

**DOCKETED**

<b>Docket Number:</b>	24-ALT-01
<b>Project Title:</b>	2024–2025 Investment Plan Update for the Clean Transportation Program
<b>TN #:</b>	257190
<b>Document Title:</b>	Evante Garza-Licudine Comments - Investment in Hydrogen Fueling Infrastructure
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	Evante Garza-Licudine
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	6/20/2024 10:20:22 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	6/21/2024

*Comment Received From: Evante Garza-Licudine  
Submitted On: 6/20/2024  
Docket Number: 24-ALT-01*

## **Investment in Hydrogen Fueling Infrastructure**

Dear Commissioner Monahan and Members of the Clean Transportation Advisory Committee,

I am writing to you as an owner of a zero-emission, fuel cell electric vehicle (FCEV).

I chose to drive an FCEV because with the second-highest electricity costs of the nation (and rising), I did not believe a battery electric vehicle would be a choice I would be content with in several years. However, driving a gasoline-powered car was also out of the question given the climate crisis. As such, the best solution was to get an FCEV, which I did two years ago in 2022. The reasons I chose to get an FCEV are also why it's so important to invest in hydrogen fueling infrastructure, including for light-duty FCEVs.

However, I am deeply concerned about California's slow progress in achieving the goal of establishing 200 fueling stations. Following the June 7th discussion of the Clean Transportation Advisory Committee, it seems that this objective is not a priority for the Commission or the Committee. The current limitations of the fueling network have significant impacts on my daily life, as the closest station to me is a 15 minute one-way drive, and which is often unavailable -- often due to broken pumps. This results in trying to strategize when I can refuel, which is not a problem facing almost every other driver.

It is particularly troubling to learn that the Commission has decided against future support for light-duty hydrogen stations, and that previously allocated funds might be redirected to heavy-duty hydrogen stations or electric vehicle charging stations. This decision is unacceptable.

As an early adopter of zero-emission vehicles, I support California's clean vehicle goals and climate initiatives. However, it is apparent that the state does not equally support both available zero-emission vehicle options. Currently, less than \$0.04 of every dollar invested by utility ratepayers is directed towards hydrogen infrastructure, with the majority being allocated to charging stations.

I respectfully urge the Commission and Advisory Committee to reconsider their stance and to reinstate support for the light-duty hydrogen fueling network. The funds previously earmarked for light-duty hydrogen stations should be reallocated to fulfill their original purpose, and future funding should be secured to ensure California meets its goal of 200 passenger stations.

Thank you for your attention to this crucial matter.

Sincerely,

Evante Garza-Licudine