

**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>	257369
<b>Document Title:</b>	Thomas Jones Comments - Support Investments in Hydrogen Fueling Infrastructure
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	Thomas Jones
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	6/24/2024 1:31:49 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	6/24/2024

*Comment Received From: Thomas Jones*  
*Submitted On: 6/24/2024*  
*Docket Number: 24-ALT-01*

## **Support Investments in Hydrogen Fueling Infrastructure**

Please read the attached letter.

*Additional submitted attachment is included below.*

Title: Support Investments 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).

My wife and I have owned a Toyota Mirai for almost two years. I can say unequivocally that it is the best car we have ever owned. We chose an FCEV because we wanted a zero emissions vehicle, but are unable to charge a BEV at home or work. Fortunately, we live near two hydrogen stations. As a commuter car in Los Angeles, the Mirai performs excellently. We normally refuel once per week.

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 our life, specifically limiting the places in California where we can travel and the closing of stations (Hollywood) has put increased demand on the stations we use.

When we purchased our car two years ago, we were looking forward to more and more stations opening. Instead, stations are closing and the price of hydrogen has increased dramatically. We look forward to the expansion of hydrogen stations up and down the California coast as we can only use our car as a commuter car. On a recent trip to Central California we could not take our FCEV and had to rent a car because the hydrogen stations do not exist.

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. Why can't the stations be combined to serve commercial and light-duty customers?

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.

We strongly feel that consumers deserve all green options in order to combat climate change. In looking toward a greener California, we must insist that all green vehicle options be available to all customers.

FCEV has been a wonderful choice for our family.

Thank you for your attention to this crucial matter.

Sincerely,  
Thomas and Julia Jones