

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	22-EVI-04
Project Title:	Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Reliability
TN #:	264471
Document Title:	Economic and Fiscal Impact Statement - Tracking and Improving Reliability of California's EV Chargers
Description:	N/A
Filer:	Spencer Kelley
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	6/27/2025 8:35:37 AM
Docketed Date:	6/27/2025

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

DEPARTMENT NAME California Energy Commission	CONTACT PERSON Ross Daley	EMAIL ADDRESS ross.daley@energy.ca.gov	TELEPHONE NUMBER 916.980.7949
DESCRIPTIVE TITLE FROM NOTICE REGISTER OR FORM 400 Tracking and Improving Reliability of California's Electric Vehicle (EV) Chargers			NOTICE FILE NUMBER Z

A. ESTIMATED PRIVATE SECTOR COST IMPACTS *Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.*

1. Check the appropriate box(es) below to indicate whether this regulation:
- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a. Impacts business and/or employees | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> e. Imposes reporting requirements |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b. Impacts small businesses | <input type="checkbox"/> f. Imposes prescriptive instead of performance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c. Impacts jobs or occupations | <input type="checkbox"/> g. Impacts individuals |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d. Impacts California competitiveness | <input type="checkbox"/> h. None of the above (Explain below): |

*If any box in Items 1 a through g is checked, complete this Economic Impact Statement.
If box in Item 1.h. is checked, complete the Fiscal Impact Statement as appropriate.*

2. The California Energy Commission estimates that the economic impact of this regulation (which includes the fiscal impact) is:
(Agency/Department)
- ☐ Below \$10 million
☒ Between \$10 and \$25 million
☐ Between \$25 and \$50 million
☐ Over \$50 million *[If the economic impact is over \$50 million, agencies are required to submit a [Standardized Regulatory Impact Assessment](#) as specified in Government Code Section 11346.3(c)]*

3. Enter the total number of businesses impacted: 1,247
- Describe the types of businesses (Include nonprofits): EV charging networks, station operators, site hosts, maintenance entities
- Enter the number or percentage of total businesses impacted that are small businesses: 1,190

4. Enter the number of businesses that will be created: 0 eliminated: 0
- Explain: Similar requirements are already required under 23 C.F.F., Section 680.104.

5. Indicate the geographic extent of impacts: ☒ Statewide
☐ Local or regional (List areas): _____

6. Enter the number of jobs created: 0 and eliminated: 0
- Describe the types of jobs or occupations impacted: EV charging station design software engineering, operations, maintenance.

7. Will the regulation affect the ability of California businesses to compete with other states by making it more costly to produce goods or services here? ☐ YES ☒ NO
- If YES, explain briefly: _____

**ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)**

STD. 399 (Rev. 10/2019)

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)

B. ESTIMATED COSTS *Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.*

1. What are the total statewide dollar costs that businesses and individuals may incur to comply with this regulation over its lifetime? \$ **11,226,024 (2026\$)**
- a. Initial costs for a small business: \$ **2,501** Annual ongoing costs: \$ **2,191** Years: **Indef.**
- b. Initial costs for a typical business: \$ **19,089** Annual ongoing costs: \$ **79,903** Years: **Indef.**
- c. Initial costs for an individual: \$ **N/A** Annual ongoing costs: \$ **N/A** Years: **N/A**
- d. Describe other economic costs that may occur: **The regulation may create second-order economic costs, which are not estimated.**

2. If multiple industries are impacted, enter the share of total costs for each industry: **N/A.**

3. If the regulation imposes reporting requirements, enter the annual costs a typical business may incur to comply with these requirements.
Include the dollar costs to do programming, record keeping, reporting, and other paperwork, whether or not the paperwork must be submitted. \$ **5,853**

4. Will this regulation directly impact housing costs? ☐ YES ☒ NO

If YES, enter the annual dollar cost per housing unit: \$ _____

Number of units: _____

5. Are there comparable Federal regulations? ☒ YES ☐ NO

Explain the need for State regulation given the existence or absence of Federal regulations: **The federal NEVI Program (23 CFR Section 680.104) does not regulate state and ratepayer-funded EV chargers.**

Enter any additional costs to businesses and/or individuals that may be due to State - Federal differences: \$ **0**

C. ESTIMATED BENEFITS *Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not specifically required by rulemaking law, but encouraged.*

1. Briefly summarize the benefits of the regulation, which may include among others, the health and welfare of California residents, worker safety and the State's environment: **Greater EV charger reliability and increased consumer confidence in EV infrastructure will assist the state in reaching zero-emission vehicle adoption and clean air goals.**

2. Are the benefits the result of: ☒ specific statutory requirements, or ☐ goals developed by the agency based on broad statutory authority?

Explain: **AB 2127 (Ting, Statutes of 2018), AB 2061 (Ting, Statutes of 2022), and AB 126 (Reyes, Statutes of 2023)**

3. What are the total statewide benefits from this regulation over its lifetime? \$ **56,890 per year (2026\$)**

4. Briefly describe any expansion of businesses currently doing business within the State of California that would result from this regulation: **Increased confidence in EV charger reliability may encourage sales of EVs and increase revenue for EV charging companies.**

D. ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULATION *Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not specifically required by rulemaking law, but encouraged.*

1. List alternatives considered and describe them below. If no alternatives were considered, explain why not: **Alternative #1 is to not require charger inventory reporting; it will not improve the quality of CEC forecasts required by statute. Alternative #2 is to apply uptime requirements to level 2 AC chargers in addition to direct current fast chargers (DCFC).**

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)

STD. 399 (Rev. 10/2019)

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)

2. Summarize the total statewide costs and benefits from this regulation and each alternative considered:

Regulation:	Benefit: \$ <u>56,890</u>	Cost: \$ <u>11,226,024</u>
Alternative 1:	Benefit: \$ <u>56,890</u>	Cost: \$ <u>7,923,332</u>
Alternative 2:	Benefit: \$ <u>533,761</u>	Cost: \$ <u>26,673,024</u>

3. Briefly discuss any quantification issues that are relevant to a comparison of estimated costs and benefits for this regulation or alternatives: The cost difference between the staff proposal and Alternative #1 is due to the lack of inventory reporting. Alternative 2 includes uptime reporting for L2 chargers in addition to DCFC chargers.

4. Rulemaking law requires agencies to consider performance standards as an alternative, if a regulation mandates the use of specific technologies or equipment, or prescribes specific actions or procedures. Were performance standards considered to lower compliance costs? ☒ YES ☐ NO

Explain: EV chargers are required to comply with uptime performance standards, rather than any specific actions or procedures.

E. MAJOR REGULATIONS Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.

California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) boards, offices and departments are required to submit the following (per Health and Safety Code section 57005). Otherwise, skip to E4.

1. Will the estimated costs of this regulation to California business enterprises exceed \$10 million? ☐ YES ☐ NO

***If YES, complete E2. and E3
If NO, skip to E4***

2. Briefly describe each alternative, or combination of alternatives, for which a cost-effectiveness analysis was performed:

Alternative 1: _____

Alternative 2: _____

(Attach additional pages for other alternatives)

3. For the regulation, and each alternative just described, enter the estimated total cost and overall cost-effectiveness ratio:

Regulation: Total Cost \$ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$ _____

Alternative 1: Total Cost \$ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$ _____

Alternative 2: Total Cost \$ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$ _____

4. Will the regulation subject to OAL review have an estimated economic impact to business enterprises and individuals located in or doing business in California exceeding \$50 million in any 12-month period between the date the major regulation is estimated to be filed with the Secretary of State through 12 months after the major regulation is estimated to be fully implemented?

☐ YES ☒ NO

If YES, agencies are required to submit a [Standardized Regulatory Impact Assessment \(SRIA\)](#) as specified in Government Code Section 11346.3(c) and to include the SRIA in the Initial Statement of Reasons.

5. Briefly describe the following:

The increase or decrease of investment in the State: The regulation should moderately increase investment in the state.

The incentive for innovation in products, materials or processes: The regulations may incentivize innovation in EV charger manufacturing and maintenance to improve reliability.

The benefits of the regulations, including, but not limited to, benefits to the health, safety, and welfare of California residents, worker safety, and the state's environment and quality of life, among any other benefits identified by the agency: Increased EV charger reliability may improve EV adoption, supporting state environmental goals.

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)

STD. 399 (Rev. 10/2019)

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL EFFECT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT *Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 6 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.*

- ☐ 1. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year which are reimbursable by the State. (Approximate)
(Pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution and Sections 17500 et seq. of the Government Code).

\$ _____

- ☐ a. Funding provided in _____

Budget Act of _____ or Chapter _____, Statutes of _____

- ☐ b. Funding will be requested in the Governor's Budget Act of _____

Fiscal Year: _____

- ☐ 2. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year which are NOT reimbursable by the State. (Approximate)
(Pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution and Sections 17500 et seq. of the Government Code).

\$ _____

Check reason(s) this regulation is not reimbursable and provide the appropriate information:

- ☐ a. Implements the Federal mandate contained in _____

- ☐ b. Implements the court mandate set forth by the _____ Court.

Case of: _____ vs. _____

- ☐ c. Implements a mandate of the people of this State expressed in their approval of Proposition No. _____

Date of Election: _____

- ☐ d. Issued only in response to a specific request from affected local entity(s).

Local entity(s) affected: _____

- ☐ e. Will be fully financed from the fees, revenue, etc. from: _____

Authorized by Section: _____ of the _____ Code;

- ☐ f. Provides for savings to each affected unit of local government which will, at a minimum, offset any additional costs to each;

- ☐ g. Creates, eliminates, or changes the penalty for a new crime or infraction contained in _____

- ☐ 3. Annual Savings. (approximate)

\$ _____

- ☐ 4. No additional costs or savings. This regulation makes only technical, non-substantive or clarifying changes to current law regulations.

- ☐ 5. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any local entity or program.

- ☒ 6. Other. Explain Regulations may create costs for local governments, but only those that voluntarily request state or ratepayer funding for EV charging stations.

**ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)**

STD. 399 (Rev. 10/2019)

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)

B. FISCAL EFFECT ON STATE GOVERNMENT *Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.*

☐ 1. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

\$ _____

It is anticipated that State agencies will:

☐ a. Absorb these additional costs within their existing budgets and resources.

☐ b. Increase the currently authorized budget level for the _____ Fiscal Year

☐ 2. Savings in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

\$ _____

☐ 3. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any State agency or program.

☒ 4. Other. Explain Additional expenditures start in FY 2026. Costs estimates are \$17,002 for years 2026-2028.

C. FISCAL EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF STATE PROGRAMS *Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.*

☐ 1. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

\$ _____

☐ 2. Savings in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

\$ _____

☒ 3. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any federally funded State agency or program.

☐ 4. Other. Explain _____

FISCAL OFFICER SIGNATURE



DATE

6/16/2025

The signature attests that the agency has completed the STD. 399 according to the instructions in SAM sections 6601-6616, and understands the impacts of the proposed rulemaking. State boards, offices, or departments not under an Agency Secretary must have the form signed by the highest ranking official in the organization.

AGENCY SECRETARY

 Bryan Cash

DATE

6/17/2025

Finance approval and signature is required when SAM sections 6601-6616 require completion of Fiscal Impact Statement in the STD. 399.

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE PROGRAM BUDGET MANAGER



DATE