

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION**

1516 Ninth Street  
Sacramento, California 95814  
Main website: www.energy.ca.gov



**Hydrogen Fuel Infrastructure Workshop**

**Location: California Air Resources Board  
Sierra Room  
1001 "I" Street  
Sacramento, California 95814**

**August 12, 2013, 10 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.**

**(Wheelchair Accessible)**

This Workshop has two major objectives: 1) to present the aggregated results of the “Hydrogen Fuel Infrastructure Survey” and 2) to present the survey topics for stakeholder discussion in a workshop format. Comments will be solicited throughout the Workshop.

**Agenda**

**10:00 a.m. – 10:10 a.m.**

Introduction

Analisa Bevan, California Air Resources Board

**10:10 a.m. – 10:20 a.m.**

Agenda overview

Tobias Muench, California Energy Commission

**10:20 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.**

Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program (ARFVTP) Presentation

Jim McKinney, California Energy Commission

**10:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.**

An introduction to the aggregated results and general trends of the “Hydrogen Fuel Infrastructure Survey” that was administered by telephone: July 8 – August 1

Sarah Williams and Tobias Muench, California Energy Commission

**11:00 a.m. - noon**

Stakeholder discussion of the “Hydrogen Fuel Infrastructure Survey” topics by workshop participants

Sarah Williams and Tobias Muench, California Energy Commission

Workshop Report Scribe: Jean Baronas, California Energy Commission  
(Note: A report will be produced and projected during this workshop.)

## DISCUSSION TOPICS:

### **Workshops and Outreach, report on the general survey trends followed by Workshop discussion:**

- (1) Please describe your experience(s) at the 2012 Workshops and afterwards
  - a. Was your input heard? Please include specific examples.
  - b. Were your contributions considered in the process?

### **September 7, 2012 Draft Solicitation, report on the general survey trends followed by Workshop discussion:**

- (2) If you submitted comments on the September 7, 2012 Draft Solicitation, did the final solicitation (November 19, 2012) incorporate your comments satisfactorily?
  - a. Could PON-12-606 have better reflected your comments?
  - b. Do you believe that posting a draft solicitation document for public comment is a good idea?

### **November 19, 2012 Final Solicitation, PON-12-606, report on the general survey trends followed by Workshop discussion:**

- (3) Did PON-12-606 meet your expectations?
  - a. In general terms, how could have the solicitation been improved?
- (4) What method(s) would you suggest be used to match Station Location Areas and maps with customers?
  - a. For PON-12-606 were the Station Location Areas and maps understandable?
  - b. Were the Station Location Areas and maps easy to comply with?

### **Noon – 1:00 p.m. LUNCH BREAK**

### **1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.**

### **November 19, 2012 Final Solicitation, PON-12-606, report on the general survey trends followed by Workshop discussion:**

- (5) For PON-12-606, were the maximum award amounts reasonable? If not, what would you suggest, and why?
  - a. What about the funding cap? If not reasonable, what would you suggest, and why?
  - b. Did the award levels address stakeholder comments at the 2012 workshops? If not, what levels would you suggest and why?
  - c. What about the required match? If the required match was not reasonable, what would you suggest and why?
  - d. Were the operation and maintenance cost requirements and restrictions reasonable and useful? How could they be modified?

- (6) For PON-12-606, was the non-road set-aside a reasonable response to workshop presentations outlining the potential/need for such an option?
  - a. Did the non-road set aside reflect stakeholder comments from the summer 2012 workshops and after those meetings?
- (7) Were PON-12-606 requirements for renewable hydrogen, both the requirement of 33% for all projects, and the 100% renewable set aside, reasonable?
  - a. Did they reflect stakeholder input at the summer 2012 workshops?
- (8) For PON-12-606, were the technical requirements (hydrogen quality and dispensing protocols, station capacity, peak fueling capacity, dual dispenser pressure and operational date) for eligible projects reasonable?
  - a. Did these requirements reflect stakeholder input during the summer 2012 workshops?
- (9) For PON-12-606, were the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements understandable? (Please see Section X.I of PON-12-606 for further information.)
  - a. How could the due dates for CEQA requirements be modified to facilitate more participation?

**2:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.**

**November 19, 2012 Final Solicitation, PON-12-606, report on the general survey trends followed by Workshop discussion:**

- (10) If your firm did not apply to PON-12-606, why not? Please be specific.
- (11) If your firm applied, how did you determine the number of station applications / projects?

**2:30 p.m. – 2:45 p.m. BREAK**

**2:45 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**

**Future Activities, report on the general survey trends followed by Workshop discussion:**

- (12) What is necessary to increase participation in the next hydrogen fuel infrastructure solicitation?
  - a. What kind of assurance(s) can the state provide to increase participation?
  - b. How does the existing solicitation process play a role in the participation?
  - c. Would performance-based grants that guarantee operations and maintenance until profitable increase participation?

**3:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

**Future Activities, report on the general survey trends followed by Workshop discussion:**

- (13) What is necessary to increase participation in the next hydrogen fuel infrastructure solicitation? (continued)
  - a. What does the industry need to do to accelerate the pace of hydrogen fuel station construction?
  - b. How do the eligible project requirements, technical requirements, eligible costs, operation and maintenance costs, and match funding requirements impact participation?

**4:00 p.m. – 4:30 Summation of the Day**

Andrew Hom and Jean Baronas, California Energy Commission

**4:30 p.m. – Additional Comments**

**5:00 p.m. – Adjournment**

### **Attendee List**

Attendees should note that an attendee list (in-person and electronic) may be prepared and that participants can choose not to be included on the list. The list becomes part of the public record and may be searchable with on-line systems.

Additionally, written comments may be posted to the Energy Commission's website for the proceeding. Please note that your posted written and oral comments, attachments, and associated contact information (e.g. your address, phone, email, etc.) become part of the viewable public record. This information may become available via Google, Yahoo, and any other search engines.