

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	16-ALT-01
Project Title:	Funding Strategies for Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Workshop
TN #:	212275
Document Title:	ClipperCreek, inc. Comments: Funding strategies for EV infrastructure
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	ClipperCreek, Inc.
Submitter Role:	Public Agency
Submission Date:	7/13/2016 12:25:44 PM
Docketed Date:	7/13/2016

Comment Received From: ClipperCreek, Inc.

Submitted On: 7/13/2016

Docket Number: 16-ALT-01

ClipperCreek, inc. Comments to Docket No. 16-ALT-01 Funding strategies for EV infrastructure

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

CLIPPERCREEK, INC.

INNOVATIVE INFRASTRUCTURE FOR ELECTRIC AND HYBRID VEHICLES



11850 Kemper Road Suite #E • Auburn, CA 95603 • (530) 887-1674 • Fax (530) 887-8527

www.clippercreek.net

July 9, 2016

California Energy Commission
Dockets Office, MS-4
Re: Docket No. 16-ALT-01
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

Re: June 6, 2016 – CEC Staff Workshop on Funding Strategies for Electric Vehicle Infrastructure

Dear California Energy Commission Staff,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the funding strategies for electric vehicle infrastructure deployment in California.

Introduction

ClipperCreek, Inc. is a worldwide leader in Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE). ClipperCreek manufactures and has deployed EVSEs for a variety of applications including public, workplace, multi-tenant, fleet and residential charging. In late 2010 ClipperCreek was awarded CEC contract ARV-10-001 to update California's existing public charging infrastructure to the new SAE-J1772 standard. Through the course of that contract administration ClipperCreek installed over 760 EVSE at 313 sites throughout California. EVSEs deployed early in the ARV-10-001 program have been in the field and in operations for up to 5 years at this point. Through the process of deploying, monitoring, and working with site hosts to maintain these EVSEs ClipperCreek has gained insight on challenges related to deploying and maintaining grant funded EV Charging infrastructure. Thank you for the opportunity to share this insight through the comments below.

Comments

1. ClipperCreek recommends the CEC considering a rebate style program covering some or all of the cost of the EVSE hardware and installation.
 - a. Interested sites could apply for the rebate either prior to or after the purchase and installation of the equipment.
 - i. This could help keep the program equipment neutral so the site selects the best equipment for their application.
 - b. A portion of the funding should be allocated to outreach and management efforts for the awarded administrator (assuming the CEC is not managing each individual rebate).
 - c. Sites going through the rebate process should have some level of investment in the project either through an equipment or installation cost share or through time and efforts invested in completing rebate requirements.

ClipperCreek, Inc.

- i. If the site participates throughout the process it would be more likely the equipment is needed at that location and the location would be more likely to maintain the equipment into the future.
2. ClipperCreek recommends the CEC consider defining a minimum feature set that does not require the EVSE be networked.
 - a. Non-networked EVSEs can provide the best value in many cases through reduced hardware, ongoing maintenance, and connectivity costs.
 - b. Basic EVSEs can provide the same level of capabilities as networked EVSE through innovative third-party add on solutions.
3. ClipperCreek recommends the CEC consider a program where any data collection or reporting requirements are clearly defined, consistent. It is desirable for the install location (site host) to be able to select EVSE equipment through their own competitive bid process that best fits the needs of their application while meeting the rebate requirements.
 - a. A variety of equipment offerings with varying features and add on functionality would be a great way to provide functionality when needed but not burden the costs of ever EVSE deployed with the same functions.
 - i. For example: A multi-family property may need to charge a fee directly for the use of the equipment where an office building may want to offer the EVSE as an amenity or vice versa. Any program should not have to carry the cost burden of all functionality that is not universally required or necessary

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Will Barrett
Director of Sales
ClipperCreek, Inc.