

**Establishing Regional Resource Centers**  
**July 25, 2013**

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you for standing by. At this time all participants are in a listen only mode. To ask a question later during the question and answer session please press star then 1 on your touchtone phone.

Today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect.

And I would like to turn it over to Mr. Jonathan Bartlett. Sir, you may begin.

Jonathan Bartlett: Thank you very much. This is Jonathan Bartlett from the Department of Energy's Wind and Water Power Technologies Office. Today's WPA Webinar will be on the subject of establishing regional resource centers. I will be joined by Ian Baring-Gould at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory and the National Technical Director of the Wind Power in America Group. I'm happy to have him here today.

So, without further ado I want to get into the details and, assuming that I have control of the slides, I will be moving us along.

So today as an outline we're going to go over the Wind and Water Power Technologies Education and Outreach Activities, why they matter, what they are, what we have accomplished so far, where we're going, our transition to a regional approach via the regional resource centers, and the value to the wind sector.

So these next few slides are going to be familiar to a number of you who have logged in. We've addressed them before so I'll go through them rather rapidly

until we get through to the actual regional resource details. But I wanted to provide all of you especially those who haven't been familiarized with this information an overview.

So on our next slide, you know, there is the link to the Wind Powering America site and this is where many of the - majority of the resources that we have developed through the years are available online and that's [windpoweringamerica.gov](http://windpoweringamerica.gov) and there's obviously tools at (unintelligible).

So examples of that can be seen on the next few slides. We have the Energy 101 series of videos. We have one on wind turbines that's available via the Wind Program site or via WPA's site. The next slide includes an active graphic animation that shows people how wind turbines work. Useful for those who haven't been exposed at all to the technology; we can direct people here. They get an idea of not only how the turbine's technology functions but how it gets the energy that is generated either directly into individual homes or onto the grid.

Next we have multimedia resources. That's photographs of the technology, photographs of different wind farms, additional videos, audio files, animations that you just saw.

The next slide deals with our national wind resource maps and these have gone through multiple iterations of improvement. This example on the screen right here is showing you the land-based and offshore (unintelligible) resource at an (unintelligible). The great thing about this availability of data via (unintelligible) and AWS true power is that you can drilldown into individual states. And so the next slide we're showing an example state so you have the graphics that indicate the available resources for that state.

As we continue on we have a number of state programs, educational resources both of the K through 12, the education center museums, community colleges, universities, other education centers. And you can again drilldown into this information to see what's available within your state.

Wind For Schools—I'm particularly fond of this activity. Through the Wind for Schools program we have built 11 wind application centers located at the universities that you see on the screen here. That number of total turbines installed is constantly rising. We've been able to make impressions and impact on over 50,000 students both at college, graduate and K through 12 levels. And it's a great way to get STEM education into the K through 12 schools, helps in public acceptance for, you know, those kids who bring that information home to their parents and say hey renewable energy is a great thing.

As many of you are aware of the Wind for Schools program is part of the co-STEM consolidation in the President's upcoming budget for FY14. So the Department of Energy will no longer be directly funding the Wind for Schools program. But we are actually in communication with the National Science Foundation, the Smithsonian, the Department of Education, and our own internal DOE co-STEM representative to do our absolute best to ensure that one, the Wind For Schools program is on the best footing possible to move forward and two, if there are opportunities for those other energies to take on the activity we'll do everything we can to make that happen.

Next I want to talk a little bit about distributed wind. The distributed wind policy tool is another DOE funded development. The policy tool helps state, local and utility officials understand the financial impacts of different policy options aimed at reducing the cost of distributed wind technologies. And it

can be used to evaluate ways that federal and state policy incentives impact the economics of distributed wind.

And this policy tool uses a dashboard interface financial model to calculate the impacts and other incentives on project (unintelligible). It's a very useful tool and it is available through eFormative Options at the link that you see below.

There are a number of other distributed wind resources including this interactive graphic that is now available online through the Wind site at the link that you see below.

And last but not least there are a wealth of distributed wind resources. We have a fact page on the EERE wind page, we have helping policy makers evaluate distributive wind options, planning a small wind system, installing and maintaining small wind systems, the Small Wind Certification Council, the Interstate Turbine Advisory Council, the Power Through Policy tool, and one thing that I want to make sure that people are aware of.

Several years ago we had printed the small wind guides. Those wind guides have now been electronically produced in a Wiki format and they are available online via an open EI site so that link at the bottom of the page. If you are not aware of it please feel to check that out. That is a great resource.

So we're about to transition to a conversation about directly into the regional resource details and many of you were at the All-State Summit in May in Chicago where we addressed this subject as well. But since then the impact and process evaluation of WPA's state and working groups was completed by Navigant. It was an independent evaluation that was completed and these are

some of the highlights from it that the program plays a vital role in the source of credible and unbiased technical information.

WPA shows market effects and capacity impacts that extend beyond those states directly targeted for wind working groups and state-based activities and that it's an important channel for impacting utility scales, small wind capacity additions. Through these activities it influenced state and local policies.

So the far reach of WPA went through regional technical workshops bringing people together. The biweekly newsletter that has over 8,000 subscriptions, this Webinar here, you know, the one we're on right now, and all the other ones that have been archived have greatly influenced the amount of deployed wind. It's increased it by an estimate of - by an influenced number of approximately 3.4 gigawatts of additional wind was added through the activities of WPA and the state wind working groups.

So moving on to the next slide you can see between 2000 and 2010 27 states moved up to 100 megawatts of installed to capacity. Fourteen states have over 1000 and as I mentioned over 3.3 gigawatts worth of wind megawatts of wind were added during the state wind working groups activities. It's a 15% addition via the \$27 million investment from DOE. Again the mention of the Wind for Schools: 125 turbines that were installed.

Now if we move on to this next slide: why are we making these changes? Why are we transitioning from state wind working groups to regional resource centers? We're obviously not funding Wind for Schools due to the co-STEM consolidation. But the way we look at it is through the life of WPA the activities within WPA have changed. There are still barriers to market deployment but they're not the same as they were in 1999 and 2000. The technology has changed, or strategies of dealing with market barriers have

changed, our understanding of the impacts of the technology and how best to mitigate public acceptance, radar, wildlife, environmental activities have also changed.

And we've learned that having 30-some state wind working groups is also in some ways a little difficult to manage especially when there's overlap between some of the states regionally. And so in light of that we believe that developing regional resource centers will be the best way to create a virtual boots on the ground if you will to address barriers, ensure that the available wind resources that we have do not shrink and potentially it would be great if we could expand them and continue on.

So building off of the wind working group model which you'll see on the next slide we're going to provide through the RRCs technical expertise and tools, ensuring smart informed decision making. We want people to host meetings and trainings. Form working groups on issues that are relevant and messaging just specific states in that region.

And our resources are finite for this and that's why moving to a regional resource center model will maximize our fund, magnify the national outreach priority, we'll be able to work with regulators, provide science-based education tools, educate the communities about the impacts, and provide DOE guidance on issues and priorities.

Now what can I say beyond that? Ian will begin speaking out how the RFP process will go and other aspects. But one thing I want to emphasize is that, you know, we want the regional resource centers to tie to the recent call by the President to double renewable energy supplies by 2020. And we feel that the timeframe that the regional resource centers will operate will sort of run well and fit within that.

So we'll be asking the applicants to sort of self-define some of the metrics because it's one of the things that we learned from the WPA evaluation. We want to make sure that we can directly tie the funds that we're getting to - that we're providing to regional resource centers to the activities within the timeframe of operation. And if there are funds that you can leverage from other parts of the industry or other organizations we also want to be able to track that because it helps us be able to tie and evaluate the effectiveness of this activity.

But then we'll also be asking each of the applicants to, you know, provide us with what you believe to be good ways to measure your success. You know, is it annual meetings at the State Capitols to the number of meetings that you're having at State Capitols to inform legislatures and their staff with the various interesting aspects of wind development in their state and the region.

You know, maybe you'll want to look into the Renewable Energy Futures Report the DOE put out a couple of years ago and the upcoming Wind Division Plan, the update of the 20% by 2030 wind report that the Wind and Water Power Technologies Office will be doing. Maybe the participation in local meetings in the counties and states to address some of the same issues that I just mentioned. Working with local utilities and co-ops and munies, getting access to their groups. So a good example of this would be being involved in the integrated resource plans of co-ops or municipality utilities.

Actually, you know, it would be great to get wind being specifically the renewable energy discussed in an IRP but at the same time just getting renewables as a subject matter will likely lead to wind because it's a readily deployable renewable energy generation.

So we won't be prescribing every minute detail of success for the RRCs in part because we really do believe that you, the applicant will help to be able to set some solid metrics for evaluation. And we want to provide you with the opportunity to think about how you'll be accomplishing these tasks and demonstrating the success of them.

That said we are well under way in the process and close to releasing the RFP. If we can flip to the next slide so we're rebranding WPA. We're very close to selecting the new branding. The Web site will be built in August and rolled out in September. The regional resource center RFP rollout will occur in August. We'll be selecting the new group in late September and kick things off in October.

This slide is sort of a conceptual design of how the regions could shake out. We are not prescribing specific regions or groups of states. We will allow the applicants to do that but, you know, conceptually you can see how this would look. And lastly a repeat of implementation of the new branding. Our concept selection is underway now. Select any—we'll build the website around it and roll out the site which will include many of the resources that you have come to be familiar with on the existing Wind Powering America site.

So with that I will be handing things off to Ian Baring-Gould and want you to realize that today we will be taking questions and answers not only through the site itself where you can raise your hand and type in a question but we'll also be opening up the lines later on for live Q&A and the Operator will assist you for getting in line. (Unintelligible) Ian?

Ian Baring-Gould: Great, thank you Jonathan. So I'm going to talk a little bit more about the RRC (unintelligible) that will be coming out hopefully quite shortly as Jonathan

pointed out. Hopefully by the end of August but certainly closer to the end of August than the beginning and I'm going to provide a little bit more detail.

So the FOA will be released by NREL. So it'll be an NREL contract document which is the reason that I'm taking over this portion of the presentation. This presentation—or this part of it—is going to be very text heavy. Not a lot of graphics in comparison with Jonathan but hopefully it'll give fairly good context, a little sneak preview about what we're expecting in regards to the FOA so that people can start thinking about this and be prepared when the FOA document actually hits the street.

As part of that I definitely want to note that this is all draft and so until you actually see the final language anything that is said here in these slides treat as informative but certainly not final. And the document that comes out from the NREL contracts office will be the one that we will be using and deciding the different organizations.

So as Jonathan really discussed the goal is to provide communities the technical assistance and information materials on the impact and benefits of wind development. And so Jonathan had talked about that independent study that said how beneficial DOE efforts primarily the wind working groups and Wind Powering America has been over the last decade. But we understand that this needs to evolve and so the regional resource centers are an attempt to take this work to the next step.

So the kind of guiding concepts of the RRCs building off what Jonathan has already talked about to address mitigated and provide accurate information about barriers impacting the deployment of wind, increasing consumer confidence in the wind energy using the best practices and education and outreach so that we do have an educated stakeholder community. And then

catalyzing fact-based decision making regarding wind projects of all types and by that I mean offshore, land-based, small, and community.

So whichever types of wind development makes sense for particular regions to make sure that the decisions are using fact-based information as compared to hearsay and the other information that unfortunately is too readily available which is not overly accurate.

The activities that we're talking about here are not expected at all to supplant wind working groups that are very active in many states trying to do lots of these same things but to provide an additional regional coordination that goes beyond the borders of any specific state group.

And so clearly if there are state wind working groups we're not expecting that a regional organization would come into a state that already had a wind working group and try to do the same thing that the wind working group is already doing but more to collaborate and coordinate with the wind working group in that state to work on these activities and potentially take the learning that had happened in one state and apply that to a state that might not have a functioning wind working group or might not have a wind working group or might be doing things differently but not as successfully. So this is clearly not a replacement for any activities that are happening on a state by state basis.

But learning from what the wind working groups have done—again, this comes out of that Navigant study that reviewed the first ten years of Wind Powering America and specifically the wind working group model. And what you see now are four successful elements of the wind working group experience. And for the people that don't necessarily have the webinar up I'll just quickly read through them but all of these are talked about in great detail in that Navigant study.

But building stakeholder networks and sharing information, establishing diverse and inclusive partnerships, developing long term strategies, and fostering wind energy champions were all key things that Navigant identified as being what drove the successful wind working groups to be able to be as impactful as they were in supporting wind deployment in their states.

And so we would certainly expect that the regional resource centers would pick up on some of these successful experiences when looking to develop strategies at the regional level that will also impact wind deployment going forwards.

Some of the key concepts: Jonathan has talked about some of these already but the RRC should define the geographic extent of their proposed regions. But each region is envisioned to be a collection of states that share common challenges, common opportunities to benefit from more educated stakeholder communities. So we're not going to define the boundaries. We're expecting the proposals to define the boundaries.

We are expecting RRCs to define specific topical areas as appropriate and needed. So a bunch of states that are looking at small wind even if they're not all touching each other would be an applicable RRC or states that are looking at offshore wind development. So we're expecting RRCs to define for us what they feel are the most appropriate technology areas as well as barriers that need to be addressed.

We are expecting the RRCs to become self-sustaining by the time the award period concludes. So there's going to be a heavy element within the RRC in regards to cost share and I'll address this again at the end of the presentation. But in regards cost share and putting in place structures to allow external

funding from DOE so that the investment that DOE makes in putting together the RRCs will live on as we know the barriers aren't going to go away. So that's going to be a major portion.

We're also expecting the RRCs will provide relevant content that can be spread through WPA or the new branded WPA to other regions or to other states that aren't necessarily represented by their own RRCs. So one would expect that an RRC in New England will have materials that will be relevant to other RRCs, potentially one in the Northwest in which case we're expected the RRCs to be sharing information just like the wind working groups themselves shared a lot of information. And the WPA infrastructure here at NREL and at DOE will be part of that sharing process.

And we also expect that that to be a two-way street. So the RRCs will become a vehicle for WPA to engage in other activities exactly like the wind working groups were as we started as DOE and NREL starting rolling out other programs. So we expect those to be a collaborative activity over the course of the contract periods.

And then as Jonathan mentioned we will have a set of metrics that will be defined through this process. Some defined by the RRCs themselves and some defined by DOE and NREL to ensure that the activity is meeting the goals that we set forth and being able to track that over time so that will continue to be an important part of the contract and the work that the RRCs will have to undertake.

So the activities are very general. I've listed a whole bunch of different potential activities on the slide but I think the key to the RRCs and the RRC proposals is we're going to expect that in the proposals the organizations that are submitted for an RRC will define their region, what the technology issues

are for their regions and then what the barriers to the deployments of those technologies are and then how they expect to address those barriers.

And so clearly through the experience of WPA there are certainly things that have worked and other things that have not worked as well in engaging local stakeholders. But we don't want to dictate how a specific organization feels that they will be able to engage with their stakeholders most clearly.

And so we're expecting that the RRCs will propose within their proposal the different activities that they believe will ultimately lead to expanded wind deployment, wind deployment on a faster timeline—taking down the timeline from initial proposal to turbines in the ground—as well as how do we lower the cost of deploying wind technologies of course all of which lead us to the overall goal of more wind in the ground kind of following the 20% by 2030 vision that had been (unintelligible) by our community a number of years ago. So again we're expecting the RRCs to propose the different type of activities that they feel will be most applicable to their region.

Some of the criteria that we're planning on using: again the final criteria will be identified in pretty good detail within the FOA proposal but clearly the work plan, what is being proposed, understanding of the regional market, generally what are the issues that are being faced by your region, and then a description from a technical approach about how the work plan that is being proposed will work to address the issues that are faced by the region. And then finally the qualifications and resources of the organizations that are making the proposal.

So those are the primary criteria. Some additional considerations as listed here: geographic and technical diversity. Clearly we're not going to fund six RRCs all in New England and so even if we get six excellent proposals for

RRCs in New England we're going to have to down select those to ensure that the rest of the country is also included.

And so that certainly leads to all of your organizations that are out there looking at who can collaborate within your region to ensure that you get high quality proposals as compared to all of you competing for one or two slots within a particular geographic region.

Clearly market tech through diversity: we're not going to fund six offshore wind only RRCs. And then finally the cost share above the minimum amount required. So what additional resources the organizations bring to the table clearly will have impact on what we're able to fund in regards to the FOAs.

So some specific RFP—or specifics, I guess. We're looking at up to three years for the contracts. We're kind of assuming most of them will be three year but if organizations want to propose something different then they should. We're looking at around 200K a year so 600K or so over from DOE over the life of the project. But as all of you know the budget uncertainty at this point in time is bordering on ridiculous and so that will certainly come into play not only this year but in out years as well.

We are expecting some level of cost share. Right now about 20% is expected for the first year but that will likely increase in the out years. Though we haven't necessarily defined numbers for that but again it's part of this effort to ensure that the RRCs after the end of the three-year or whatever it is contract that they have the highest likelihood of being a sustaining organization going into the future. And part of that effort will be to increase the cost share that we expect from the RRCs going into the future.

And then we anticipate around six awards. Clearly that will depend on the proposals that we get and the funding that we have available. And so that's what we're looking at for the specifics of the RRCs.

So with that as kind of a more detailed overview in regards to the RRCs—or the expected request for proposals for the RRCs—why don't we pop back to the other presentation if you would Tessa, and then we'll also open the line for questions. And...

Coordinator: Thank you.

Ian Baring-Gould: Yep.

Coordinator: Now if you' like to ask a question over the phone lines please press star then 1. Please unmute your phone and record your name clearly when prompted. Your name is needed to introduce your question. So again star then 1 and one moment please.

Ian Baring-Gould: Okay and while that's out there I'll address some of the questions that came in via the Web.

(Beth Soholts) asked whether we only have wind maps at 50 meters. We actually have wind maps at 30, 50, 80, and 100 and varying degrees. So check out the wind maps. There are a bunch out there that are focused on different heights.

A comment from (David) about including the (WIA). We can certainly do that.

Let's see. A question from (Matt Lochner): will there be resources to find other interested applicants to form teams for the FOA response? From our perspective, no. There won't be funding provided by DOE or NREL to help support the development of FOA proposals. That's not something we can do at this time. So unfortunately organizations are going to have to do that themselves.

(Rich) from Alaska says we need to update our wind map to include a few more projects. So we'll go ahead and do that (Rich). Thanks for letting us know.

(Susan): her question is how are the RRCs to become self-sustaining? Can they take industry membership? Okay if they have industry members today. I would say that that (Susan), and everybody else that's part of the proposal. So how the organizations go about becoming self-sustainable is something that we're going to want to see in the proposals. And in the outline of the proposals there will be a section on what strategies the proposing organizations are going to use.

But your specific questions I would say that taking industry members would certainly be something that they could consider doing. And if industry wants to be part of the RRCs from the beginning that I don't think we would see that as a negative.

We have to ensure that those kind of key points in the beginning are well documented, understood in the sense that we want to make sure they're fact based and that the RRCs like the wind working groups were seen as nonbiased and independent per se of the wind industry. Though in almost every case the wind working groups had industry representation on them.

So it's a fine line that one has to walk there but it would not surprise me at all if RRCs have industry members. And then clearly as we look to a way to have themselves funded over the years industry will have to play a role in funding these organizations I would say if they are going to be successful.

Do we have any online questions? If not we can continue going through the questions that have been typed in.

Coordinator: We do have a few.

Ian Baring-Gould: Okay.

Coordinator: (Rick Bergman), your line's open first.

(Rick Bergman): Good afternoon and thank you. Very, very good presentation. I am in Wisconsin and I want to know somewhere—there's a wealth of information that you've provided, thank you. But I want to know somewhere if I wanted to answer this particular question if the resource is available. I said I'm in Wisconsin; if I want to find a list of businesses—General Motors and John Deere, whatever—all the difference businesses in Wisconsin that are, you know, if they're not using renewables at all for their energy if there's a list somewhere on one of these websites of companies that are willing to start, you know, employing renewables for their energy.

And that's part A. And part B: if they're for example 20% right now and they say hey we want to be 50% by the year 2015, you know, what they're using renewables, there's so many websites. But is there a specific site that would address this question?

Ian Baring-Gould: Jonathan, I don't know if you know of one. I don't that would have a list of that nature.

Jonathan Bartlett: No, not specifically. However we can take that as something to look into and we can always shoot an email out.

(Rick Bergman): All right. Thank you.

Jonathan Bartlett: Welcome.

Ian Baring-Gould: A question for (Travis): how will these topics affect performance selection? Will rural applicants in areas with seasonal economy to... will seniority affect? Will proximity to resources and market (unintelligible) outreach activities—what if a group has always been self-finances affect cost share?

A lot of those questions it's hard to determine. Again I would say let's wait until the specific criteria come out in the request for proposals. My sense is we will not kind of favor one reason to another though certainly if there are areas that are having more difficulty breaking into defined markets and that is talked about explicitly within the proposal then that will help define the proposal more specifically. So without getting into kind of the details of your questions I think it's really hard to respond to that at this point.

A question from (Mia). And Jonathan, if there are questions here that you want to dive into please let me know. From (Mia Divine): you presented a map with eight different regions. Are the regions already defined by these maps or do we define our own regions?

You define your own regions and again I don't think they need to be contiguous from a state by state perspective. As an example, even on that map

Alaska and Hawaii are not - and the U.S. Virgin Islands even though it's not represented there are not contiguous but they are certainly all dealing with similar issues in regards to wind deployment.

Have you defined who's eligible applicants are? That is a question right now only in regards to 501(c)(3)s or 501(c)(4)s and the level of an organization's ability to do lobbying and also be the prime point for an RRC. So that is being hashed out by NREL lawyers at this point about what kind of criteria we're going to have to put in place to ensure that an organization that becomes an RRC is not an active lobbying organization or primarily an active lobbying organization. And that's something that we're figuring out at this point in time.

But all organizations—NGOs, private, universities, whatever—I think are all open to support the activities and be on proposals whether they're the lead or part of the team that supports the project.

Jonathan Bartlett: If I can add to your response...

Ian Baring-Gould: Mm-hm certainly.

Jonathan Bartlett: ...regarding the map of eight different regions and defining them. We also have a question about the number of awards expected and do we expect every state to be included in an RRC. So while we're not prescribing the number of states or how that spread of states comprises a region it is unlikely that we wouldn't cover every state because it would be sort of odd to have a gap.

Let's say there's a region of six or seven states that one or two of those states are very far along in terms of the, you know, development of rurals covering deployment within counties and dealing with public acceptance and already

have a large amount of deployed wind. So it could be that region just isn't quite as active in those states where things are farther along.

But on the flip side of that you can use whatever methods that state used to get to that point maybe there are some lessons learned that could be applied to the other states in the region. So I think that's kind of how we would envision things being balanced out.

And while an applicant may propose a certain grouping of states if in the event we had—as Ian mentioned before—six RRC proposals from New England and we have a gap somewhere we might massage those areas to include a state that would be left out.

Ian Baring-Gould: And it could be that a single state that is kind of in a border area or whatever could be represented by two groups if those groups had different focuses or things of that nature.

And this gets to a question by (Maureen): how are the region states coordinating their specific region? I don't think there is a way for us to do that without us actually explicitly stating this is a region. And so unfortunately I don't think there is a method to coordinate which states are trying to be parts of which regions or which proposals are being written by which organizations.

And I've thought about ways of trying to orchestrate that without being obtrusive and I haven't come up with any. But if someone has a good idea, please don't hesitate and let us know.

There's a question by (Deborah Donovan): can the awards be set at different levels per year over the three years? As in can you request \$100,000 in the first year and \$200,000 for the second year? Certainly go ahead and do so.

That would be part of your proposal and we don't expect—even though almost every proposal comes back with almost the maximum amount for each year if that's not the way it makes sense for your region or the proposal that you're pulling together you're free to request different amounts of money for different years.

There was a question from (Heather Rhodes Weaver): with only six awards expected do you expect every state to be include in RRCs? Jonathan said we believe - I think he's covered that already.

Jonathan Bartlett: Yes.

Ian Baring-Gould: We're going to try and get every state but not necessarily.

Is the Navigant study available?

Jonathan Bartlett: Yes.

Ian Baring-Gould: Yes it is and I think in the last two e-newsletters it was listed and in one of the new reports coming out. So it is...

Jonathan Bartlett: (Unintelligible)...

Ian Baring-Gould: Oh, go ahead Jonathan.

Jonathan Bartlett: Yes, if you go to the wind site directly to the Wind Program site it's currently on the rotation and it leads to a link to the report.

Ian Baring-Gould: Okay, and then in the RFP documents we'll include a link to that report because I think it has a lot of great information in it.

Let's go to one of the other questions online, or voice questions that people have.

Coordinator: Our next then is from (Victoria Hubble). Your line is open ma'am.

(Victoria Hubble): Thanks. I think you answered it. My question was similar to (Maureen's) about having... could one state be in multiple regions. You answered that.

But I do have another one and that is in (Jonathan's) presentation he talked about one of the Navigant findings would be the deliverable of being able to reach out to legislators and other decision makers. And can you clarify how that relates to advocacy versus science-based decision support which you emphasized in your slide scan.

Ian Baring-Gould: Jonathan, do you want to take that? Or I can.

Jonathan Bartlett: Well we can tag team it. Well one of the ways we envision that is making sure that, like, for instance the number of meetings that an RRC can get with the various county commissioners. I mean, with 3,500 counties across the U.S. we want to make sure that due to natural attrition there's a constant need for reeducation about renewable technology and wind technology specifically. We want to make sure that the people who are making those decisions that can impact deployment are well informed. So that's an example of what I mean in terms of educating the legislators.

Ian Baring-Gould: And in the wind working group context that was always a tricky line to walk. So certainly DOE and NREL do not fund, cannot fund lobbying activities. But yet there's a fine line between being able to provide information to decision makers and lobbying those decision makers.

And in the case of the wind working groups none of the money that the wind working groups had from DOE was spent on lobbying but certainly members of the wind working group lobbied I believe using their own funds, their own corporate organizations. And so that's a distinction that has to be understood and walked carefully but clearly being part of a RRC doesn't force you from not talking to your local representatives either when they approach you or by you approaching them just so long as there's a clear division between the activities. So hopefully that answered your question (Victoria).

So let's see. I think to a degree we already answered this question from (Stephanie): can the activities include introducing legislation and advocating on the behalf of legislation at state and local levels that address bearers to wind energy?

I would say that' probably crossing the line in regards to lobbying. So introducing legislation or advocating specifically for legislation unless that information is requested by the legislative body—so certainly something that we do at NREL and a lot of the wind working groups have done is if they are requested to provide testimony on a piece of legislation then they can do and do that. But they cannot go outright and provide testimony because that crosses that line.

Again that doesn't exclude people who are part of the RRCs or organizations that are part of the RRCs to partake in lobbying. Just so long as the organization isn't almost completely a lobbying organization and the funds are kept separate so there's some sort of firewall in between those two. Anything further on that Jonathan, on that topic?

Jonathan Bartlett: No, no. I think that's good.

Ian Baring-Gould: Okay. A question from (Larry Flowers): with the 2014 budget uncertainty and the August timeframe for the RFP response will you be giving guidance on target funding scenarios? And then what about continuing resolution impacts?

We will certainly have guidance in the request for proposals in regards to funding and our expectations on what the funding will be in the out years. We have money that's been set aside this year to support the RRCs and it's in this year's budget language and so any continued resolution shouldn't impact that at all. We can still go forwards.

It's more in out years that the uncertainty in regards to funding. And then again the budget for FY14 hasn't been finalized and so there's a little bit of question about how much we can commit even in 2014. But the request for proposals will be fairly explicit in the level of funding that we believe we have available for at least the first year and in this kind of budget environment that's all we can really do.

A question from (Howard): who are the most likely recipients of the grants? I think we've addressed that. We're not defining that. My bet is that state entities probably cannot be the prime though I'm not 100% sure of that. But again from a regional perspective if—just picking on New England again if a state organization in Vermont wanted to run a regional resource center I'm not quite sure how they would articulate that and put that within their state—within their budget or define that in their state mandate to run a regional entity.

So my bet is that state governments will not be the prime but would certainly be on the team and that some entity that had more regional jurisdiction, which could be a university. But that an organization that had a more regional focus

would be the primary RRC organization supported by universities and state entities and things like that.

This briefing here will be posted on the Wind Powering America website just like all of our webinars. It takes us about a week and a half to get that up there so it should be there relatively soon but it will be there in the recorded format just like all the rest of them.

Why don't we go to—oh, following on (Victoria), a link to the website, or to the slides—we won't send it out to the participants. That's not something that's easy to do but we'll announce when the webinar is available in the WPA e-newsletter and that should go out to everybody here. So that's how you will know when it's out there. Emailing slides out is actually something that we're getting in more trouble for because it requires specific review and things of that nature.

Another question from the phone?

Coordinator: Our next now is from (Liz Argo). Your line is open ma'am.

(Liz Argo): Hello. Hi everybody. Thank you so much. I think you've pretty much indicated that you're looking for the person or the group leader to have a 501(c)(3) or a 501(c)(4) status. So if you could talk to that.

And then I also wondered if you will be able to help facilitate identifying interested parties. If there will be a way to collect interested people either regionally or... I know you're not defining the regions but if that's something you might be able to help with.

Ian Baring-Gould: Certainly. Thanks (Liz). Thanks for the question. In regards to the 501(c)(3), 501(c)(4) we're not defining the organizations and to a degree I think 501(c)(4)s might be a more complex organization to be submitting. But I think other than this issue about organizations that primary focus is lobbying which we will not be able to contract with I think any organization should think about applying if they feel it makes sense for the organization to be the prime. And the guidance that comes out with the request for proposal will address this issue of lobbying and that'll be very explicit.

I am more than happy to try and connect organizations that I know are thinking about proposals and if anybody has a smart way of doing this please let me know. It becomes a little bit complicated without... Well, it becomes a little complicated because when people are responding to FOAs they could potentially be competing with each other. And so there's some level of collaboration and then there's some level of competition. And so how you skirt that.

But if people want to let me know if they... at least to the point where the RFP goes out. Once the RFP goes out then we cannot communicate on the proposals at all. But until that point if people are submitting proposals or thing they're going to and want to know other organizations within their region that have also let us know that they are thinking of doing something please don't hesitate to do that and I'll try to connect people as it makes sense.

Do we have another question?

Coordinator: We do. (Bethany Mowers), your line is open.

(Stephanie Nowers): I think that was (Stephanie Nowers) but hi Ian, hi Jonathan.

Ian Baring-Gould: Hi.

(Stephanie Nowers): Thanks for the presentation.

Jonathan Bartlett: Hi.

(Stephanie Nowers): I wasn't able to access the slides but I wondered if you could talk about the cost share a little bit more. A lot of our areas are financially challenged and so I'm wondering is that just a straight up match of money or can that be an in-kind match in some form?

Ian Baring-Gould: It can definitely be in-kind match. The requirements on what is cost share from NREL and DOE's perspective is very broad. So it can be desk space, it can be equipment like computers or what have you, it can be personnel time, and it can be cash on the barrelhead. So it's very broad.

(Stephanie Nowers): Okay. Great, thank you.

Coordinator: I have one more on the phone lines.

Ian Baring-Gould: Okay.

Coordinator: (Amanda Orman), your line's open.

(Amanda Orman): Hi, thank you. A question about the RRC COs. When you were speaking it it made me think that you all are thinking that these will become their own entities or could possibly become their own entities. So a little discussion about that and also about the cost—or not the cost sharing but the 501(c)(6)s. I think you had said earlier that you're having some attorneys take a look at that

and do you know when you might have a determination about whether a 501(c)(6) would work?

Ian Baring-Gould: Okay. Thanks for the question (Amanda). Now I've spaced on the first part of your question so I'll tackle the second one.

It probably won't be until the request for proposal is out when we actually have legal guidance and can articulate that legal guidance about what types of organizations are able to apply. I'm not sure if there is a good way to get that information out prior to the actual release of the request for proposals.

(Amanda Orman): (Unintelligible) what about...

Ian Baring-Gould: But I'll try to think of a way that we can do that.

(Amanda Orman): Okay.

Ian Baring-Gould: Get that information out. And then what was the first part? Sorry.

(Amanda Orman): The other thing was is it your expectation that the RRC COs kind of—because you mentioned that you want to get them to be self-supporting after the period of the grant. So is there an expectation that the RRC COs become their own standalone entities?

Jonathan Bartlett: Well, I can address at least part of that. We don't envision infinite funding for the regional resource centers and that's in part why we want to make sure that they develop some other sources of funding if their activities are to continue in the future.

But there's also the, you know, perhaps this is a glass half full way of looking at the universe but in the event that the regional resource centers are a tremendous success and they either mitigate some large barriers to deployment or, you know, create a strong increase in the level of deployment it could be that we get to the point where both from DOE, NREL, and the entities themselves recognize well maybe there's not a need for these organizations anymore.

So we want to set the stage for them to be able to survive but there might be a future where they're not needed anymore. So that's part of the design acknowledgement.

(Amanda Orman): If I can stick on one other question: how are you going to determine if they're going to be able to become self-supporting?

Ian Baring-Gould: I don't think there's a way to determine that completely but it would be in their description of how they plan to go about setting up a structure so that they can be. And we're certainly now in discussions about what facilities, kind of technical services or whatever NREL, DOE and others could provide to help RRCs become self-sustainable.

But at this point I think the best that we can do is within the request for proposal have the organizations describe what approaches they would take to becoming self-sustainable, we'll select the ones based on the whole list of criteria that we come up with, and then we'll work to support them in becoming a self-sustaining entity over the term of the contract. And that certainly doesn't guarantee success but it's probably the best we can do at this point in time.

(Amanda Orman): Thank you.

Jonathan Bartlett: Yes, and as part of one of the things I alluded to is we want to make sure that these entities do a good job of tracking their usage of funds or if they're in-kind or leverage funds from other sources because that's part of the... consider it just like a good, you know, good business planning. You know, if you do a good job of tracking how you're using the money then not only can you track your success but it also gives you a better idea of how you're going to be operating in the future.

(Amanda Orman): Terrific. Thanks.

Coordinator: And that was my last question over the phone lines.

Ian Baring-Gould: Okay, great. A few more questions here. (Lisa Powell's): if the RFP is released in late August what will be the deadline for the application? We're certainly hoping to give organizations a fair amount of time to propose. Three to four weeks would be my bet. One of the reasons that we're trying to do a Webinar like this is to get people thinking prior to the RFP being released so that you can be talking about it.

But we want to make sure that we get good proposals. So if it takes us a little bit longer and people need a bit more time to pull together good teams and write their proposals then we're certainly not going to try and have an amazingly fast turnaround because that just hurts all of us in the end.

Let's see. Question from (Heather): will the intended focus be utility scale wind or (unintelligible) wind, both? I think it'll be everything. So utility, small community, offshore. So we're not putting any brackets around this at this point in time in regards to what technology. And I think in some cases it'll be all technologies and in some cases it might be that RRCs want to focus on a

specific technology area because that's where they think they can be the most impactful.

Another question: is it possible to obtain a list of the names of the persons who attended this webinar? I will check into that and see whether we can do that either legally as well as functionally. So let me see if I can do that and if it is possible then I will certainly send that out.

Let's see. You showed a map with public acceptance (unintelligible) and wildlife concerns. Is it available along with the report? Unfortunately, no. That was done as a... and this was a question from (Bonnie). Hi (Bonnie). That report has not been made public and given the issues with review my bet is it will never be public. It's something that if you want specific information on, (Susan Tegan) was the one who pulled that together so I would contact her. But no, that report... a short summary report I believe is being produced but the full report will not be produced.

Let's see. Other questions from (Simon Mehan): we're working with organizations from other regions so if folks have questions about people to connect—so (Simon Mehan) is putting himself out there as a go-between. So if people want to talk to him he can.

Another question; (Brian): if you're looking for proposals to define the regions is there a logic behind the eight regions that you've shown on the map? There will be...

Jonathan Bartlett: Yes, I can...

Ian Baring-Gould: Yes.

Jonathan Bartlett: ...yes.

Ian Baring-Gould: Go for it.

Jonathan Bartlett: Sorry for interrupting. Is there a logic behind the eight example reasons that you've shown on the map that will influence how favorably proposals are received? No. That was just was just a conceptual let's cut the country up just to show an example. But in no way were we prescribing that the regions should represent that and it's a hypothetical. So do not feel constrained in your application.

Ian Baring-Gould: Yes.

Jonathan Bartlett: So thank you for that clarifying question.

Ian Baring-Gould: Yes. Lastly—and I think I've got all the questions but there were a lot of them. Question from (Jim Wilson): the August RFP, September selection, October kickoff seems unrealistically aggressive and I agree with you completely but we're going to try and do our best. So we're going to try and get this out there as possible. But as I said we're not going to try to rush this because we know people do need time to put the proposals together and we want to insure that we have good proposals not fast proposals.

Let's see. Just as a final note: this whole recorded activity will be available in about a week on the WPA website and the WPA e-newsletter will let you know when that is out there.

Any other questions on the line both for people who want to type them in or people who want to submit them verbally?

Coordinator: Over the phone lines I have no further requests.

Ian Baring-Gould: Great. So I think we've covered all of it. Please don't hesitate to reach out to either Jonathan or myself. You've been looking at our email addresses for far too long at this point but I'm sure all of you have them as well as our phone numbers. So don't hesitate to let us know if you have any questions, concerns or thoughts in regards to the RRCs. That's easy to do.

Just the last topic: the next regularly scheduled webinar which is going to be on the 21st is going to be a summary of the distributed applications market report. And (Heather Rhodes Weaver) who is still on there I can see will be taking part in that presentation.

So please again don't hesitate to reach out and make sure you put on your calendars the 21st, 3:00 Eastern to get an update on the distributed applications market report.

So Jonathan, unless you have any last words? I'm letting you have the last words.

Jonathan Bartlett: (Unintelligible) I want to thank all of you for participating in today's webinar. We look forward to the release of the regional resource centers RFP via NREL. I want to thank NREL again for all of the WPA activities including this webinar series. Ian, thank you very much for all that you do and for participating today. We will see you in August.

Ian Baring-Gould: Great. Thank you, all.

Coordinator: Conference is now concluded. Thank you for your participation. You may disconnect now at this time. Have a great day.