

## Phase II Budget Presentation Follow-up Materials

---

The materials in this packet provide additional information related to questions posed by the Ways and Means Natural Resources Subcommittee to the department at the May 2, 2013, Public Hearing on HB 5011 and HB 5012. Materials include:

- Additional Information about funding for Policy Package 101
  - A corrected list of Small-scale Energy Loans made to businesses or individuals in Senator Dingfelder's district
  - Additional information about fees and the Biomass Collector and Producer Tax Credit component of Policy Package 201
- 

### Policy Package 101

The total costs for this policy package are \$1,406,027, with revenues coming from Other and Federal Funds.

Federal Funds:	\$ 174,012
OF/SEED:	64,721
OF/ESA:	<u>\$1,167,294</u>
Total:	\$1,406,027

This package is closely tied to the department's 070 Revenue Short-fall Package. This package identifies two existing, permanent energy analyst positions that the department held vacant during the 2011-13 biennium due to declining revenues from Federal Fund and Other Fund grants. Federal Fund revenues have dropped by approximately 35% from Pre-federal Stimulus levels (prior to the 2009-11 biennium).

POP 101 asks for the continuation of these two permanent positions to focus on the Governor's energy priorities related to residential energy conservation and conversion of fleets to alternative transportation fuels, and that the funding for these positions comes from Energy Supplier Assessment revenues.

The package also makes whole a part-time position to provide continued support for the Governor's Cool Schools Initiative and the State Building Innovation Lab. With approval of POP 101, half of the funding for this combined position will come from Energy Supplier Assessment revenues.

In addition, the package asks for \$300,000 in professional services limitation. In short, half of this investment is database upgrades, and the other half is a system assessment and development plan. This approach looks at improving the department's existing schools database as a platform to build on, rather than abandoning one system and buying another. And, carving out \$150,000 for an assessment of needs and current capacity instead of more database patching will be less costly in the long run and sets us up for scalability.

The total incremental Energy Supplier Assessment revenues needed to fund the positions linked to the 070 Revenue Short-fall Package, half the technical position for Cool Schools and the State Building Innovation Lab, and proposed data investments is \$788,016.

When the department developed its current service level budget, over \$340,000 was eliminated from the department's special payments budget because the High Performance Schools Program in the Planning, Policy and Technical Analysis Division is almost complete. This program was established over 10 years ago and provided grants, using Energy Supplier Assessment revenues, to assist schools with incorporating energy efficiency investments in the design of new schools. [This past effort is distinct from the department's current schools programs, SB 1149 and Cool Schools.] An additional \$135,000 in services and supplies expenditures funded with Energy Supplier Assessment revenues, during the 2011-13 biennium, was phased out of the Administrative Services budget. These phase-outs total almost \$500,000 of activities formerly funded with Energy Supplier Assessment revenues. When combined with other cost cutting actions, the department expects to assume the additional costs of this package with minimal incremental increase in the Energy Supplier Assessment during the 2013-15 biennium.

#### Energy Loans in Senator Dingfelder's District

The table that follows provides a list of Small-scale Energy Loans made to business and individual located within Senator Dingfelder's District.

**Senator Jackie Dingfelder**

<b>Borrower</b>	<b>LoanAmount</b>	<b>CloseDate</b>	<b>Senate District</b>	<b>Project Description</b>
Malarkey Roofing Co.	293,000.00	04/23/1984	S-23	Waste gas recovery project.
Turner B.L.	14,500.00	12/19/1984	S-23	Automatic chemical treatment system for boiler water.
Walter Ratzlaf, et. al.	17,000.00	02/08/1990	S-23	Weatherization for 17-unit apartment complex.
Multnomah County	55,550.00	12/19/1996	S-23	Lighting, insulation, efficient boiler and direct digital control.
Warner Pacific College	82,504.79	09/30/2002	S-23	Retrofit of existing interior and exterior lighting for 10 campus buildings.
Pollard Lloyd	23,000.00	11/17/2003	S-23	Replace oil-fired boiler with gas furnace for residential rental 4-plex.
Hermitage Partners LLC	52,864.00	09/13/2004	S-23	Install energy conservation measures including insulation and lighting upgrades to a 68-unit apartment complex. Measures were identified through an energy audit by the Office of Sustainable Development.
American Condominium Homes, Inc	506,219.00	12/10/2004	S-23	Replace 172 windows and install floor insulation.
Film Action Oregon	300,000.00	11/30/2005	S-23	Upgrade boiler and delivery for theater building HVAC including DDC.
Film Action Oregon	248,368.40	11/30/2005	S-23	HVAC Upgrade for Hollywood Theatre
American Condominium Homes, Inc	71,286.00	11/05/2009	S-23	Project includes installation of high efficiency Lochinvar model: SBN1500 condensing natural gas boiler that upgrades the existing Burnhan model: PF-509 natural gas boiler that is within its existing service life. Project is expected to save 6,016 th
Revolt Technology LLC	2,040,223.48	09/28/2010	S-23	The development and demonstration of electrically rechargeable metal-air technology. Project is to design and demonstrate electrically rechargeable zinc-air battery system for use in EV applications.
	3,704,515.67			

***How much revenue has been generated historically, and how much additional fee revenue will be raised by each of the fees being increased?***

See the attached documents which provide an overview of the assumptions that are included in the cost recovery model used to forecast fees for the Energy Incentives Program (Attachment A), along with a table that provides the revenues anticipated from each of the proposed fee changes (Attachment B). As we gather more data, we will continue to refine this forecast.

BIOMASS PRODUCER/COLLECTOR TAX CREDIT

***What is the range of tax credit size? What is the median tax credit size?***

For biomass, tax credits awarded have ranged from \$329 to \$505,392. The median tax credit to date is \$24,209 and the mean tax credit is \$50,264.

***Is there a statutory time limit (max time) within which the application must be processed?***

No, there is not a statutory time limit for application processing time. However, the department's objective is to complete review of biomass applications within 30 days.

***What constitutes a "technical review"?***

The department's technical review of biomass tax credit applications determines whether the type of biomass is eligible, whether the person claiming the credit has title to it, whether the biomass material was sourced in Oregon, and whether the claimed tonnage is supported by the applicant's documentation. For example, the department's processing of tax credit applications for manure requires a review of the herd's composition because the breed and type of animal (calf, cow, bull, steer) changes the amount of biomass that is eligible, in addition to confirming the applicant meets the other requirements described above.

***To the extent that the fees are not covering costs, are applications being approved without sufficient review, denied without sufficient review, or is the process just taking longer?***

The process is taking longer. The department must approve incentives only for projects that meet the legal requirements of the program. This includes the technical review described above. The time it takes to review biomass applications is similar to the time it takes to review other applications for business energy incentives. However, the fee the department assesses today for the biomass tax credit is only 0.6 percent of tax incentives awarded – that's 10 times less than for the other programs.

In addition, the administrative costs for the biomass program increased. The program now uses an auditing process in reviewing the applications, which increases the time it takes to review each file and increases the cost. Initially auditing was focused on sourcing in Oregon and title. Today it includes examining the weight receipts to determine wet versus dry tons when loads are delivered. Further, the department instituted processes to more accurately capture staff

time devoted to the program, revealing the true program cost from technical review to creation of the tax credit certificates to program management.

The department’s evaluation of expected numbers of applications and associated revenues for the biomass tax credit program, versus program expenditures in the Governor’s budget, demonstrates that the biomass program will accrue a deficit of more than \$200,000 during the next biennium at current fee levels. The requested fee change is necessary to cover the cost of administering the program. The department is not asking for any additional expenditure limitation for the biomass tax credit program.

***How many biomass plants are there?***

The State of Oregon provides tax credits for the production, collection and transportation of biomass that is used for energy production. To be eligible, the applicant must be an agricultural producer or biomass collector and the biomass material must be sourced from and used within Oregon. Biomass includes woody biomass, manure, oil seed crops, rendering offal, used cooking oil, waste grease and other such materials. In addition, the biomass must be used as biofuel or to produce biofuel in Oregon.

For each tax year from 2010 to 2012 there have approximately 20 - 25 facilities in Oregon that received biomass that was eligible for a biomass producer or collector (BPC) tax credit. Depending on the year there are between 20 – 35 firms that apply for a BPC tax credit certification for delivering to these facilities.

Oregon is home to bioenergy facilities that produce thermal energy for industrial process or space heat, electricity for use on site and export, and facilities that produce a solid or liquid biofuel.

48 facilities can produce electricity	Over 60 facilities that produce thermal energy or solid, liquid and gaseous biofuels
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 landfill gas to energy projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 liquid biofuel manufacturers producing biodiesel, and conventional and cellulosic ethanol.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 16 combined heat and power facilities at forest products manufacturing facilities, 1 standalone power plant.</li> <li>• 8 on-farm anaerobic digesters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approximately 30 forest products manufactures that use biomass to produce process steam</li> <li>• 19 facilities that use biomass to provide space heating or cooling.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11 facilities at water treatment facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12 wood pellet manufacturing facilities</li> </ul>

Not all of these facilities are currently operational (e.g. there are lumber mills that are idle). There are also facilities such as landfills and certain anaerobic digesters and thermal production facilities that do not use biomass that is eligible for the tax credit.

In addition to the facilities that are located within Oregon, over 20 percent of the eligible biomass was transported to facilities located outside of the state.

## COST OF ADMINISTERING LEGACY VS. NEW ENERGY INCENTIVES FOR BUSINESSES

### ***How does the cost to administer the legacy Business Energy Tax Credit (BETC) program compare to the cost of administering the new energy incentive programs?***

When developing the proposed fees for the new incentive programs established by the 2011 Legislature, the department analyzed the cost of administering the BETC program to set a baseline. The department also needed to forecast the use of the new incentives program – whose design is markedly different from the BETC program.

In addition, the department streamlined work processes to reduce costs of administering the state's energy incentive programs for both businesses and residents, including the following:

- **Consolidated all energy incentive programs for residents and businesses into a single division**, facilitating shared staff and services and creating more consistent results.
- **Eliminated the expense of having a third party handle pass-through payments.** As provided under state law, the pass-through option allows project owners to transfer their tax credit to a third party in exchange for a cash payment equal to the present value of the credit. Sale of the credits goes toward reimbursing project expenses and, in some cases, accelerates repayment of project debts. The department has always issued pass-through payment letters and credit certification. However, in the past a CPA firm administered the pass-through payments. It is less expensive for the department to handle those payments in-house and that is now the practice.
- **Eliminated one technical position**, after the position was last vacated.

For the new, competitive energy incentive programs created by the 2011 Legislature, the application fee must be higher because the program requires more complex processes that take substantially more time than it took to process BETC applications. See the steps outlined below. In addition, program costs are borne by a smaller number of applicants given the caps on tax credit amounts.

Following is a high-level description of the workflow for the new tax credit programs:

- Opportunity announcements are developed for each technology, which includes information about the due date for applications, technical specifications, and criteria by which the competing projects will be ranked.
  - Technical specifications are developed and peer-reviewed internally, which takes several weeks.

Follow-up materials from the Phase II Budget Presentation to the Joint Committee on Ways and Means Natural Resource Subcommittee, May 2, 2013

- The criteria are based on statutory requirements, such as simple payback. The department works with stakeholders to determine the appropriate weighting of criteria.
- Application forms must also be developed to ensure that the agency gets sufficient information to determine how the projects meet the criteria. The form development takes several days and is peer-reviewed to ensure that it is consistent with the opportunity announcement.
- Once the opportunity period closes, applications are reviewed for completeness. This takes about 15 to 30 minutes per application.
  - If incomplete, the applicant is notified that the application will not be considered.  
Templates were developed so letters can be easily sent using a mail-merge function. This takes several minutes per letter to generate.
  - If complete, the application is screened to determine if it meets the statutory criterion of having a simple payback period of more than three years. This type of initial screening takes about an hour per application.
- All of the applications that meet the statutory requirements are then ranked by other criteria, which include energy savings compared to incentive requested, annual savings over the life of the equipment, strength of the financial plan, strength of implementation plan, location of project, number of jobs created and sustained per tax credit amount requested, and whether a measurement and verification plan is included.
  - A group of technical staff do this review, which generally takes several hours per application.
  - If it is a large project with many attachments, it may take several days to review the application.
  - Scoring by each of the technical staff is averaged to determine the consolidated ranking.
- Only projects selected in the initial ranking – those with the highest consolidated ranking up to the incentive amount in the opportunity announcement – are considered for technical review. The other projects are placed on a supplemental list.
  - Letters are sent to project owners of their advancement in the process and need to pay the technical review fee.
  - If the applicant does not pay the technical review fee, then another project may be selected from the supplemental list.
- Once the technical review fee is paid, technical staff reviews the applications against industry standards to determine technical feasibility and whether the project will operate as represented.
  - Processing the technical review fee, paid by check or credit card, take about five to 10 minutes per transaction, which includes documenting that the fee was paid and redacting information.
  - If technical review reveals that the project is not technically feasible, then the department may deny the application.

- The technical review process may take several days if the application has sufficiently detailed engineering reports. If the engineering reports have insufficient information, there can be delays as staff discusses the project with the owner and gets questions answered.
- Applications that pass technical review are awarded a preliminary certification. The preliminary certification may have conditions that must be met in order to receive a final certification of the tax credit.
  - Preliminary certifications typically take about 15 to 30 minutes to prepare. If there are a significant number of conditions that must be specified in the preliminary certificate that describe what the project owner must demonstrate in order to receive a final certificate, the processing of the preliminary certificate takes longer.
  - A basic template is used for the preliminary certification, which can be merged with project information from the database, but the conditions are unique to each project and require separate entry.
  - Preliminary certifications are reviewed by technical staff for accuracy before being sent to the project owners.
- Applicants are required to report on project progress throughout the three year period for which the preliminary certification is valid or until they file a final application.
  - Department follow up is needed, which results in additional work to generate letters and answer the calls. This typically takes 5 to 15 minutes per application but may take longer.
  - Logging reports and filing them takes about 10 to 15 minutes per application.
  - If a report indicates that a project may not be successfully completed, it is referred to a technical reviewer for follow up. That takes additional time.
- Once a final application is filed, the application is reviewed to ensure that the property taxes are current, that the application provided a CPA letter to confirm project costs, and that the conditions of the preliminary certification are met.
  - Review of final applications typically takes about 30 to 45 minutes per application.
    - If the final application is missing information or supporting documentation, the application is placed on hold and the project owner is contacted to obtain the additional information or missing documentation.
    - It may require more than one letter, email or phone call in order to get the required information from the project owner.
  - The project may also be selected for inspection. The cost of inspections is included in the application fee.
    - Inspections are scheduled with the project owner to accommodate the project owner's schedule.
    - Inspections may take several hours or a day, depending on the technology.



- Once the department completes application review and inspection, then the tax credit is issued to the project owner unless the project owner has elected to use the pass-through option.

For renewable energy projects, the Department of Revenue sells the tax credits and the proceeds are used to fund development grants. The department issues the tax credit certificates to the tax credit purchasers. After the sale of the credits in the fall, the department determines dollars allocated to renewable energy grants. The total amount may not exceed \$1.5 million in a fiscal year. In the spring, the department issues an opportunity announcement and undertakes an evaluation process, similar to the process described above for the new energy tax credits, to determine grant recipients. The department disburses grant proceeds upon completion of the project.

During the first two years of new energy incentive programs, the 2011-13 biennium, the department issued four opportunity announcements for transportation, 10 opportunity announcements for conservation, and two opportunity announcements for renewable energy development grants. Each opportunity announcement creates a batch of work associated with it.

***Is there a limitation to the number of times a credit can be sold?***

Credits are only transferable one time. However, the tax credit recipient can divide the amount of the credit and transfer the portions to any number of entities.

RE-INSPECTION FEE IN HB 5012

***Why not just charge an inspection fee for the energy incentive programs, rather than a re-inspection fee for no-shows?***

The department does not charge a separate inspection fee. Instead, inspection activities required by statute are included as part of the application fee. The reason is that the department does not inspect every project. That would be more costly. Rather, the department focuses on higher-cost projects and certain technologies that are more at risk of falling short of installation specifications as represented by the applicant and required by law. The department also consolidates inspections in various parts of the state in order to save on travel time and other travel costs. In addition, the department typically does not inspect a facility if a utility has conducted an inspection and we can get the requisite information from that utility.

The department schedules inspections with project owners at a time that is convenient for them. The re-inspection fee is designed as a deterrent to avoid costs in the event the applicant does not call to cancel and reschedule, and simply fails to meet the inspector at the agreed-upon time. In that case, staff must travel on a one-off basis to the project site to inspect the facility.

The re-inspection fee ensures that those additional costs are borne by the party that imposes the cost, rather than other program participants. During our rulemaking on this fee, Follow-up materials from the Phase II Budget Presentation to the Joint Committee on Ways and Means Natural Resource Subcommittee, May 2, 2013

stakeholders agreed with this approach. In December 2012, the Department of Administrative Services approved the department's request to charge BETC applicants a \$400 re-inspection fee. The rate is based on an estimate of staff time and travel expenses.

## **Attachment A**

### **Energy Incentives Program Fee Model Assumptions**

---

In the interest of continuity and simplification in our Energy Incentives Program fee communications, the information below takes all assumptions used to model our current and proposed fee structures and puts them into a narrative format. This has been done in the hopes that it will provide Department management with a script of sorts to answer questions that may come up during the 2013 legislative session.

#### **Overall Model Assumptions**

---

##### **General Assumptions**

1. **Tax Credits**: Total tax credits allowed for all three programs (\$51 million/biennium) will not change for the life of the program.
  - a. Within the Transportation program cap of \$20 million/biennium, the allocation of tax credits to the Transit group will gradually decrease until 2016, when the full \$20 million in tax credits will be allocated to Alternate Fuel Infrastructure Projects.
  - b. Within the Conservation program cap of \$28 million/biennium, \$2 million in tax credits will be allocated to Small Premium Projects, while the remaining \$12 million will go towards other Conservation projects each fiscal year.
  - c. Within the renewable program cap of \$3 million/biennium, the tax credits are sold and the proceeds are used to fund grants. The amount offered as grants cannot exceed \$1.5 million in a fiscal year.
2. **Sunset Date**: The sunset date for the Renewable Energy, Transportation and Conservation programs is January 1, 2018, with the Transit portion of the Transportation program phasing out January 1, 2016.
3. **Staffing**: EIP will remain fully staffed, including the positions requested in the 2013-15 Governor's Balanced Budget until one year after the program sunset (January 1, 2019). After this point, 1/3 of the staff will continue to work for another 6 months until July 1, 2019, when the program will scale back to only the staff necessary to carry on compliance activities. On January 1, 2021 all activity related to EIP would end.

##### **Application Assumptions**

1. **Applications Received**: EIP will receive an average of 292 applications per year. Of these, 208 will come from Small Premium Projects, 40 will come from other conservation projects, 29 from Transportation projects and 15 from Renewable Energy projects.

Follow-up materials from the Phase II Budget Presentation to the Joint Committee on Ways and Means Natural Resource Subcommittee, May 2, 2013

2. **Average Project Cost:** The average project cost for Transit projects will be \$2.4 million, while alternate fuel infrastructure projects will average \$450,000; Small Premium Projects will average \$10,000, while other conservation projects will average \$305,000. Renewable energy projects will average \$100,000.
3. **Amendment:** Ten percent of all applicants will apply for amendments, with the exception of Small Premium Project applicants, who are not allowed to apply for amendments.
4. **Re-inspections:** No re-inspections will be necessary, thus no income will come from re-inspection fees.
5. **Precerts:** It will take an average of 3 months after the opportunity announcement closure date for projects to receive their precerts. (This excludes SPP applications, which do not receive precerts.) For renewable grants, it may take 4 to 6 months for projects to receive their performance agreements.
6. **Finals:** For Renewable Energy projects, they will take an average of 18 months to receive their final disbursement. In the transportation program area, alternate fuel infrastructure projects will average 9 months to receive their final certification, while transit projects will average 12 months to final. In the conservation program area, SPP projects will average 10 months to final, while other conservation projects will average 12 months to final. (The time to final projects is measured from the date the application is received and the application fee is paid to the date the final certificate is issued.)
7. **Pass-Through:** One hundred percent of all transit applications will go enter the Pass-Through program, and average 10 Pass-Through partners. Fifty percent of Alternate Fuel Infrastructure applications will go enter the Pass-Through program, and average 5 Pass-Through partners. Alternately, only 10% of Small Premium Projects will go through the Pass-Through program and average 1 Pass-Through partner. While 50% of other Conservation projects will elect for the Pass-Through option and average 5 Pass-Through partners. Due to the grant structure of the renewable energy program, none of these projects will go through the Pass-Through program. Additionally, 25% of all projects entering the Pass-Through program will elect to utilize Department assistance in finding a Pass-Through partner.
8. **Time in Pass-Through:** In the Pass-Through program, Alternate Fuel Infrastructure projects will average 9 months in the program, while Transit projects will average 14 months. SPP projects will average 3 months in Pass-Through, while other conservation projects will average 12 months. (The time in Pass-Through is measured from the date of final certification to the date a Pass-Through partner is found and the full tax credit transaction is completed.)

### Current Fee Structure

---

The current EIP fee structure was created in the fall of 2011 and spring of 2012. Unlike the Business Energy Tax Credit (BETC) program before it, the EIP fee structure created a “pay as you go” model with the noble goal that applicants would only pay for the services they utilized. Unfortunately there was no historical program data on which to base any fee assumptions. Where applicable, historic data from the BETC program was used to generate fee assumptions, Follow-up materials from the Phase II Budget Presentation to the Joint Committee on Ways and Means Natural Resource Subcommittee, May 2, 2013

but due to significant differences between the new EIP and the BETC program, these assumptions proved to be unreliable once the EIP launched and applications began to come in. Tepid stakeholder interest resulted in lower than anticipated revenues, while a more involved application assessment process delayed revenues and increased costs. By the fall of 2012, it became obvious that a different fee structure was needed if the programs were to operate at cost recovery as requested by the Legislature.

### Proposed Fee Structure

---

The new, proposed fee structure increases the application fees for renewable energy grants, alternate fuel infrastructure, transit and all conservation projects except Small Premium Projects from \$200 to \$500; and increases the fee on Small Premium Projects from \$60 to \$100. It increases the final review fee for all projects within the transportation and conservation program areas from 0.50% to 0.55%. In the Pass-Through program it removes the \$25,000 fee cap and increases the cost per Pass-Through partner from \$100 to \$200.

## Attachment B

### Impacts of Proposed Fee Increase on Energy Incentive Program Revenues

Energy Incentive Programs			Forecast Current Fee				Forecast Proposed Fee			Change Forecast Proposed Fee		
			Biennium			<i>Proposed Fee (Changes in Bold Italics)</i>	Biennium			Biennium		
Program Type	Fee Type	Current Fee	2011-13	2013-15	2015-17		2011-13	2013-15	2015-17	2011-13	2013-15	2015-17
CONSERVATION	APPLICATION FEE	\$200	23,288	57,246	49,960	<b>\$500</b>	23,288	128,285	124,902	0	71,039	74,942
	TECHNICAL REVIEW FEE	0.55% Proj Cost	178,665	510,714	419,048	0.55% Proj Cost	178,665	510,714	419,048	0	0	0
	AMENDMENT FEE	\$300	60	9,364	7,494	\$300	60	9,364	7,494	0	0	0
	FINAL REVIEW FEE	0.50% Proj Cost	53,152	376,038	342,858	<b>0.55% Proj Cost</b>	53,152	413,640	377,142	0	37,602	34,284
	PASSTHROUGH W/ ASSIST	1.25% Tax credit(Cap \$25K) + \$100 per	0	164,923	343,750	<b>1.25% Tax credit + \$100 per</b>	0	214,923	393,750	0	50,000	50,000
	PASSTHROUGH W/O ASSIST	\$100 per transferee	0	12,735	25,046	<b>\$200 per partner</b>	0	21,832	42,935	0	9,097	17,889
	REINSPECTION FEE	\$400	0	0	0	\$400	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>CONSERVATION SUB - TOTAL</b>			<b>255,165</b>	<b>1,131,020</b>	<b>1,188,156</b>		<b>255,165</b>	<b>1,298,758</b>	<b>1,365,271</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>167,738</b>	<b>177,115</b>
SMALL PREMIUM PROJECTS	APPLICATION FEE	\$60	26,903	72,180	72,180	<b>\$100</b>	26,903	114,285	120,300	0	42,105	48,120
	FINAL REVIEW FEE	0.50% Proj Cost	6,280	49,610	57,142	0.50% Proj Cost	6,280	54,420	62,858	0	4,810	5,716
	PASSTHROUGH W/ ASSIST	1.25% Tax credit + \$100 per	1,771	38,405	50,000	1.25% Tax credit + \$100 per	1,771	38,405	50,000	0	0	0
	PASSTHROUGH W/O ASSIST	\$100 per transferee	5,433	66,947	81,204	<b>\$200 per partner</b>	5,433	88,001	108,270	0	21,054	27,066
	REINSPECTION FEE	\$400	0	0	0	\$400	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SMALL PREMIUM PROJECTS SUB - TOTAL</b>			<b>40,386</b>	<b>227,142</b>	<b>260,526</b>		<b>40,386</b>	<b>295,111</b>	<b>341,428</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>67,969</b>	<b>80,902</b>
RENEWABLE ENERGY GRANTS	APPLICATION FEE	\$200	5,060	17,142	17,142	<b>\$500</b>	5,060	42,858	42,858	0	25,716	25,716
	TECHNICAL REVIEW FEE	1.05% Proj Cost	47,906	90,000	90,000	1.05% Proj Cost	47,906	90,000	90,000	0	0	0
	AMENDMENT FEE	\$300	0	2,692	2,572	\$300	0	2,692	2,572	0	0	0
	REINSPECTION FEE	\$400	0	0	0	\$400	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>RENEWABLE ENERGY GRANTS SUB - TOTAL</b>			<b>52,966</b>	<b>109,834</b>	<b>109,714</b>		<b>52,966</b>	<b>135,550</b>	<b>135,430</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25,716</b>	<b>25,716</b>
TRANSPORTATION	APPLICATION FEE	\$200	10,767	21,695	30,655	<b>\$500</b>	10,767	50,987	76,637	0	29,292	45,982
	TECHNICAL REVIEW FEE	0.55% Proj Cost	302,770	689,342	540,179	0.55% Proj Cost	302,770	689,342	540,179	0	0	0
	AMENDMENT FEE	\$300	300	3,262	4,591	\$300	300	3,262	4,591	0	0	0
	FINAL REVIEW FEE	0.50% Proj Cost	21,721	544,327	507,142	<b>0.55% Proj Cost</b>	21,721	598,760	557,858	0	54,433	50,716
	PASSTHROUGH W/ ASSIST	1.25% Tax credit(Cap \$25K) + \$100 per	0	121,809	54,217	<b>1.25% Tax credit + \$100 per</b>	0	171,809	104,217	0	50,000	50,000
	PASSTHROUGH W/O ASSIST	\$100 per transferee	0	3,133	6,945	<b>\$200 per partner</b>	0	5,371	11,905	0	2,238	4,960
	REINSPECTION FEE	\$400	0	0	0	\$400	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TRANSPORTATION SUB - TOTAL</b>			<b>335,558</b>	<b>1,383,568</b>	<b>1,143,729</b>		<b>335,558</b>	<b>1,519,531</b>	<b>1,295,387</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>135,963</b>	<b>151,658</b>
BIOMASS PRODUCERS/COLLECTORS	APPLICATION FEE	Higher of \$50 or	650	18,750	21,700	<b>\$100 and</b>	650	35,000	43,400	0	16,250	21,700
	TECHNICAL REVIEW FEE	0.6% Tax Credit <sup>1</sup>	74,536	84,343	98,933	<b>2.5% Tax Credit</b>	74,536	321,835	412,219	0	237,492	313,286
<b>BIOMASS PRODUCERS/COLLECTORS SUB - TOTAL</b>			<b>75,186</b>	<b>103,093</b>	<b>120,633</b>		<b>75,186</b>	<b>356,835</b>	<b>455,619</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>253,742</b>	<b>334,986</b>
<b>Total All Programs</b>			<b>759,261</b>	<b>2,954,657</b>	<b>2,822,758</b>		<b>759,261</b>	<b>3,605,785</b>	<b>3,593,135</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>651,128</b>	<b>770,377</b>

<sup>1</sup> The Legislature has provided prior authority of a \$100 application fee and 1% of tax credit review fee. Implementation of this change was delayed because of biomass stakeholder activities during the biennium.