DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	22-ERDD-03
Project Title:	Clean Hydrogen Program
TN #:	250582
Document Title:	Sophie Silvestri Comments - Draft Solicitation Concept
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Sophie Silvestri
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	6/9/2023 3:27:00 PM
Docketed Date:	6/9/2023

Comment Received From: Sophie Silvestri
Submitted On: 6/9/2023
Docket Number: 22-ERDD-03

Draft Solicitation Concept

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

Pasha Comments: Draft Solicitation Concept for Large-Scale Centralized Hydrogen Production

Docket Number: 22-ERDD-03

June 9, 2023

Section VIII: Questions for Stakeholders

1: Are project Elements in Section 4 realistic, reasonable, and feasible?

Answer: Yes

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?

Answer: Pasha does not have a definitive answer at this time. For us to make this project feasible, the cost share needs to include the cost of the renewable energy sources. Our intention is to make the hydrogen at or near where it will be utilized. This will limit the transportation of energy and increase resiliency. As such, there is typically limited space to create the large amount of zero emission energy required to produce the hydrogen. This limits the feasibility of using solar systems to create the needed amount of energy. The solar system would have to be augmented with more energy dense zero emissions technology. These zero emissions energy dense sources are expensive but can provide the power required to make the green hydrogen in a relatively small space. This allows the hydrogen to be produced locally where it will be utilized.

3: Is the requirement for spending in California feasible?

Answer: No. The zero emissions energy dense sources and Non-Membrane Hydrogen generators are not produced in CA. The requirement to be made in the US is feasible, but the most technologically advanced equipment is not made in CA. This equipment is the majority of the cost.

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

Answer: The abstract in a month is realistic, but the 3 months for full application is very tight. There are a lot of public stakeholders in a project like this that tend to move slower than commercial entities. 4-6 months is preferred.

5: Is four year a feasible project timeline:

Answer: In our experience permitting new technologies can create substantial delays at a significant cost. There is no way to know what challenges local permitting agencies can impose on the project. Pasha has had permitting take years for battery storage systems and electric charging stations. There is also no way of knowing what opposition community groups may have to hydrogen production in their area and nor the amount of time community engagement would take. The four year time period is acceptable with the caveat that any substantial delays in permitting allow for an extension of the performance period.

6: Any other comments?

Answer: Pasha is confident that these types of project should improve the resiliency of the community it will serve. It is better to have several smaller 2 MT hydrogen facilities than one larger 6 MT hydrogen facility where the hydrogen will have to be transported to the user. All the resources that are needed to make hydrogen (zero emissions energy source and waste water) can be found in most communities. The goal would be to eventually provide each community the ability to generate its own hydrogen energy supply, independent of natural or manmade disasters of remote hydrogen energy supplies or transportation routes. As such, the evaluation criteria should include community resilience and energy independence. Please let us know if you would like to discuss further.