the Narrative? |
| 1. \* | Benefits to Priority Populations must be discussed in the project narrative, Attachment 2, item 6. It is important that the applicant address each of the three steps outlined in Section III.D.9 of the Solicitation Manual. If multiple sites are proposed, the three steps must be addressed for each site. |

# 

# Table 6. Agreement Term and Terms and Conditions

| No. | Agreement Terms and Conditions Question/Answer |
| --- | --- |
|  | What is the anticipated agreement end date? |
|  | The anticipate agreement end date is 3/31/2024. |
|  | If someone is awarded funds, how long do they have to install the equipment after they receive the grant funds? |
|  | The agreement end date can be up to 3/31/2024. There is no specific date by which the equipment must be installed, however all grant requirements must be met. This includes post-installation measurement and verification which is 12 months for year round facilities and two seasons for seasonal facilities. Applicants should consider these requirements, and the agreement end date, when creating their project schedules. |
|  | What is the timeframe for when proposed projects would need to be started and completed? |
|  | The anticipated agreement start and end dates are 6/30/2021 and 3/30/2024, respectively. Please refer to the solicitation manual, Section I.G Key Activities Schedule, for more information on key dates. |
| 1. \* | During earlier meetings, the question of confidentiality was raised. How do you determine whether your narrative or calculations are confidential or not? |
| 1. \* | As indicated in Section IV.D.3, Information received by the Commission in response to a solicitation shall be kept confidential before the posting of the NOPA. However, with few exceptions, all project documents submitted to the CEC are considered public records subject to disclosure under the Public Records Act. Information on grant awards must be reported to the California Air Resources Board (CARB), as indicated in Chapter 5 of the Food Production Investment Program Guidelines (<http://www.energy.ca.gov/research/fpip/documents/>).If you are submitting something you believe is confidential, there is a process that is described in Section IV.D.3. |
| 1. \* | What are the terms and conditions? |
| 1. \* | The terms and conditions describe the responsibilities of the grant recipient if it receives a grant award. The terms and conditions are posted at [https://www.energy.ca.gov/media/2249](https://gcc01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.energy.ca.gov%2Fmedia%2F2249&data=01%7C01%7C%7C68d20f21dae947b3192d08d74b435b12%7Cac3a124413f44ef68d1bbaa27148194e%7C0&sdata=HHO6erfCQSWHqni0uFCL4z90d73Qy7ml8w4lnOecL4g%3D&reserved=0). |
| 1. \* | To confirm, proposed projects must complete the CEQA process before they can enter into a contract with the CEC, correct? |
| 1. \* | Yes, the CEQA process must be completed in a timely manner prior to approval of the grant at a CEC business meeting. |
| 1. \* | How long will The CEC reserve the right to conduct and audit to verify assumptions and estimates of energy savings and GHG emission reduction after equipment is installed? |
| 1. \* | The CEC reserves the right to audit and verify savings for up to three years after the project term ends. |

# Table 7. Formatting and Submissions

| No. | Formatting and Submissions Question/Answer |
| --- | --- |
|  | If an applicant applied to a previous FPIP GFO and did not pass, can they correct any errors or deficiencies and apply again? |
|  | Yes, applicants who applied to a previous FPIP GFO and did not pass may apply again, assuming they meet the eligibility and project requirements. Applicants who received a debriefing should consider any feedback received and modify their application accordingly. Previous evaluations are also available by request by emailing the Commission Agreement Officer, Angela Hockaday at [Angela.Hockaday@energy.ca.gov](mailto:Angela.Hockaday@energy.ca.gov). |
|  | What does that mean do not revise description of the products in task 1? |
|  | In Attachment 3 Scope of Work, do not revise any of the text in Task 1 General Project Tasks. Sections where text should be revised are indicated clearly in blue text. |
| 1. \* | Can you share a completed example of the project schedule technical tasks section? |
| 1. \* | Technical Tasks section of the Project Schedule is to be completed by the applicants based on the proposed budget timeline, and would be different for every project. The agreement term is expected to be 6/30/2021 - 3/31/2024. The Project Schedule template can be found on the solicitation webpage, located at <https://www.energy.ca.gov/solicitations/2020-11/gfo-20-307-food-production-investment-program-2020>. |
| 1. \* | For Application Form (Attachment 1):   1. Can the project managers listed, as well as other contacts be contractors of the applicant, i.e. non part/full time employees of the applicant? And is it ok for that contact list to change after project award for substitutions in the event of staff changes, additional hiring, etc.? 2. Can any equipment, specifications, supplier, or listed contractor change after the application is awarded, as long as the budget or performance intent does not change? This might be the case if like equipment or service providers offer lower costs with equivalent equipment performance alternatives through engineering processes. 3. Can contractor markup for equipment or systems (i.e. complete refrigeration system, components, etc.) that cover installation performance warranties or certifications be included in eligible costs? For example most purchase and assign agreement between the owner and supplier often include references to control standard contractor markup allowances. 4. Do facilities that annually report to CARB because of Large system under the Refrigerant Management Program, that also leak refrigerant quantities that have equivalencies greater than 25,000 metric tons of CO2e annually receive priority consideration? 5. Is there any case where installation, labor, or technical services can be eligible outside of M&V related tasks? |
| 1. \* | 1. The applicant must be a California food processor; however, the project manager listed can be from a third party. The contact list names may change in the event of staff changes. 2. Any changes in equipment, specifications, suppliers, or listed contractor must be approved by the CEC agreement manager in advance, before the implementation of the changes (please see the FPIP Terms and Conditions, Section 6, Amendments). 3. Installation costs are ineligible for grant funds. Third party contractor markup on equipment or systems is eligible but subject to additional justification and documentation per CEC staff request. 4. Only the capped and mandatory-reporting facilities identified by the California Air Resources Board through the Cap and Trade program that meet the appropriate NAICS codes and the requirements of the solicitation are eligible for FPIP. For a complete list of capped facilities and the methodology to determine facility GHG emissions, please see: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/mrr-data>. 5. No. Only labor associated with M&V is eligible if these costs are performed by a subcontractor. Installation costs are not eligible for grant funds. |
| 1. \* | If a utility incentive program is used as part of the satisfaction of the match funding requirement, could a typical “conditional incentive reservation document” be used as the match funding commitment letter? |
| 1. \* | No, a conditional approval document from a utility incentive program would not satisfy the requirements of a match funding commitment letter. A match funding commitment letter must be signed by a representative of each entity or individual committing to providing match funding and must also (1) identify the source(s) of the funds, (2) identify the dollar value of the match funds, (3) guarantee the availability of the funds, and (4) provide a strategy for replacing the funds if they are significantly reduced or lost. See section III.D.7 of the solicitation manual and Attachment 7 for the full requirements for match funding commitment letters. |
| 1. \* | For support letters, your talks to industry representatives (e.g., CLFP) as well as local community based organization; does this include local agencies, such as air districts, irrigation districts, city councils, etc.? |
| 1. \* | Yes, support letters can be from any entity or individual. |
| 1. \* | Is an equipment vendor required to submit a major subcontractor budget? |
| 1. \* | No, equipment vendors are not required to submit a major subcontractor budget. Equipment must be included in the budget of the prime in Attachment 4A, Tier I & II Prime Budget Form. |
| 1. \* | The RFP states that a budget needs to be developed for all of the tasks, even the ones that are not reimbursable. Where is that presented? Because budgets are set up to show reimbursable CEC and eligible cost share, where does the overall budget get presented? Is it in the narrative? |
| 1. \* | Budgets for each individual task are not required. However, the budget breakdown by category only pertains to eligible expenditures and match and these costs must be provided in the budget document. Please refer to the budget instructions in Attachment 4A, Prime Budget Form, and Attachment 4B, Major Subcontractor Budget Form. |
| 1. \* | Is there a max limit on support letters? |
| 1. \* | No, there is no maximum limit on support letters. |
| 1. \* | Please describe how you define "distinct" projects. Do they have to be different measures or just operate independently of each other? |
| 1. \* | Distinct projects must have no overlap with another project that is also being requested for funding. In addition, a distinct project is one that can be performed independent of other projects. If an applicant submits two applications, both projects may be at the same facility, but each must be able to be executed without the other.  For example, if an applicant is requesting funds for an economizer project and submits an application for a boiler project involving the same economizer, the two projects are not distinct and will be rejected based on application screening criteria.  Another example is two submissions which are variations of the same project, involving the same equipment at the same facility but implementing different retrofit measures. These projects are not distinct and will be rejected based on application screening criteria. |
| 1. \* | In regards to Measurement & Verification Plans, are all IPMVP Options A-D eligible? |
| 1. \* | Only options A-C are eligible and A and B are strongly encouraged. It is up to the applicant to choose the M&V method. It can be a recognized protocol like IPMVP or another protocol or methodology. Whatever is used must be robust enough to evaluate and validate energy saving GHG emissions at the equipment level and the system or facility level. FPIP will only fund M&V conducted by independent third-party contractors. |
| 1. \* | * + 1. If we are applying for Tier I technology (drop-in ready) and replacing existing permitted equipment that does not require any construction/engineering/etc. Do we need to have the local authority still sign off on an exclusion from CEQA?     2. Could we provide case-law as evidence of exclusion from CEQA for Tier I (Drop in ready Technology) from previous projects in local authority jurisdiction as evidence of CEQA exemption?     3. To qualify for FPIP, does the project have to go through a full CEQA process or could it qualify if it went through a Mitigated CEQA or Administrative Review process with the local authority?   In order for a project to qualify for FPIP funding does it have to go through a Full CEQA process? |
| 1. \* | 1. Not at the time of application submission. However, you must complete Attachment 5, CEQA Compliance Form and provide us with the information requested, including any backup information to justify your responses. 2. If a previous project has received a notice of exemption and shows the specific exemption under CEQA, include this information as backup. 3. No, not at the time of application. The CEC will evaluate all projects to determine whether it is a project under CEQA. Completing Attachment 5 will help with that determination. If a project is determined to be a project under CEQA and is not covered by one of the exemptions, then it will need to go through the review process as described in CEQA. If a project is not exempt, and the project is selected for an award, then any required CEQA review must be completed before the CEC can approve the project. This would be taken into consideration.   Additionally, the CEC is not responsible for any permits required to complete the project, but will require status letters on obtaining the required permits. |
| 1. \* | Could a project that receives approval by the local authority through a Mitigated CEQA or Administrative Review process be approved for FPIP funding? |
| 1. \* | Yes, the Mitigated CEQA documents must be provided either with the proposal or in a timely manner to meet the business meeting deadline. The CEC will use those findings to make a CEQA determination for the proposed project. |
| 1. \* | Tier I is standard technology that is widely available.   1. Is it still necessary to include the section on market potential? 2. What is the format of the market potential plan? Calculations? |
| 1. \* | * 1. Yes. It is required. We want you to explain that the technology has market potential beyond your site and for you to identify where else it can be used and how this information can be disseminated to these other markets. Sharing information with others is significant—even if the CEC can’t fund everyone, the results will show the potential elsewhere, so someone else repeat that project.   2. No calculations, provide the information in narrative format. |
| 1. \* | When you register online, can multiple people from your company login to your application? Is there a way to give them that access? |
| 1. \* | Yes, you can have multiple people with different accounts work on the same application. They just have to be granted permission by the originator. |
| 1. \* | In Attachment 2, how much detail do we have to go into to describe existing systems? |
| 1. \* | The narrative needs to provide sufficient detail on the technology and the application at each of the food processing plants and how the technology impacts energy savings and GHG emissions at the project’s equipment level, and either at the system level or the facility level. |
| 1. \* | Should measuring the baseline be included in the M&V budget? Otherwise it will be hard to see companies pay for baseline data before they know if the projects get funded? |
| 1. \* | Your application baseline will be estimated based on current equipment type and operations and using the emissions factors from Attachment 8. The establishment of this baseline as part of the application is not reimbursable by the grant. Funding for post application M&V for baseline and post retrofit can be funded by the grant, if a third party subcontractor is used for this M&V (refer to Section II.B.2 of the Solicitation Manual). There are 3 M&V phases: Phase I M&V will be conducted before application submittal and is not reimbursable by the grant. Phase II M&V will happen before equipment is installed to obtain a more accurate baseline. Phase III will be post implementation. Phase II and Phase III are reimbursable expenses under the M&V category if the work is done by a third party subcontractor. |
| 1. \* | As a food plant, should we apply directly for the grant or should we work with an energy firm to apply? We would hire the subcontractor so almost all of the funds would go to the subcontractor to perform the work for our technology. |
| 1. \* | Food processing facilities must apply directly and sign the application form (Attachment 1). However, if you hire a separate party to prepare your application and perform the work identified in your grant proposal, the CEC grant will only apply to the cost associated with equipment, and subcontractor cost associated with M&V. |
| 1. \* | 1. What level of detail will we have to go into to get the grant? 2. Do we need to be so granular that we select the company and the exact product type or can it be a touch vaguer in certain circumstances? |
| 1. \* | 1. Be as specific as possible. You need to state all your assumptions. For example, if you want to do a compressor replacement but haven’t chosen the exact product yet, just include the efficiency rating, costs, and as much information and specifications as you can give us. 2. During the application phase, it is not necessary to specify the company from whom you will be buying energy efficient technologies from or the specific product type, but please be as accurate as you can in estimating the cost of the equipment to be purchased as this cost will weigh into the cost-benefit criterion of the project. |
| 1. \* | We have technology that falls under the Tier I category but I have multiple clients in the Central Valley that can take advantage of our drying system. Each client will have a different sized system but the system will operate the same in each facility.  Do I put all the applications under one umbrella for my company but have the separate clients sign the applications or do I make separate applications with logins for each client?  The only reason that I ask is that each facility is hauling their sludge to East Bay Mud so the narrative will be the same for all clients although the GHG emission reduction will vary per facility based on volume. |
| 1. \* | Applications must come from individual, eligible food processing plants per Section II.A of the Solicitation Manual, and not the technology company/vendor. If the same technology is used in multiple food processing plants of different ownership, then each of these plants must submit an application. If a food processing plant has multiple sister sites that will be using the same technology, they can be bundled into one application if they are under the same ownership and meet the bundling requirements and application maximums as stated in Section II.B.3 of the Solicitation Manual GHG emissions associated with transporting and hauling sludge cannot be counted towards the overall GHG emission reductions for the project. Transportation project are not eligible for the FPIP solicitation. |
| 1. \* | Are project team resumes required for the proposal? If so, should they be a separate attachment or combined with another required element? |
| 1. \* | No, they are not required. |
| 1. \* | Are Letters of Support (as opposed to Letters of Commitment) required or recommended? |
| 1. \* | Letters of Support are not required. However, Letters of Commitment are required. |
| 1. \* | The budget form instructions state that “applicants must budget for all cost not covered by the grant, such as installation….”, however there is no place on the budget form to show these costs. Does the CEC mean that applicants should budget *on their own* for these costs? Where, if anywhere, should we discuss this information? |
| 1. \* | Yes, you should budget on your own for these costs to ensure that you can complete the project but they do not need to be included in the budget. You do not need to submit a budget for non-eligible costs. |

# Table 8. Subcontractors

| No. | Subcontractors Question/Answer |
| --- | --- |
| 1. \* | How difficult would it be the contractor to fill the paperwork out on behalf of the client? How much work can we, the contractor, do on behalf of the client and how much do they have to do? |
| 1. \* | Applicants may utilize subcontractors to assist them in grant application preparation, however the application package must be reviewed and signed by the applicant prior to submission. Please note section IV.D.1 of the solicitation manual which states “The CEC will not reimburse applicants for application development expenses under any circumstances, including cancellation of the solicitation.” Costs must be incurred during the agreement term to be reimbursable or counted as match funds. |
| 1. \* | Can a major subcontractor contract a subcontractor for over $100,000.00? |
| 1. \* | Yes, a major subcontractor can contract with a subcontractor for over $100,000. Both subcontractors must provide a full budget breakdown using Attachment 4B, Major Subcontractor Budget Form. |
| 1. \* | If I’m doing a construction project, the subcontractor won’t do a fixed price. |
| 1. \* | As installation costs are ineligible for FPIP, the price for equipment must be separated from the overall project cost. Only subcontractors associated with M&V are eligible for reimbursement by the grant. For minor subcontractors (<$100,000), full budget details are not required. For major subcontractors (>$100,000), you will have to break down the various budget categories in Attachment 4B. |
| 1. \* | Regarding Attachment 4B, I thought you are not paying for labor? |
| 1. \* | Attachment 4B is applicable if you are hiring an M&V major subcontractors (over $100k or 25% of the CEC reimbursable amount). |
| 1. \* | Can you explain why the subcontractor can only be used for M&V? |
| 1. \* | For M&V we are interested in independent analysis and verification of the energy savings. The FPIP grant is used to supplement project funding for the project and not supplant funds. Paying in-house staff for M&V is supplanting funds since these staff are already paid by your organization. |
| 1. \* | You mentioned that there’s no grant matching for labor, but then you went over labor, can you clarify? |
| 1. \* | Attachment 4B only applies to subcontractors. If you’re hiring a subcontractor to do M&V, you need to fill out Attachment 4B if costs are more than $100,000 or 25% of the CEC grant. Direct labor match funding can be provided by subcontractors. Installation labor, administration, accounting, permitting, or project management are not eligible costs. |
| 1. \* | Can subcontractor cost for grant application assistance be included? If not, why? |
| 1. \* | No. Grant application assistance is not an eligible cost per Section II.B of the Solicitation Manual. |
| 1. \* | Can you please provide clarification on the allowed M&V costs for proposals? Specifically, are equipment, M&S, and Travel as well as labor costs allowable for an M&V subcontractor? |
| 1. \* | Direct labor, fringe benefits, travel, subcontractors, indirect costs, and profits are the only eligible costs for M&V subcontractors. |
| 1. \* | If a have a contractor that’s doing the M&V for the project and their cost is $110,000, can I pay them $100,000 from the FPIP grant (budget that in the application) and count the $10,000 profit they’re making on this deal towards the match? |
| 1. \* | Yes, you can provide profit to your M&V subcontractor as match as long as the minimum match requirement is met. Please refer to the budget instructions in Attachment 4B, Subcontractor Budget Form. |