

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	18-ALT-01
Project Title:	2019-2020 Investment Plan Update for the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program
TN #:	229209
Document Title:	Commissioner Monahan Letter to Advisory Committee Regarding August 5 Meeting
Description:	N/A
Filer:	Jessica Martinez
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	8/5/2019 11:39:04 AM
Docketed Date:	8/5/2019

Dear Advisory Committee Members,

We are looking forward to your feedback on our 2019-2020 Investment Plan Update for the Clean Transportation Program (also known as the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program). As a new Commissioner, I am particularly excited to meet all of you and to work together to ensure our Program helps California meet its ambitious goals for clean transportation.

At our August 5th Advisory Committee meeting and public workshop, we will be raising a few key issues, which we describe below. We welcome your responses to the questions embedded within these issues, whether during the workshop, in writing, or both.

We recognize you may have thoughts on other issue areas as well, and we also welcome your broader feedback. However, we expect that our time will be limited during the Advisory Committee meeting and public workshop, and we may not have an opportunity to address all subjects of interest. Accordingly, we strongly suggest providing such feedback in writing.

Please provide written comments by 5:00 p.m. on August 9 at the following website:

<https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/Ecomment/Ecomment.aspx?docketnumber=18-ALT-01>

Thank you again for lending your time and expertise to our Clean Transportation Program.

Sincerely,

Commissioner Patty Monahan

Key Issues:

#1 – Overall Approach: Focus on Zero Emission Transportation

The state has ambitious goals for achieving greenhouse gas emission reductions, electrifying transportation, and reaching carbon neutrality by 2045. The Clean Transportation Program is one of a suite of state initiatives to help us achieve those goals. The Program also has complementary goals to improve air quality, promote economic development, increase alternative fuel use, and reduce petroleum dependence. We've been wrestling with the tradeoffs between achieving near-term benefits (such as reducing criteria pollutant and GHG emissions and increasing alternative fuel use) and the longer-term transition to zero-emission transportation. For the 2019-2020 Investment Plan Update, we are proposing to focus heavily on zero-emission vehicles (ZEVs), and especially ZEV infrastructure. Do you think this focus on ZEVs and ZEV infrastructure is the best use of Clean Transportation Program funds this year? How should our program fit into the broader suite of state regulatory and funding programs that contribute to the state's decarbonization goals?

#2 – ZEV Infrastructure Priorities

In the 2019-2020 Investment Plan Update, we are proposing to focus on passenger vehicle charging, commercial truck electrification, and hydrogen infrastructure. For passenger plug-in electric vehicles, we propose to spend \$32.7 million to address a critical shortfall in charging infrastructure. Staff analysis finds a gap of over 80,000 charging connectors needed to support the state's goal of 1.5 million ZEVs by 2025; by 2030, that goal shifts to 5 million ZEVs. What do you think of this focus on the light-duty vehicle charging gap? Are there specific regions, charging technology types, or project types that our program should prioritize?

We have also significantly adjusted our traditional medium- and heavy-duty funding category to focus on zero-emission technologies. We are proposing a \$30 million allocation for ZEV vehicles and infrastructure, up from \$17.5 million in FY 2018-2019. We are also proposing a \$20 million allocation for hydrogen refueling infrastructure, and have raised the prospect of co-locating refueling stations for commercial trucks and buses together with stations for passenger vehicles. Relative to our funding for light-duty ZEV infrastructure projects, are these proposed allocation amounts and approaches appropriate? Are there types of projects that we should prioritize in the medium- and heavy-duty freight/fleet/transit sectors?

#3 – Equity and the Advisory Committee

The Energy Commission is committed to ensuring equity through its administration of the Clean Transportation Program. Historically, we have relied upon the amount and location of program funding to assess impacts to disadvantaged communities. However, this approach does not necessarily capture all impacts (positive and negative) to local communities. What other strategies should we employ to ensure our Investment Plan is attentive to equity? And, given the trade-offs between different project types, what metrics should we use to prioritize benefits to disadvantaged communities (e.g., air quality benefits, economic and job benefits, climate benefits)? In addition, we've heard feedback that the Advisory Committee should include a broader perspective and be more reflective of the diversity that is California. How should we expand or modify the Advisory Committee membership to include additional perspectives and ideas?