

Response to Draft Solicitation Concepts

Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle
Technology Program

Subject Area –Hydrogen Fuel Infrastructure

Docket 12-HYD-01

Thursday October 16th, 2013

Introduction

ITM Power extends its appreciation and thanks for allowing us the opportunity of providing commentary and recommendations that are related the entitled document, issued by the State of California, California Energy Commission and dated September 25th 2013.

The responses provided by ITM-Power are listed on page 2 below.

ITM Power designs and manufactures hydrogen energy systems for energy storage and clean fuel production. ITM Power is committed to clean sustainable energy solutions based upon water electrolysis. ITM's principal objective is to engineer and deliver zero-carbon hydrogen energy systems that provide energy security and independence from fossil fuels.

Any clarifications, questions and further communications regarding this tender should be addressed to:

Geoffrey Budd

ITM Power Inc.

gb@itm-power.com

Work: +1 (604) 620 8525

Mobile: +1 (604) 617 5588

gb@itm-power.com

www.itm-power.com.

Page number	Section	Comments
3	2A	Due to the fact that California has a legal requirement for 33% renewable hydrogen we request in support of this requirement that the number of 100% renewable set-aside stations be increased from <u>one to three</u> and that each be funded to the extent of \$2.8 million. In addition we recommend that these three set aside stations be offered to other independent applicants that will submit proposals for stations based on SMR from fossil fuels and who are not able on their own to attain the 33% minimum. A letter of collaboration in this regard by two or more parties submitting funding applications would need to accompany the independent proposals.
3/8	2B/14	Mobile stations are very well suited to the use of electrolyzers in that they only require a water and power connection on site. Hydrogen does not thus need to be transported, a costly and time-consuming exercise. The funding cap of \$1 million is inadequate to be able to deliver a refueller that meets the draft proposal's specification. It is proposed to increase the funding to \$1.75 million and to reduce the drafted specifications to be able to deliver 50 kg per day with the same back to back filling requirements. The system should be upgradable in terms of daily delivery capacity to 150kg per day.
14	18	Operation and maintenance costs are recommended to be capped at a maximum of \$100k for each of three years after each refueller is commissioned and that this portion of the grant money be paid based on the provision of documentary evidence that the expenses have been incurred. As the three years progress it is expected that the O&M costs per annum will decline. This recommendation will provide a safety net should costs for unexpected reasons not decline.
6	12	We seek clarification of the term "applicants' entire portfolio of CEC funded stations." If a lead applicant for 2013 funding was only a major sub-contractor in the 2012 competition does his "entire portfolio" include the 2012 station?
20	20	The scoring weighting for the sustainability aspect of projects is fairly low – we recommend that the weighting for sustainability be increased to 60 points