

Lithium-Ion Car Battery Recycling Advisory Group

Meeting Minutes for 7.13.2021

1. **Call to Order, Roll Call, and Establishment of Quorum** – Caroline Godkin, Deputy Secretary for Environmental Policy and Emergency Response, CalEPA
 - Advisory Member roll call:
 - Ana-Maria Stoian-Chu (AS)
 - Mohammed Omer (MO)
 - Hannon Rasool (HR)
 - Terry Adams (TA)
 - Dan Bowerson (DB)
 - Mark Caffarey (MC)
 - Todd Coy (TC)
 - Toshiya Fukui (TF)
 - Perry Gottesfeld (PG)
 - Steve Henderson (SH)
 - Bernie Kotlier (BK)
 - Nick Lapis (NL)
 - Alison Linder (AL)
 - Teija Mortvedt (TM)
 - Geoff Niswander (GN)
 - Lou Ramondetta (LR)
 - Les Schwizer (LS)
 - Absent for roll call
 - George Kerchner (GK)
 - Jennifer Krill (JK)
2. **Administrative items** – Mohammed Omer, Engineer at DTSC
 - Meeting is being video recorded and livestreamed
 - Public can ask questions and comment via chat or calepa.workshops@calepa.ca.gov
 - Approval of May 25th meeting minutes
 - Minutes approved
 - Updates and questions
 - None

3. Lea Malloy (LM), Cox automotive:

- Cox automotive is family owned and the family company is Cox international
 - Creator and maintainer of trusted marketplaces (Autotrader, Kelley Blue Book)
 - Touch about 67% of all car buyers
 - \$58 billion of vehicle values sold
- Cox vision for EVs:
 - They will be the dominant form of transportation
 - EVs are important in reducing greenhouse gases
 - Believe in a closed-loop EV ecosystem
- The quickest way to enhance the market is the engagement of all parties in the value chain. This responsibility shouldn't be just placed on the manufacturer. This will be driven by data shared. Three high priority opportunities include
 - EV Battery State of Health (SoH) —similar to the universal diagnostic system discussed by the subcommittees.
 - The ability to measure durability will be key to reducing friction as the EV batteries go from warranty to out of market. SoH will help with evaluation.
 - EV battery labelling/ tracking – Passport
 - Surfacing key information for the valuing of the product.
 - Expanded OEM partnerships and access to EV battery data
 - Reduces in the friction of movement and support of EV batteries.
 - Incentives to partner with independent servicing and recycling partners could counterbalance need for extended producer responsibility regulatory scheme

Questions:

AL: Thank you. Can you elaborate on what the incentives include?

LM: One example is a higher transaction price for EVs with SoH provided by the EV.

AL: So market driven solutions?

LM: Yes.

AL: Anything around information sharing to alleviate intellectual property concerns?

LM: We are demonstrating it is possible and the benefits associated with the data use.

DB: Question on the process of getting SoH data. How do you access the data?

LM: I know it is a couple different way. OBD service connect input port. It will be over air in the future. Again, we are working with OEMs.

PG: I am confused as to what this product has to do with the economics of recycling batteries. Why is this a substitute to EPR.

LM: Battery health isn't a substitute but it can provide information to recycling and repurposing. In a marketplace where there is information to future value streams. This means the marketplace has the opportunity to takeover and the EPR isn't needed.

PG: I hear you but I don't see the link.

SH: Ford agrees that SoH will be important. Experts are telling me it is tricky to show SoH. We think it is important to have a standardized process. Do you agree?

LM: Yes, there is value in standards for cross shopping. I think there could be add ons to the standards to further differentiate products.

GN: I want to expand on Perry's question. Why do you see the SoH transparency as a counterbalance to EPR and not compliment them. An EPR would catch what would fall through the cracks in a healthy market. Wouldn't they compliment each other?

LM: Our focus is on upstream insights to inform healthy decisions downstream. This is independent of EPR.

GN: You are focused on upstream and not downstream?

LM: EPR is a separate issue.

GN: So your focus is on the resell?

LM: Correct and EoL decisioning.

TF: The value of SoH monitoring is that with that you are able to ascertain the life left in the battery without having as much data from the OEM. The big issue you mentioned is that it helps with the evaluation of EVs, especially those coming off lease, this helps quantify that a battery has a certain amount of life left which increases the battery. About how many vehicles does Cox handle after leasing?

LM: First, yes. Second, the auctions process about 6 million a year. About half are commercial sellers (off-lease).

BK: To what degree do your positions in policy as a company enable and promote second use, if any.

LM: Our positions are developing. We are believers in reducing environmental impact. If you can extend the life, that is a win for the environment.

MO: We had some discussion about the unlicensed dismantling. What are you doing to make sure these hazardous and important assets are staying in the right areas with trusted parties.

LM: Today the auction is only dealing with the whole car, not dismantled batteries. We are ensuring they are following environmental interests.

MO: Thank you for presenting today! If there are no more questions we will move to the next presentation. Meg Slattery will be talking about preliminary results of the policy recommendation survey.

4. **Presentation of preliminary survey responses, Meg Slattery, UC Davis**

- Jess, Alissa and I have been compiling the potential policies and compiled a survey. There have been 12 members that filled out the survey./
- The sections include:
 - Defining EOL management and financing mechanisms
 - Access to battery information
 - Support reuse and recycling industry development
 - Industry development
 - Reverse logistics
- Preliminary results show consensus for some industry development and information and data. There are diverse opinions for responsibility and financing and the recycling standards
- Information and data sharing:
 - Consensus at this point for a physical labelling requirement
 - Suggestions that this should be harmonized with the CARB proposal
 - Also the suggestion that SOH should be harmonized. The key question is that if SOH is readable after removed from vehicle. This would be in addition to the CARB proposal
 - Also the comment that a logo should be the manufacturer

NL: I think we should be cautious about only have small consensus and not have those solve the problem.

MS: I will talk about our approach later. That is a good point and we are open to suggestions.

- Reverse logistics had a fair amount of support.

- Consensus to changing the universal waste interpretation. It must be noted legislature may not have the authority
- We had recommendations to consider existing resources and feedback that advisory group members hadn't seen strong enough evidence to support these.
- There is opposition to state run programs

TF: How will this survey relate to the second?

MS: we are going to reframe the language based on feedback. We will send this to everyone for more feedback before the next survey is sent out. We are also thinking about having the financing as rank choice.

TF: Thank you

MS: If anyone has suggestions about things done differently we are open to feedback.

TF: Also it looks like 11 of the 12 people voted for the last two. This is a draft and we should take it accordingly

AL: I was wondering what you mean by "recommendations will consider existing resources"?

MS: This was suggesting that when in the report we describe training materials available that we state there are agencies with training materials already available. It is making sure legislatures are aware of existing training material and not duplicating this but filling in the gaps.

MO: Are you going to share the timeline at this stage or later on?

MS: Jess will later on.

- Support industry development
 - Guaranteed timeline and budget and the limit to rule changes had a consensus
 - It was pointed out that there was no funding source for the economic incentive package

LR: What percentage of the survey encompasses the overall group?

MS: A little over half of the advisory group.

- Recycling standards
 - There is more variety in opinion for these. The recycled content standards and minimum material recovery rates are split between support and do not support.
 - The proponents pointed out this could make it more economic

but opposition for these was that it would inhibit the innovation

- It was also pointed out that before recommending a recycled content standard more research should be done
- We received updated language from Perry for the third-party verification.
- Responsibility and financing
 - The least popular was having the current owner is responsible, the most was a vehicle registration fee. I think this will also change in the next survey. Steve will be presenting an update to EPR this meeting and next meeting Dan will be presenting an updated core replacement policy.
- It is very helpful when people send us updated language. If anyone would like to draft language we would appreciate it.

GK: One of the comments I added is that when the secondary use is handed over to the repurposer, that company should take responsibility as producer. That was hard to convey in the survey. I want the record to reflect that. This seems similar to the approach taken by the EU as well.

MS: I think you are correct in pointing out that if there is an EPR, the transfer of ownership is necessary to clarify.

PG: One thing I didn't see is the efficiency standard and reuse of recycled material standards. We didn't talk about improving transparency and including reporting requirements. This might be amenable to the group and putting in specific standards. I think this is true for other aspects.

MO: I want to follow up. I think this is a good idea and I don't want it to be missed out on in the next survey. Perry would you be willing to write this?

PG: If someone can draft it I will fill in the blanks.

MS: we can draft some of that and look at other policies in Europe. I will turn it over to Steve.

SH: Thank you! First off, we didn't have an argument for the intent of the wording there, we realized if this is what we were asked to do we would need to know what we are responsible to do. We had no disagreement with the EPR written by the UCD team. We just embellished

- We specified the EPR initiates when the OEM takes custody of the battery. This includes that we are responsible for all the EOL steps and the reporting.
- Someone mentioned there needs to be education that happens, so we would be responsible for that too.
- The last piece is what is really important to us. Even if we wanted to, we don't

have the authority of the EV unless someone brings it back to us out of warranty. If we as an industry are responsible for the batteries we have to have legislation that the owner relinquishes that battery and gives it to us. Hopefully it would not be the customer but we want them legally responsible to give it to us. As soon as that switch is flipped it is us. This is just Ford speaking, we don't have consensus in the industry. As you know companies don't like to be responsible, there is beauty in it too. We need to sell a lot of EVs and all other options are paying into a fund ten to fifteen years early. This option means we don't have to pay for another ten to fifteen years.

NL: I think this is a nugget of a really good policy. It seems like a starting point for a really consensus policy. A couple questions:

- Batteries have to be relinquished. This means that you are only responsible if they are relinquished?

SH: Don't read into it. We are saying that we need to get responsibility somehow.

NL: If the OEM is willing to pick up the batteries for free or if they are dropped off, then they are handled by the OEM, this is good policy.

SH: Yes

NL: I think Ford should sponsor a bill.

SH: I have to talk to the industry.

NL: of course. I see no red flags.

BK: I am curious about the specifics and unintended consequences. If the OEMs are responsible, to what extent would their liability encourage them to recycling instead of second use.

SH: I don't know if I understand. What I am being told, folks believe in the future second use will be viable from a financial perspective, but people think it may be better to recycle environmentally. This is what might be steering the question.

BK: A good point. We know that decisions made on a financial basis aren't always good for the environment. We need to be cautious with proposals based on the economic driver without the strong dose of environmental concern. There is evidence in the marketplace that it is more expensive to reuse but it may be a better environmental decision. I think we need more discussion.

SH: One thought my colleagues saw was that there needs to be triage when it is decided if they are reused and recycling.

BK: I know I am being redundant but I think that public policy should address the OEM responsibility that they should not be making decisions about the EoL.

GK: a question about the required companion legislation. Is this when the car is in CA or is it something that would be required across the US?

SH: Yes that is the giant loophole. These are nationwide problems and this needs to be a nationwide program.

Mark Williams: My question is about other consumer good EPR. Is it also that products are required to be returned. .

PG: Excellent starting point. I was curious again on the reuse side. If it is decided to be reused, how?

SH: You could see a system of putting it out to the wild and then pulled back.

JK: This is terrific, I am loving this. BK and GK asked my questions regarding how the EPR pathway leads us to the second-use options. What about other countries? Labelling and some of the options considered regarding how the battery or the system is getting tracked. Is Ford thinking about the logistical side of the triage?

SH: We do business in EU and this is similar to what is going to happen. The one difference I haven't penetrated. It seems that the dismantlers have less control. We seem to have a good system of dropping off cars at dismantlers. China has a statewide run program.

- For labeling, China has one at the cell level, and EU has it at the pack. CARB is proposing one that is similar to the EU and we have no problem with that

AM: thank you Steve. What about orphaned EVs? Maybe we could add that OEMs take a portion of the orphaned batteries. All EPRs have a system. We tried to establish the 90% answer and there is more out there.

TA: I am not a fan of going down this path. To the extent of an EPR it should be for orphaned batteries. I believe the owner has the right to dictate and that the state of CA should dictate that the battery is recycling. The economic outlet should drive that. If there is a negative value than there needs to be an outlet for that. OEMs who have no expertise in recycling are in control and that this is not something dismantlers will support.

SH: A couple of folks got excited about EPR but they said EPR only applies to orphaned panels.

TA: To the extent that EPR applies to an outlet for batteries that would otherwise be mismanaged if improperly disposed of, then I think that makes sense.

NL: To follow up on TA point. I think it would be helpful to not apply this to EPR. Terry this might be a question for you. In my mind I am hearing that if there is a negative cost to dealing with the battery, you could turn over the battery to OEM for free.

SH: Let me jump in here. If you are going to make the OEM responsible, you have to somehow give the access to the OEM. We are talking about the responsibility to all of them. You have to make sure that the battery is available unless there is a rule that says when you remove it, it is OEMs.

NL: Are you suggesting that the dismantler has to turn it over to the OEM.

SH: Yes

NL: The key is that you are providing a key option to recycling. We have never mandated that someone has to turn something over of value.

SH: If these are of value, then this is needed. The reason we wrote it this way is that with some assurance these batteries will be properly cared for at the EoL.

CG: Thank you. This is kind of an observation and also a suggestion. As we think about recommendation of committees. This sits within an ecosystem of recommendations. The math will cancel out when more batteries are compiled and we need to think about the grey market. We need to stop thinking about the independence of the policy and how it will fit within the other policies.

SH: Yes, we need to think about the orphaned modules.

PG: Yes, I think there is something of value in your proposal. Maybe what you are really suggesting is a lease program because in the end the battery will come back to you.

SH: Models like that have been suggested. Interesting point.

TA: Back to the dismantler point of view, if the battery has reached its end-of-life it may have a negative value but if it is a new battery in a crash it may have a lot of value. I would like the OEM responsibility to provide a pathway if the disposal is not economic.

GN: It seems that this will play out once the battery is waste and has no value.

SH: No. We intended once it was removed from a vehicle. The reason we use that as a dividing line is we don't want to be separating batteries from cars, but once removed this battery is a problem.

GN: Okay, that is a point to work on. I agree. Terry, I agree, this is private property but when it is public watersheds that are polluted because they are abandoned it is a bigger problem than personal rights. One thing is that in 1980 the imported smoke detectors had to be returned due to radioactivity.

MO: I agree this is a good starting point. The major thing I am thinking about is the orphan panels that will not be captured by this. Thank you Steve.

Ahmad Pesaran: I have heard about the EPR and the discussion we had with groups is this would be one example that other companies don't want because it will go directly to recycling. I am happy to see that the slide talks about recycling. Earlier GK mentioned that reuse is better than directly recycling and the economics of the transportation. The sentence saying the EV will need to be returned to OEM. I understand that they don't mean literally but that is what it looks like on paper.

SH: Thank you for giving me the opportunity.

MS: Thank you. It has been helpful to hear specific responses as they were written down.

- The purpose of this slide is to give an update on the timing portion. We will modify language based on the feedback. Please reach out to us if you would like to contribute with specific language.

NL: For the survey, I think there should be the option of with support with the following changes

MO: There is a whole time frame after the survey that the UC Davis team will be writing the report. We will have a meeting in between there as well.

TF: Thank you Mohammed. It is hard to get consensus. I am concerned that there was only 60%. We want 100%, is there any guidelines? Or is this just one tool for the recommendation process?

CG: I think we need to assert to all committee members that it is critical that everyone responds. It is critical and we will send reminders and all those things. There will be time for discussion and commentary for the final report. Yes, we want 100% participation, but also we will be editing the report.

TF: One of the challenges is that we have to have hard deadlines within the various groups. Working with two different groups, it was hard to get comments.

JD: In response to that, in the next presentation I will be providing hard deadlines so that the organizations can prepare.

TEN MINUTE BREAK

MO: Welcome back everyone. Bernie had a question then we will move onto Jess's presentation.

BK: Who will send out the survey next time?

MO: I will send out the survey but will not personally see anyone's survey results, those all go to Meg, Jess and Alissa and they are the ones that look at it and compile it. Thanks Meg for running through the survey and as Caroline said we will push to get 100% response rate. Jess is a PhD student working behind the scenes and she will present an updated timeline and plan for the report.

5. Update on draft report, Jessica Dunn, UC Davis

JD: Thanks Mohammed. Hopefully I'll be able to answer a lot of the questions that have been brought up. This is the timeline we showed in January and we have completed phase 1 and 2 so far. We are moving into phase 3 which is incorporating feedback and creating the rough draft, which is what the survey is informing. I will show an outline for the draft later.

The timeline for the report development—we want to provide complete transparency to the AG. This is the schedule we created to write the report. We are using the next few weeks until August 9 to write down our process and compile all of the feedback into policy options and creating the survey. The draft recommendations will be sent out on August 9 for review and changes to language. We are asking that this be returned August 16. The survey will be distributed on August 19. We are providing three weeks for members to fill out the survey so the deadline is September 9. After that we will evaluate the policy recommendations and write the remaining sections. We are hoping to provide the draft report to the AG for review on November 1. We are asking for feedback on November 19 and then aiming to provide the report to the public for review on December 15.

These dates should be in your email inbox from Mohammed as well and we will be sending email reminders and updates throughout the process. Are there any questions or concerns?

MO: Let's pause this quickly because I want to make sure it's well understood. Between now and August 9 is when the survey will continue to be edited internally, then it will be sent to us for feedback. So by August 16 everyone should have responded back if they have edits to the final survey language. The survey should be submitted by September 9.

DB: Will there be an opportunity to comment "would support with modifications" and talk through some of the survey responses? There could be an opportunity to get to a better position if the committee can discuss the results.

MO: I'm getting ahead of the general flow of the meetings but I'm thinking that the latter half of August for one last advisory group meeting, that way there can be more potential for changing the language in the survey.

JD: The recommendation survey deadline for August 9 is just to get feedback on the language.

DB: How long will the public have to review the draft?

CG: We will aim to have two months to get feedback and revise, so getting it back in February

MS: It would be good to meet after we get all the results so we can present everyone's feedback.

MO: We will probably be meeting more often particularly now that the subcommittees are no longer meeting so maybe a meeting in late August and another in late September or early October.

CG: I request that everyone from the AG respond to the draft even if you are just letting us know that you have no additional changes.

JD: Here are the deadlines again presented as a timeline. Next we will look at the report outline. This has been changed slightly and modified as we have been writing the report. The sections are split into: Introduction, Background, Subcommittees, and Policy Recommendations. The subcommittee and regulations have been completed and sent out for feedback, thanks to everyone who responded.

The June and July meetings are helping to inform policy options and the final survey. Under the policy recommendations we will have consensus policies and we will try to work through them as well maybe looking at 2/3 or 3/4 majority, this is to be determined but we will have a space for dissenting opinions even where there is majority support.

We have received edits to B&O document, thank you for those of you who provided feedback. Those edits will either be incorporated in the next draft. If we do not include your edits we will send a copy of your edits with a response to the comment.

Thank you, here is Meg and my's email address so you can reach out with any questions.

MO: Thanks Jess, I'm sure there will be questions after the fact.

BK: Mohammed when you were talking about the meetings, I would urge the management of the group to send out doodles as soon as possible because there is a lot of pent up demand for meetings in September and October so the sooner we can get dates on the calendar it would be much appreciated.

MO: Thanks, I agree. Usually we schedule the next meeting at the end of each meeting but I think if people are interested we can try to schedule out the next two or even next three meetings at the end of today.

PG: I had a quick look at the report that was sent out and I wanted to just ask about some specific things I thought may be missing or maybe I missed them in my review. One issue I see in here but it's kind of buried as "economics," I think that is a question about the cost of used batteries. I think that should be highlighted upfront because it is one of the drivers to everything else—cost of logistics, transportation, and processing. The other thing I don't see is anything on reporting. I also don't see anything on exports of used vehicles or used batteries, I think we need to highlight that we may not have a solution for every problem but it's important to highlight. I also don't see anything about the benefits of recycling for CO2 and GHG emissions and making the case for why investments in recycling are so important.

MO: So it sounds like the comments are mainly surrounding the language and placement of the discussion around cost, and the need to include reporting, transparency and exports.

PG: Yes, overall I think you did a very good job, it's a good start and there is a lot here.

MO: I will thank you on their behalf because they are both muted.

JD: Thank you Perry, we've made notes of your suggestions and if you want you can also feel free to track changes in the document and send it back to us.

MO: Moving onto deadlines. Is it helpful to send calendar reminders?

yes

MO: I will send those with calendar dates for the next meetings, thanks. Any other questions?

TF: The final report for public review is December 15. And I think the deadline was April 21, 2022. What happens between December 15 and the end of March?

MO: The public will provide input on the report through mid-February and we as a group might meet after public review is done, so there will be more for us to discuss. Between that time I think it will be a lot of fielding of input from the public but not much for the advisory group as a whole to do during that time. Caroline do you have any thoughts on that?

CG: Yes, so we will be getting public comments and seeing how it will be incorporated and then coming back as a group to adopt a final version to be transmitted to the legislature.

MO: Thanks, great question. Anyone else? Thanks Jess for running through that with us. It's about 11:42 pacific time and we just came back from a break. Do we want a longer break?

CG: I suggest that we push through and take a later lunch for those of us on the west coast. We will do everyone's favorite round robin. Terry do you have any comments or anything else to add today?

TA:

DB: I think one thing that has stood out to me in the last couple meetings is the openness and honest discussions that we have been having and I really think the next two meetings where we look at the final recommendations for the survey will be important. I look forward to more honest discussions and conversations moving forward, I want to compliment the leadership of the committee and committee members. It's encouraging to see people being open to new policies and I appreciate the UC Davis team and

CG: I would like to echo those comments, there is so much expertise and dedication and I think we are moving towards some great recommendations.

MC: I second your and Dan's comments and I look forward to actively participating in the second survey as I admit I didn't participate in the first survey,

TC: No comments at this time.

TF: I have several comments, I'm very happy to see that we have respectful discussions with people from various perspectives, I think it's good that we are seeing other perspectives and trying to come up with a good solution for the state. This is a continued changing condition and maybe in the future one of the takeaways can be that this is reviewed every 3-5 years as we get more information and data. I was impressed with UC Davis's work on the survey and look forward to seeing what things look like when we get close to 100% participation.

CG: I think the point you make on needing to revisit recommendations and the need to consider changing landscape is really important, thank you for that suggestion.

PG: I also want to reiterate that I think the UC Davis Team has done an excellent job in preparing an outline to a comprehensive report. One thought listening to the discussion on Steve's proposal is it might be worthwhile thinking about a process to take a deeper dive into that particular proposal. I think a lot of people think it has a lot of merit and it might be a good way to take this forward.

SH: I'm starting to get worried that my proposal might be too popular and might happen. Thanks Perry. I also want to thank everyone for the congenial and professional environment. We don't always agree but everyone wants to do the right thing. I agree with Toshi—the timeline that was laid out is important but the more time we have to digest and talk things out the better. I think we are moving towards clarity if not consensus.

GK: I echo what Toshi and Dan said, I think the UC Davis team has done a fantastic job pulling this all together and everyone has been respectful of everyone's opinions. I'm looking forward to the next step in the process, I think that's where the rubber will meet the road.

BK: I know it's redundant but I would also like to extend my thanks to leadership, UC Davis, and committee members. It's been a great process with great ideas and discussion and I look forward to continuing. Thank you.

JK: We might be a broken record as a committee. I am grateful to the UC Davis team and Caroline and Mohammed and everyone who is keeping us on track. Particularly the discussion around the survey results and Steve's EPR proposal I found really thought-provoking and terrific, I'm excited to get to the finish line.

NL: Ditto, everything Jennifer just said.

AL: It has been really interesting watching this process unfold. I've submitted most of my comments and questions to the staff and some of it was discussed today, I look forward to the discussion and want to thank everyone for their hard work and commitment to the process.

TM: All good, thanks everyone.

GN: I think being grateful to the UCD team is the consensus we have reached the easiest. Very grateful to the team for carrying us and making the policy draft possible. Thanks to everyone for voicing their opinion, quiet meetings are not productive. Thanks to Steve for leading with the EPR proposal.

LR: Ditto

CG: Les you have to introduce your cat.

LS: I have two large dogs and a cat. That was tiger and the dog was Emma. We are also grateful for the collegial spirit, there has been a lot of productive conversation and I'm grateful to be a part of it. Echo consensus that UC Davis team is doing a fantastic job.

CG: Hanon can you give a quick overview of the zero-emission package that was signed last night?

HR: Yesterday the gov signed a 3.9 billion package which contains funding for agencies for three years. The EC will receive 1.1b for infrastructure, CARB will receive 2.3b, Cal ???. A bit of CEC funding and CARB will work in collaboration. Some programs are a bit more stand-alone for CARB. The CEC will get about 250 million for ZEV manufacturing for supply chain and infrastructure as well, and another 500 million omnibus for clean transportation program. Really exciting, this will make a big difference here. There is support for manufacturing to deal with climate change. We aren't waiting for the next heat wave or wildfire to act.

DB: On the funding for manufacturing, is that for incentives for manufacturing in California?

HR: Those will be grants for manufacturing within California and will work with separate workforce development funding. This could apply to supply chain, component manufacturing, infrastructure manufacturing.

CG: What's the best way for people to follow along with the implementation of this package?

HR: GO-biz is leading a market development strategy. The CEC and CARB are currently developing our investment packages. We have an investment plan that broadly allocates money and within that we have solicitation and go through a stakeholder input process. If anyone wants to reach out to me I can provide links but mainly I would say CARB website, their investment plan, our website and investment plan, and GO-Biz.

CG: This transformational investment stresses the importance of this committee as we move towards the 2035 goal. Do you have any thoughts on the progress of the committee or anything else to add?

HR: Ditto, great job, it's coming along nicely.

AMSC: It's very hard to say anything at the end. I would like to acknowledge the commitment and progress, great job UC Davis, we have some fine-tuning to do on the policy language and I look forward to coming together to discuss the recommendations.

MO: Ditto as far as UC Davis, we will continue to fine-tune with everyone and I want to say again that I'm struck by how collegial this whole process has been and it's fun to see how it has evolved over time from spending our time on technical background meetings to these last two where there has been a lot of discussion and I look forward to that continuing to be the case.

CG: I would like to ditto everything that has been said and thanks to everyone for sharing their expertise. We really do want to hear everyone's input so if a means of communication is not working for you please let us know. The most critical thing is getting everyone's input as we move towards the end of the year. With that I will hand it over to Mohammed to talk about our next meetings.

MO: It sounds like we want to schedule out to the end of the year. How about the last two weeks of August? We have had a lot of success with Tuesdays so maybe we can continue that—we are looking at August 24 or August 31.

BK: What time of day?

MO: We usually do 10-3, today was 9-2, do people have a preference?

BK: The ACT expo starts on the 31 at noon so I would prefer it be an early meeting ending at noon.

LR: I like the earlier meeting starting at 9 vs. 10 and I'm okay with the 24 or 31, probably prefer the 31.

MO: Never mind let's go alphabetically.

*I'm not writing all of this down but the group decided on **August 31 from 9-12 pacific time**.*

CG: I suggest we put our heads together with the UC Davis team then send out a doodle poll within the next week for the following meetings.

MO: Any questions from the public?

CG: There was a comment requesting the survey but they did not specify which version.

MS: I can make a copy of the survey for the public so people can fill it out and provide input without getting the responses confused.

MO: *Summary of meeting*

CG: Thank you to everyone and meeting adjourned.