

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	21-ALT-01
Project Title:	2021-2022 Investment Plan Update for the Clean Transportation Program
TN #:	239795
Document Title:	Claire A Warshaw Comments - 21-ALT-01__2021_09_16 Clean Energy Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Claire A. Warshaw
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	9/18/2021 3:20:20 PM
Docketed Date:	9/18/2021

Comment Received From: Claire A. Warshaw
Submitted On: 9/18/2021
Docket Number: 21-ALT-01

21-ALT-01__2021_09_16 Clean Energy Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting

(This same comment will hopefully be attached as a pdf and - per past comment docketing experiences - will probably be easier to read.)

21-ALT-01 California Energy Commission docket comment, Clean Energy Transportation Advisory Committee meeting, September 16, 2021, Claire A. Warshaw

Regarding California Energy Commission (CEC) staff question 3 proposed for consideration: “Does the Investment Plan reflect the needs of low-income, disadvantaged or under-represented Californians and California Communities? If not what changes to the Investment Plan should the CEC consider? Yes and no.

YES: Thank you for working on reducing greenhouse gases (pollution) and bringing zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) and ZEV vehicular infrastructure to California (CA) in an efficient and affordable manner; in this way the plan is addressing needs of all Californians to have better air quality. Well-functioning, long lasting, well-maintained vehicles are not usually cheap. Your group is working to make newer zero-emission vehicles affordable and public transit enduring, due to less emissions; in this way the plan is addressing lower income CA residents.

NO: The CA car seems to be considered a “staple” item. If CA population continues increasing simultaneously, choosing funding for routine long-distance personal vehicle travel more over other public-private transit will continue to increase traffic (which already can be abhorrent), brake pad and tire particulate matter (which can irritate public, esp. bicyclist, health issues).

In the distant past, as a travel agent, I noticed customers of all incomes wanting to purchase the lowest travel ticket, e.g., airplane, cruise, sometimes car rental too - possible. The cheapest option seems especially desirable for low-income persons, even if the choice, e.g., Amtrak, Greyhound, Southwest, Jet Blue, Alaska Air, Princess and Royal Caribbean cruises, pollutes. Everyone seemed unaware of greenhouse gas emission problems. Currently, I have plans to possibly use CA Amtrak (probably using diesel which can cause exhaust unhealthy particulate matter) bus/rail and other private transit systems. Amtrak runs whether I purchase from them or not. Rarer CA Mendocino Transit Authority bus routes reach rural desirable CA areas. As a low-income person I less afford targeting, accident, car replacement and injury. Basic insurance, fuel, maintenance of personal vehicles “zero emission or not” can be expensive. Mid-age persons to seniors might have injuries and vision issues to respect. Also, driving solo long distance seems less desirable often. Travel can be highly desirable by all for mental health benefits. CA needs positive mental health. Also, travel boosts the CA

21-ALT-01 California Energy Commission docket comment, Clean Energy Transportation Advisory Committee meeting, September 16, 2021, Claire A. Warshaw

Regarding California Energy Commission (CEC) staff question 3 proposed for consideration: “Does the Investment Plan reflect the needs of low-income, disadvantaged or under-represented Californians and California Communities? If not what changes to the Investment Plan should the CEC consider? Yes and no.

YES: Thank you for working on reducing greenhouse gases (pollution) and bringing zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) and ZEV vehicular infrastructure to California (CA) in an efficient and affordable manner; in this way the plan is addressing needs of all Californians to have better air quality. Well-functioning, long lasting, well-maintained vehicles are not usually cheap. Your group is working to make newer zero-emission vehicles affordable and public transit enduring, due to less emissions; in this way the plan is addressing lower income CA residents.

NO: The CA car seems to be considered a “staple” item. If CA population continues increasing simultaneously, choosing funding for routine long-distance personal vehicle travel more over other public-private transit **will continue to increase traffic (which already can be abhorrent), brake pad and tire particulate matter (which can irritate public, esp. bicyclist, health issues).**

In the distant past, as a travel agent, I noticed customers of **all incomes wanting to purchase the lowest travel ticket, e.g., airplane, cruise, sometimes car rental too - possible.** The cheapest option seems especially desirable for low-income persons, even if the choice, e.g., Amtrak, Greyhound, Southwest, Jet Blue, Alaska Air, Princess and Royal Caribbean cruises, pollutes. Everyone seemed unaware of greenhouse gas emission problems. Currently, I have plans to possibly use CA Amtrak (probably using diesel which can cause exhaust unhealthy particulate matter) bus/rail and other private transit systems. Amtrak runs whether I purchase from them or not. Rarer CA Mendocino Transit Authority bus routes reach rural desirable CA areas. As a low-income person I less afford targeting, accident, car replacement and injury. Basic insurance, fuel, maintenance of personal vehicles – zero emission or not – can be expensive. Mid-age persons to seniors might have injuries and vision issues to respect. Also, driving solo long distance seems less desirable often. Travel can be highly desirable by all for mental health benefits. CA needs positive mental health. Also, travel boosts the CA economy.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS: Funds could be allocated to push for private clean energy transportation system engine improvements and corporate takeovers – even if the takeover is for the part only within CA. I tried talking to out-of-state Greyhound management on cleaner low-to-zero emission buses; calls routed to ‘dead-end’ personnel. Greyhound, which I have sometimes utilized especially as a student, seems to have a substantial low-to-medium income customer base. Amtrak might have similar circumstances and is said to have federal government funding. Systems, in-state and cross-state, might possibly appreciate positive, non-threatening clean energy counseling. All CA private transportation systems (aviation, rail, bus, ship, space) could be educated to share, at the time of purchase, what a travel ticket’s greenhouse gas profile and embodied carbon fuel system is purchasing, besides the fun or not so fun get-away. This idea - which was suggested as a software ticket counter enhancement at a CA Energy Behavior conference - when offered at a competitive price, could aid all consumers in purchasing a less polluting choice. Advocacy staff might be worth employing for these solutions.