

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	22-ERDD-03
Project Title:	Clean Hydrogen Program
TN #:	250571
Document Title:	Apricus Energy Partners Comments - Large-Scale Centralized Hydrogen Solicitation Concept
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Apricus Energy Partners
Submitter Role:	Applicant
Submission Date:	6/9/2023 12:53:28 PM
Docketed Date:	6/9/2023

*Comment Received From: Apricus Energy Partners
Submitted On: 6/9/2023
Docket Number: 22-ERDD-03*

Large-Scale Centralized Hydrogen Solicitation Concept

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

Comments on CEC Clean Hydrogen Program

CEC staff are seeking responses and comments to the following to shape the direction and scope of this solicitation:

1. Are the Project Elements in Section 4 of this document realistic, reasonable, and feasible?

Please clarify if the specified water consumption limits are for the incoming unpurified feed water or for purified water feeding the electrolyzer.

Please clarify if the specified water consumption limits are for electrolysis only or if it also includes balance of plant operations such as system cooling.

If the specified water consumption limits are for the incoming unpurified water and/or for balance of plant operation, 13.5kg of water/kg of hydrogen produced is too low. Please consider limitations above 13.5.

If the water source is not intended for human consumption, why is there a strict limit on water consumption?

The TRL of 8 would exclude at least one of the major electrolyzer suppliers that would be sourced in CA. Please consider a TRL of 7.

2. What would be the appropriate level of project funding that would leverage private investments associated with the work proposed in this draft concept and why? a. How would limiting the use of grant funds to Eligible Project Costs in Section 3 impact the project? What changes do you recommend, and why?

Please clarify what tasks are included in installation as it pertains to the equipment. This should include direct labor for installation.

3. Is the requirement for spending in California (50% minimum, preference points for spending over 50% in California) feasible?

Yes, however with 80% required to go to materials, this means that all of the equipment must be sourced from CA and means that the direct labor may or may not need to be sourced from CA. If you are looking to incentivize direct CA labor, please consider modifying the cost allocations listed.

4. Provide any feedback on the two-phase solicitation approach. Is the 1-month deadline and 3-month full application deadline realistic?

Yes

5. Is four years a feasible project timeline? a. If grant awardees were CEQA-ready (see CEQA in Section 4) but need to obtain regulatory approvals, permitting, and zoning during the project, is a 4- year timeframe feasible for completion? If not, what is the recommended term for a funded project?

Yes

6. Please provide relevant comments regarding other considerations not explicitly listed above.