

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	16-EPIC-01
Project Title:	EPIC Idea Exchange
TN #:	216529
Document Title:	Travis O'Guin Comments: Axiom Exergy Comments to Docket#16-EPIC-01
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Travis O'Guin
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	3/13/2017 12:44:29 PM
Docketed Date:	3/13/2017

Comment Received From: Travis O'Guin

Submitted On: 3/13/2017

Docket Number: 16-EPIC-01

Axiom Exergy Comments to Docket#16-EPIC-01

See attached Word document for Axiom Exergy's comments. Thank you.

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

Comments to Docket # 16-EPIC-01
Travis O'Guin
Director of Business Development
Axiom Exergy
1387 Marina Way S., Ste 500
Richmond, CA 94804

To Whom It May Concern,

Axiom Exergy applauds the CEC's continued efforts to support clean energy technologies and offers the following comments in response to the RFC for Docket #16-EPIC-01.

1. (For all groups) What are barriers that large-scale customers face when procuring emerging energy technology solutions? Would projects funded from this solicitation help address those barriers? If not, what specific changes would you recommend to help ensure the resulting projects meet large-scale customer procurement needs?

Axiom encourages the CEC to continue to make funds available through EPIC for emerging technology pilot and demonstration projects. Most large scale customers want to see at least one fully funded (i.e. little or no cost to them) demonstration project at one of their facilities before they will consider a larger roll out. Getting funding for these pilot & demonstration projects is a significant hurdle for emerging technology companies.

2. (For all groups) What are specific recommendations you can provide for improving the purpose of the solicitation outlined in this RFC? Please explain the rationale behind the recommendations.

No comment.

3. (For all groups) Are there existing efforts that complement the groups identified in this RFC? What specific changes to this proposed solicitation would you suggest to best leverage these existing efforts?

No comment.

4. (For all groups) Are the proposed funding amounts identified in this RFC appropriate for the work requested? Please explain the rationale behind the recommendations, and, if applicable, what would the expected cost be to adequately test and evaluate the technology types identified in this draft solicitation?

No comment.

5. (For Group 1) Should the Energy Commission require test bed locations in both Northern and Southern California? Please explain the rationale behind the recommendations.

No comment.

6. (Groups 1 and 2) Are there additional technologies we should consider or technologies we should remove from the lists provided in this RFC? Please explain the rationale behind the recommendations.

Axiom Exergy strongly encourages the CEC to include a diverse array of energy storage technologies within their scope. Specifically, Axiom would like to see cold thermal energy storage included in the groups 1 and 2. Thermal energy storage can achieve most all of the same objectives as electrical energy storage, but has the potential to do so at a lower cost. However, given the unique nature of thermal storage, there are little to no resources for testing, validation, and evaluation. Axiom encourages the CEC to include cold thermal energy storage for refrigeration and HVAC in the list of technologies, as part of the broader category of 'energy storage.'

7. (Group 3) How can Group 3 most effectively build trust with target customers to ensure that the target customers are buying high quality products?

No comment.

8. (For Group 4) What are the largest impediments to successful deployment of solutions that can facilitate successful procurement of emerging energy technologies? Are there solutions not addressed under this proposed solicitation that would address these impediments? Please explain the rationale behind the recommendations.

No comment.