

DOCKETED

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Docket Number: | 19-ALT-01 |
| Project Title: | 2020-2021 Investment Plan Update for the Clean Transportation Program |
| TN #: | 233713 |
| Document Title: | Transcript - 6-19-20 - 2nd Advisory Committee Meeting for the Clean Transportation Program Investment Plan Update |
| Description: | Transcript of Advisory Committee Meeting held June 19, 2020 for the Clean Transportation Program Investment Plan Update |
| Filer: | Tami Haas |
| Organization: | California Energy Commission |
| Submitter Role: | Commission Staff |
| Submission Date: | 7/1/2020 3:49:06 PM |
| Docketed Date: | 7/1/2020 |

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

PUBLIC WORKSHOP

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|
| In the Matter of: |) | Docket No. 19-ALT-01 |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| CEC 2 nd Advisory Committee |) | 2020-2023 INVESTMENT PLAN |
| Meeting Presentation for the |) | FOR THE CLEAN TRANSPORTATION |
| Clean Transportation Program |) | PROGRAM |
| 2020-2023 Investment Plan |) | |
| Update |) | |
| _____ |) | |

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION (CEC)

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

REMOTE

FRIDAY, JUNE 19, 2020

9:07 A.M.

Reported by: Peter Petty

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC
229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

APPEARANCES

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Commissioner Patty Monahan, California Energy Commission

COMMISSIONER ADVISORS PRESENT:

Jana Romero, Advisor to Commissioner Monahan

Ben De Alba, Advisor to Commissioner Monahan

CEC STAFF PRESENT:

Patrick Brecht, Investment Plan Project Manager

John Butler, Deputy Director

Tami Haas, Supervisor

Charles Smith, Office Manager

Dorothy Murimi, Public Advisor's Office

PANELISTS:

Casey Gallagher, California Labor Federation

Mary Solecki, AJW

Bill Magavern, Coalition for Clean Air

Richard Schorske, Zero net Energy Alliance

Matt Gregori, SoCalGas

Jimmy O'Dea, Union of Concerned Scientist

William Barrett, American Lung Association

Zac Thompson, East Bay Community Energy

Eileen Tutt, CalETC

Jose (JB) Tengco, BlueGreen Alliance

Leela Rao, Port of Long Beach

Jerome Carman, Schatz Energy Research Center/Humboldt State
University

Michael Pimentel, California Transit Association

Robert Meyer, ETP

Kevin Hamilton, Central California Asthma Collaborative

Russell Teall, Recreational Boaters

Ruben Aronin, Better World Group

Tracy Stanhoff, President AD PRO and American Indian Chamber of
Commerce

Patricio Portillo, Natural Resources Defense Council

Katherine Garcia, Sierra Club

Larry Engelbrecht, Engelbrecht Consulting

Bill Elrick, California Fuel Cell Partnership

PANELISTS (CONTINUED):

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC

229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

Tyson Eckerle, California Governor's Office of Business and Economic
Development
Heidi Sickler, Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Sandy Naranjo, Mothers Out Front
Alfred Artis, Consumer Reports
Rey Leon, The Latino Equity Advocacy & Policy Institute
Jose Lopez

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Jaime Levin, Center for Transportation and Environment
Mahlon Aldridge, Ecology Action
John Shears, Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies
Dmitry Diment, CALSTART
Alycia Gilde, CALSTART

INDEX

| | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Call to Order | 5 |
| 2. CEC Staff Overview of the Clean Transportation Program's Lead Commissioner Report Version of the 2020-2023 Investment Plan Update | 8 |
| 3. Advisory Committee Discussion of the Proposed Revisions Addressing COVID-19 Impacts to Jobs and the Economy | 16 |
| 4. Public Comments | 109 |
| 5. Adjournment | 119 |

Reporter's Certificate

Transcriber's Certificate

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 JUNE 19, 2020

9:07 A.M.

3 MR. BRECHT: And welcome. My name is Patrick Brecht.
4 And I'm the project manager for the 2020-2023 Investment Plan
5 for the Clean Transportation Program. I want to thank you
6 all for being here.

7 I just need to go over a couple of housekeeping items
8 first. The remote meeting is consistent with Executive Order
9 N-25-20 and N-29-20, in order to slow the spread of COVID-19.

10 This meeting is being recorded. We ask that you mute
11 yourself when you're not speaking. The transcript of this
12 meeting will be made available on the Energy Commission
13 website. This is our first remote meeting, obviously, for
14 the Advisory Committee meeting but our Second Advisory
15 Committee meeting of this investment plan cycle.

16 There will be opportunity for public comment at the
17 end of the meeting and written comments submitted to the
18 docket are really strongly encouraged. We ask the Advisory
19 Committee members indicate they would like to speak or
20 comment by using the raise hand feature. We would like to --
21 we'd like you to identify yourself before you speak.

22 We have a lot to cover today so we'll ask everyone to
23 be concise and to make sure that -- to make sure that all
24 Advisory Committee members have the opportunity to weigh in.

25 With that, I will turn it over to Commissioner Patty

1 Monahan for opening remarks.

2 COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: Good morning, everybody.

3 First off I want to say like how well Patrick did an
4 introduction considering all the technical difficulties we
5 had getting him on to this panel. So way to go, Patrick.

6 So welcome to our Second Advisory Committee meeting.

7 And I just want to say that, you know, when we met
8 previously, it was such a different world. Right? Our pre-
9 COVID world. And the comments that we got from you all which
10 we really took to heart the oral comments, the written
11 comments, didn't reflect the situation that we're in today.
12 And so we are really curious to get your thoughts on how we
13 can use the funding from the Clean Transportation Program to
14 continue to support the movement toward, you know, reaching
15 California's goals to have a carbon-neutral economy by 2045
16 and to electrify our vehicles as much as we can with zero
17 carbon hydrogen or zero carbon electricity.

18 But with this plan about, you know, what can we do to
19 support jobs and economic recovery? So we internally really
20 took this to heart, made some adjustments to the investment
21 plan, the staff was really thoughtful about this. And we
22 want to get your thoughts on whether we hit the mark, whether
23 we -- whether you think there are additional refinements that
24 are needed.

25 And I really encourage you to with us, you know, help

1 us think through what can we do to be able to make sure that
2 the state makes it through this economic recession with a
3 deep focus on electrifying transportation or reaching near
4 zero or zero-emission fuels in vehicles.

5 So I also want to acknowledge to you this has been a
6 really sobering time for our country and our state. You
7 know, the murder of George Floyd, all the protests that have
8 been having for Black Lives Matter. The fact that today is
9 Juneteenth and, you know, a really important day recognizing,
10 you know, in Texas the last state to recognize the end of
11 slavery. And so before we start, I just want to ask
12 everybody to just take a moment of silence and reflect, just
13 to put us all in the right state to be able to talk about
14 this investment plan with alignment towards equity and
15 fairness and justice and jobs. That's I think what we need
16 to get to. So I'm hoping that we can -- we can all do this
17 together.

18 So just a moment of silence as we reflect on all
19 that's going on.

20 (A moment of silence)

21 COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: All right. Thanks, everybody.

22 Let me turn it back over to Patrick to lead the
23 discussion and to share it with you how we've been thinking
24 about revisions in light of COVID and economic situation.

25 MR. BRECHT: Great. Thanks, Patty. Excuse me.

1 Slide 2. I will start by providing the abbreviated
2 overview, the Clean Transportation Program and the Investment
3 Plan highlighting major changes from the staff draft version
4 of the investment plan. This will all -- this will be
5 followed by an Advisory Committee discussion on the proposed
6 revisions in this -- excuse me -- the Lead Commission Report
7 Version of the 2020-23 Investment Plan update focusing
8 primarily on proposed revisions and the response to COVID-19
9 impacts to jobs and the economy.

10 Next slide.

11 The Clean Transportation Program was established by
12 California Assembly Bill 118 in the year 2007. The program
13 is funded through a small surcharge on California vehicle
14 registration leading to a budget of up to 100 million per
15 year. And California Assembly Bill -- excuse me, Assembly
16 Bill 8, extended the program to January 1st, 2024.

17 The program was developed to provide funding support
18 for projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It's in
19 the transportation sector which accounts for roughly 50
20 percent of state greenhouse gas emissions. Funded projects
21 also contribute to complimentary state goals including
22 improved air quality providing investments in low-income and
23 disadvantaged communities, project economic development, and
24 reduced petroleum dependence.

25 Next slide.

1 THE COURT REPORTER: This is the court reporter.

2 Mr. Brecht, you're having some -- your voice is
3 cutting in and out kind of severely. Is there a way we can
4 fix that? Or is anybody else hearing that?

5 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, it sounded that way to me too.

6 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Me as well.

7 MR. BRECHT: Okay. Not sure how I can fix that at
8 this point.

9 MR. KELLEY: You are just sounding a bit better,
10 Patrick. Let's go ahead and continue.

11 MR. BRECHT: Okay, thank you.

12 Today we will discuss Lead Commissioner Report
13 Version of the '20-'23 Investment Plan for the Clean
14 Transportation Program. The document updated annually serves
15 as a basis for the program's funding opportunities for each
16 fiscal year. The investment plan lays out how the coming
17 fiscal year's funds will be allocated across various
18 categories such as infrastructure, fuels, technology, and
19 supporting elements.

20 The allocations and implementation of the Clean
21 Transportation Program reflects the effect of numerous
22 policies and goals by legislation, regulation, and executive
23 order. The net result of these policies have been to
24 steer -- steer our program towards zero- and near zero-
25 emission fuels and technologies. This policy include

1 achieving 100 percent zero carbon electricity as well as
2 carbon neutral economy by 2045. By 2031, achieving a 80
3 percent reduction smog forming NO_x and reaching 1.5 -- excuse
4 me -- reaching 1.5 million ZEVs or zero-emissions vehicles by
5 2025 and 5 million ZEVs by 2030. And by 2025, having 250,000
6 electric vehicle chargers and 200 hydrogen fueling stations
7 to support these ZEVs.

8 The document is vetted through a public process, a
9 review process, that is, that involves multiple iterations of
10 the document and meetings with the Advisory Committee, such
11 meetings as today.

12 And finally, the investment plan sets allocations for
13 various funding categories and not individual projects.

14 Proposed funding priorities.

15 Next slide.

16 With all this in mind, four key priorities are being
17 proposed to guide our investment plan funding allocations.

18 First, it is anticipated that within the area of zero-
19 emission vehicles, CARB will continue to lead the funding
20 on -- for vehicle incentives with the Clean Transportation
21 Program focusing more on recharging and refueling
22 infrastructure in addition to other priorities.

23 Second, within the area of ZEV infrastructure, the
24 CEC is proposing an early focus on light-duty passenger
25 vehicle needs. This is intended to help narrow the charging

1 gap anticipated by 2025. With other -- with over 700,000
2 battery electric vehicles already on the road in California,
3 it's vital to ensure that there's adequate infrastructure to
4 support growing consumer demand for electric vehicles or we
5 risk slowing the adoption.

6 The CEC expects to follow this long term. But the
7 long-term focus with ZEV infrastructure for trucks, buses,
8 and off-duty, excuse me, off-road equipment.

9 Third, the CEC is interested in funding projects that
10 could help overcome the barriers associated with near zero
11 and zero-emission fuel commercialization.

12 And finally, the most relevant to today's discussion,
13 the CEC is leveraging funding to process or to address our
14 current unprecedented situation as it relates to COVID-19
15 impacts. The CEC is prioritizing funding to support high-
16 quality jobs, help invigorate the economy, and advance
17 equity. The funding will provide quick recovery and
18 reinvestment measures that build infrastructure while
19 supporting job creation, economic development, and equity.

20 Next slide.

21 In response to COVID-19, the CEC has proposed a new
22 funding allocation titled, Recovery and Reinvestment. The
23 CEC is proposing a shift from zero and near zero fuel
24 production supply category from Fiscal Year 2021 to the
25 category Recovery and Reinvestment. We believe this would be

1 the fastest way to create jobs and build needed
2 infrastructure with shovel-ready projects.

3 The CEC is also stressing a program-wide focus on
4 creating high-quality job opportunities and the funding --
5 and the funding for manufacturing and workforce training and
6 development has been leveled over the remaining life of the
7 Clean Transportation Program and we have proposed an increase
8 of 2 million for manufacturing for the Fiscal Year 2021
9 and -- yeah, 2020-'21.

10 And the lead Commission report version of course, the
11 investment plan update incorporates Advisory Committee Member
12 and public feedback for both the -- from the first Advisory
13 Committee meeting and docket submissions. We had over 100
14 submissions for our first Advisory Committee meeting or after
15 our first Advisory Committee meeting.

16 Next slide.

17 This slide shows how we're proposing to translate the
18 aforementioned funding priorities into real funding
19 allocations. This table shows the proposed funding
20 allocations table for Fiscal Year 2021 as well as the
21 proposed funding for the next two and half years.

22 I should stress the uncertainty of the 51 million
23 one-time legislative appropriation under the light-duty
24 electric vehicle charge infrastructure e-Mobility funding
25 category, the second line there.

1 As I -- as mentioned, we are proposing to make big
2 contributions towards building light-duty charge
3 infrastructure in the upcoming fiscal year while future
4 fiscal years would focus more funding toward medium- and
5 heavy-duty ZEVs and infrastructure. We encourage the need
6 and the opportunity to advance zero-emission vehicles, excuse
7 me, zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty ZEVs but we were
8 motivated to focus our light-duty charging infrastructure as
9 a response to the COVID crisis.

10 Faced with high unemployment and struggling economy,
11 the buildout of passenger vehicle infrastructure to the
12 CALeVIP program or the California Electric Vehicle
13 Infrastructure Project provides the greatest number of near
14 term high-quality jobs per dollar invested.

15 Now allocations for hydrogen refueling infrastructure
16 and zero and near zero fuel production supplies would remain
17 steady over time with the exception of Fiscal Year 2021 where
18 there's a one-time shift from the funding from the fuel
19 production supply category to the new funding category which
20 is recovery reinvestment.

21 I should add the zero and near zero fuel production
22 supply still has unspent greenhouse gas reduction fund
23 dollars and Clean Transportation Program fuel production
24 supply dollars and supply dollars for this upcoming year. So
25 the -- although this table provides no added funds for this

1 upcoming fiscal year, we are still planning on moving forward
2 with new projects.

3 Compared to the previous version of the investment
4 plan are allocations for ZEV and ZEV infrastructure
5 manufacturing and workforce development are leveled out over
6 each fiscal year with the shared aim of supporting in-state
7 economic development and hastening the adoption.

8 Finally, as mentioned earlier, we're creating a new
9 category titled, Recovery and Reinvestment.

10 Next slide.

11 Here is the schedule for the investment plan update.
12 The CEC released a Draft Staff Report on March 2nd. The first
13 Advisory Committee meeting was held on the 3rd of March with
14 full membership attendance. The Lead Commissioner Report was
15 released just on June 16th. Depending on feedback from the
16 Advisory Committee meeting and a review of the docket
17 comments, the CEC may possibly release their revised Lead
18 Commissioner Report version in July 2020. Staff will then
19 anticipate presenting the investment plan update to a CEC
20 business meeting for approval in August.

21 And the last slide here. This slide shows where you
22 can find more information on the Clean Transportation Program
23 website as well as where you can submit comments to the
24 docket regarding the Lead Commissioner Report version of the
25 2023-'23 -- excuse me, 2020-'23 investment plan update.

1 I just want to point out the deadline to submit
2 comments is July 6th. And that you can always contact me and
3 e-mail -- e-mail address is here provided.

4 And with that, I will take us into our discussion
5 questions.

6 Next slide.

7 At this point, we will begin Advisory Committee
8 discussion. And since changes were made to funding
9 allocations in response to COVID impacts and the economic
10 recovery needs, we would like to focus the conversation
11 around the next three questions on this slide.

12 As we enter discussion questions, we'd ask that you
13 use the hand function which can be found under participant's
14 tab near the invite button. And for anyone calling in, you
15 can use the star 9 to raise your hand. And please be clear
16 and concise and I can -- and I ask you to be considerate of
17 time allowed for other Advisory Committee members to speak.

18 Okay. I will go ahead and go into our discussion
19 questions.

20 First one here is: Has the latest version of the
21 draft investment plan adequately addressed the impacts of the
22 COVID-19? If not, what additional changes to the investment
23 plans should the CEC consider?

24 Question 2: Where are the CEC's biggest
25 opportunities to use Clean Transportation Program funds to

1 create jobs quickly and to help stimulate the California
2 economy and support California businesses on our path to
3 economic recovery?

4 And 3: Have the changes made to the latest draft of
5 the investment plan adequately prioritized high-quality job
6 opportunities? If not, what additional changes to the
7 investment plan should the CEC consider?

8 And again, due to the time limit, this meeting will
9 need to -- we will need everyone to keep comments as brief
10 and succinct as possible.

11 And with that, I guess we'll open up the lines, I
12 guess you can say, and await your comments.

13 MR. KELLEY: Nobody has their hand raised.

14 Okay, we've got one.

15 The first panelist speaker will be Casey Gallagher.
16 I am unmuting him now. There we go.

17 Casey, you're clear to speak.

18 MR. GALLAGHER: Okay. Excellent. I was afraid I
19 unmuted myself early, then got muted again. Fabulous. Thank
20 you so much. Thank you for the opportunity.

21 Yeah, these are really challenging times. And first
22 off, I just want to make a quick statement. I don't want to
23 go over time. I want to thank Commissioner Monahan on kind
24 of setting the stage on this, we're dealing with a lot of
25 heavy things right now to say the least. Pandemic, civil

1 unrest. And happy Juneteenth, everyone.

2 And I think these are all very appropriate questions
3 and also wanted to make the statement of we commend the CEC
4 and the staff and Commissioner Monahan on the hard work that
5 it takes and also revamping the investment plan to reflect
6 the current situation in both and the pandemic context but
7 also the issues with the economy.

8 I think I mainly just want to focus on 3 and 1 and 2,
9 the questions I'll send in written comments of kind of
10 (indiscernible) back to my legislative staff and a few other
11 folks of what's going on around this state throughout the
12 federation.

13 So once again, Casey Gallagher, California Labor
14 Federation, Workforce Economic Development Department.

15 So the question, have the changes made in the latest
16 draft of the investment plan adequately prioritized the high-
17 quality job opportunities? I really appreciate the mention
18 and the commitment to equity and high-quality jobs. And also
19 we commend you on all the investments that is being mentioned
20 in this.

21 I think one of the things that I think it would be
22 helpful if we discussed further of how we'd define equity and
23 kind of equity in these times that are always constantly
24 changing of the reflection of kind of the expansion of how we
25 define equity but also equity in action. Meaning that there

1 is a lot of mention of the different partnerships say within
2 manufacturing we see the, like, the joint apprenticeship
3 committees between the steel workers, the Proterra, and also
4 Smart 105 and BYD, huge vehicle manufacturers within the
5 state that are doing really great work. And I think the
6 highlight of that partnership work of both private sector,
7 public sector, the state, labor, and community-based
8 organizations, how we actually kind of push that forward.

9 One of the things I'd love to see that -- it's not --
10 I don't think it really got mentioned or highlighted. But so
11 a really great thing that the CEC did -- well, you always do
12 great things -- but one of the great things that generally
13 get them I'm impressed was the creation of a like a high road
14 procurement policy that was connected to the school --
15 electrification of the school bus. I believe it's SB 100,
16 though check back. But there was actually a procurement
17 policy that was focused on creation in support of the high
18 road (indiscernible).

19 So the expansion of, like, what are those kind of
20 characteristics that the CEC wants to support and
21 (indiscernible) and all the procurement policies and how we
22 actually expand that to reflect these times such as health
23 and safety training, is there job advancement. If state
24 money is going to something, it would be great to actually
25 make sure there is a connection of while supporting high road

1 creation of jobs in these sectors and within the NRG and
2 electrification of vehicles. But also what -- that these are
3 also careers that go somewhere. That will getting -- will
4 maximizing exactly that return on investment and also an
5 equitable future.

6 So I'm happy and I imagine a lot of other folks on
7 this Advisory Committee would be happy to have that
8 conversation about how we expand the definition of equity and
9 what does it looks like. I know like it was a lot of
10 attention in CalEnviroScreen and everything else. But I
11 think those -- we need to keep on expanding on it. And it's
12 a work that always (indiscernible). Just like technology is
13 always changing (indiscernible).

14 So thank you. And of everything else, I'll be adding
15 through my written comment.

16 MR. KELLEY: Perfect. Thank you, Casey.

17 The next panelist speaker is Mary Solecki. I'm going
18 to -- and she unmuted herself. Go ahead, Mary.

19 MR. SOLECKI: Thanks. Mary Solecki with AJW. Thank
20 you to Commissioner Monahan for a good intro and setting us
21 on the right foot for the morning.

22 Due to the importance and gravity of some many of the
23 economic things that are happening right now, I just wanted
24 to highlight again a recent CEC docket that I think might
25 have a lot of importance for some of these investment

1 considerations, and that was the strategies to attract
2 private investment in zero-emission vehicle charging
3 infrastructure and other clean transportation projects. I
4 think there might be some big opportunities to better
5 leverage private capital so that what we're looking at here
6 is a force multiplier.

7 Second point is that I wanted to just hear a little
8 bit more hopefully through the course of today's discussion
9 about how those recovery and reinvestment dollars are being
10 imagined and how those will be spent. I note that those came
11 from the low carbon fuel bucket, that's where they were
12 previously allocated. And of course that's where I actually
13 spend the majority of my time thinking about and working on.
14 So while I was disappointed to see those dollars disappear
15 from that bucket, at the same time I thought, well, really a
16 lot of those investments are recovery and reinvestment. So I
17 just want to understand a little bit more about what would
18 be -- what kinds of projects would be qualified under that.

19 And, yeah, that's I guess maybe third and final point
20 is just that it is to make the point that those low carbon
21 fuel investments really are strong investments in local
22 facilities, jobs. They are frequently located in areas that
23 need the jobs that -- and they are well-paying high-quality
24 jobs so to me, that is absolutely hand in hand.

25 So thank you.

1 COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: I wonder, can someone on the
2 team really respond really quickly to Mary's question about
3 the thinking around what are some of the potential
4 investments in that new category?

5 And Charles, I don't know if that's you or Patrick or
6 John. One of the three of you I'm guessing would be the
7 right one.

8 MR. SMITH: Hi, Patty. This is Charles. So I think
9 I heard either Patrick or John try to jump in as well.

10 So a couple of things that I'll mention. So one
11 possible model for this, we previously -- in previous
12 investment plans had a funding allocation that was labeled
13 emerging opportunities and one of the opportunities was for
14 federal cost sharing. So we don't know if there will be
15 federal economic stimulus as a recovery investment to follow
16 in the coming year.

17 Having a category that is not sort of narrowly
18 defined by one fuel type or one supply chain phase or kind of
19 gives us a little bit of flexibility to plan out how we might
20 try to maximize the benefit of how to try to use our funds to
21 leverage more federal investments into the state.

22 So that's just one possible example.

23 MR. KELLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mary, again.

24 The next panelist speaker will be Bill Magavern.

25 MR. MAGAVERN: Good morning. Bill Magavern with

1 Coalition for Clean Air.

2 I think this is an excellent draft and I appreciate
3 all the work that went into it. I think I especially agree
4 with the strategy of investing heavily in zero-emission
5 infrastructure and that as others have said is going to
6 create some high-quality jobs. And I agree with the strategy
7 of frontloading light-duty infrastructure and then really
8 ramping up on medium and heavy duty after that.

9 In terms of additional changes to consider, an area
10 where I think we could raise our sights is in investments in
11 disadvantaged and low-income communities. Because these are
12 the communities that are being hit the hardest by COVID-19
13 and by the recession and by climate change. So I would
14 recommend that the investment plan seek to invest at least 50
15 percent of the funds in disadvantaged and low-income
16 communities as defined by AB 1550 from 2016, authored by
17 Assembly Member Gomez.

18 Thanks.

19 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Bill.

20 The next panelist speaker will be Richard Schorske.
21 And I'll unmute you now.

22 MR. SCHORSKE: Can you hear me?

23 MR. KELLEY: Perfect.

24 MR. SCHORSKE: Can you hear me?

25 MR. KELLEY: Yes.

1 MR. SCHORSKE: Okay. Good.

2 Yes, thank you. I really appreciate the opportunity
3 to comment and I really appreciate the changes on the COVID,
4 and I agree with Bill Magavern on the prioritization of light
5 duty at this time of the stages of the product releases. And
6 I'll also note that the complimentary funding by CARB for
7 both medium- and heavy-duty infrastructure planning is a year
8 or more to work that out through the blueprint process as to
9 what the priority investment should be. So I think this is a
10 very rational approach.

11 I just want to hit on a few different points. You
12 know, I recognize that this is a very high-level plan and
13 that it doesn't necessarily get into sort of how funds are to
14 be designated within categories like light duty, Level 2, and
15 so on. That said, and I think I made this point in our last
16 meeting but I really want to drill on it for a while until we
17 see an MUD focus emerge that's strong.

18 I think everybody's aware of some of the vagaries and
19 arbitrariness of the DAC designation. Just as an example, we
20 do a lot of work in Richmond and unfortunately Richmond, many
21 areas of Richmond are not considered DAC even though really
22 it's about as a disadvantaged community as you can find. So
23 it's quite hard to actually get dollars always to the right
24 places even with the DAC designation as well intentioned as
25 that is.

1 On -- by contrast, an MUD-focused program that's
2 specifically targeted below median or some threshold like
3 that, a hard tech threshold, though a moderate income would
4 get you a much more equitable distribution of funding within
5 the areas where low-income households live. So and most
6 importantly, of course, the MUD segment has just flagged
7 remarkably there's really been an ongoing market failure in
8 MUD charging across the state for reasons that I think we all
9 understand in terms of the difficulty and also the slow
10 uptake of EVs in the kind of -- and the issues there.

11 But I would suggest that a program, a really robust
12 program, you know, ideally in the \$10 million range beef up
13 with some MUDs and that one of the criteria be the number of
14 units enabled for EV charging within the building. They
15 encourage shared charging which is a much more economic
16 approach and a much more feasible approach for a lot of MUDs.

17 Likewise, in terms of -- and these are all equity
18 issues in my view, I think obviously. So the next issue is a
19 program criteria and a round number of people enabled for EV
20 access. And, again, if we're making distinctions in the
21 Level 2 category about priorities of allocations, I think the
22 programs that combine shared EV access for those who can't
23 afford an EV and by shared EV I would include both four-wheel
24 and two-wheeled electric mobility solutions such as e-Bikes
25 in particular.

1 And I think one of the beautiful things that we've
2 all seen with COVID, particularly on a national global basis,
3 is that many streets have been converted into a de facto ZEV
4 mobility corridors or at least bike-ped corridors and that
5 has picked up a lot of steam. And I think another program
6 strategy could be to redo priorities in municipalities and
7 regions that are declaring ZEV zones. As we know, Santa
8 Monica is just embarking on one of the first larger scales of
9 pilots, ZEV zone pilot. And I think giving an inducement and
10 making a priority for serving those regions and
11 municipalities that are willing to be pioneers in ZEV zones
12 by saying you get first dibs on charging infrastructure would
13 be a significant and very positive inducement.

14 And lastly, I want to just second Mary Solecki's
15 emphasis on the leverage finance. I think to do a specific
16 callout of some funding substantial, say 3, whatever, 2 to
17 5 million just to use an arbitrary range. To do something
18 like an RFI to financiers and say what can you do with this,
19 what would you do this? If you just had an extra 3 million
20 of leverage public finance, how much charging infrastructure
21 could you provide? See what emerges. And I know that Tim
22 and the Commission is doing a lot of research on leverage
23 finance for other -- for cross program areas and I think it
24 would be great to see what would emerge out of an RFI like
25 that and then maybe come back and determine what to do in the

1 face of those opportunities.

2 But those are my suggestions and thanks for the
3 opportunity to comment.

4 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Richard.

5 The next panelist speaker is Matt Gregori. I'm going
6 to unmute you now.

7 MR. GREGORI: Good morning. Can you hear me?

8 MR. KELLEY: Yes.

9 MR. GREGORI: Great. Thank you.

10 Matt Gregori, SoCalGas. SoCalGas is opposed to the
11 reduction of all of next year's funding for low carbon fuel
12 production and supply. Based on our review of comments
13 submitted to the docket, there doesn't appear to be any
14 evidence to support zeroing out funding for this category.
15 And this category provides the most GHG reductions per dollar
16 spent out of any of the funding categories for the CTP
17 investment plan through 2023.

18 Referring to a legislative analyst office report from
19 2016, the average cost per ton of carbon reduction from dairy
20 digesters is \$8 in contrast to the average administration
21 cost per ton reduction of \$57.

22 In addition, CEC's own report conducted by the
23 National Renewable Energy Lab quantified benefits of the CTP
24 and suggested that the money the CEC spent on diesel
25 substitutes was 30 times more cost effective for every dollar

1 spent on EV infrastructure. So why would the CEC stop
2 funding the most cost effective way to reduce carbon? It
3 doesn't really make sense.

4 There's also an important jobs angle here. Fuel
5 production offers long-term well-paying jobs often in rural
6 areas of the state. So we strongly encourage the CEC to
7 reconsider this cut and to continue to fund biofuel
8 production because it is -- it is one of the most cost
9 effective GHG reduction strategies California can employ
10 right now.

11 And then Patrick I think you mentioned in your
12 discussion that there were additional funds to provide for
13 fuel production. But it's our understanding that the GGRF
14 funds that could go to fuel production were encumbered by the
15 last business meeting so they're not actually available for
16 future projects or for additional incremental projects.

17 And with that, thank you very much for the
18 opportunity to comment.

19 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Matt.

20 Our next panelist speaker is Jimmy O'Dea.

21 MR. O'DEA: Hi, this is Jimmy O'Dea at the Union of
22 Concerned Scientists.

23 Yeah, definitely appreciate CEC's recognition of what
24 is going on in the world right now and it might be most
25 appropriate to pivot some plans.

1 I guess the high level takeaway for me is, you know,
2 infrastructure is jobs so I think CEC is on the right track
3 of investing heavily in infrastructure and shifting money
4 towards that.

5 I guess the question of, you know, has the latest
6 draft addressed the impacts of COVID and getting, you know,
7 jobs out there quickly. To me it's, you know, how fast can
8 money get out from CEC? You know, projects being awarded,
9 you know, there's an economic crisis right now that is
10 hurting a lot of business. So I think the faster it's
11 streamlined that these processes can be is one of the areas
12 to really help with economic development.

13 I also support comments that others have made about
14 cost sharing. I think, you know, there's a lot of ways to
15 spend the pot of money that is allocated and I think getting
16 the most bang for, you know, the state's buck is -- should,
17 you know, should be a priority in how projects are evaluated.
18 Is this project going to fund 10 chargers or is going to fund
19 100 for the same cost? You know, people -- applicants are
20 creative and whatnot. And that's where I think cost sharing
21 comes in.

22 The support what Bill said about really getting money
23 towards disadvantaged communities, the more, the better there
24 for sure. And so to me I guess just the high-level buckets
25 of 20 million here, 10 million here is less important for

1 these particular questions. But just really the details of
2 who is getting funding? What, you know, what dollar amount
3 is going to the number of chargers and the number of jobs
4 supported by that dollar amount? So I think it's a time to
5 really think about how to make this money go as far as
6 possible.

7 Also put in a plug, I think manufacturing can have
8 long-term, you know, economic benefits. And so, you know,
9 2 million there maybe seems a little on the low side. And so
10 really, I guess, seeing more concrete plans of how the money
11 will be allocated within this bucket I think will be helpful
12 to evaluate really be effective of getting jobs and creating
13 high-quality jobs and making this money go as far as it can.

14 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Jimmy. Are you finished?

15 MR. O'DEA: I am done. Thanks.

16 MR. KELLEY: Perfect.

17 Our next speaker is William Barrett. I'm going to
18 ask him to unmute now.

19 MR. BARRETT: Hi, good morning, this is Will Barrett.
20 Can you hear me now?

21 MR. KELLEY: Yes.

22 MR. BARRETT: Great. Okay. Will Barrett with the
23 American Lung Association. Thank you for the opportunity to
24 speak to everyone today. It's good to hear and see so many
25 people.

1 So first off I just want to say thank you to
2 Commissioner Monahan for framing today's conversation.
3 Certainly the world has changed in tremendous ways. And I
4 think that the effort to update the plan to reflect where we
5 are today makes a lot of sense.

6 The Lung Association, we're very supportive of the
7 structure and the direction of the plan. Really to address
8 multiple risks to lung health, we're looking at this from
9 COVID-19, which is a lung health pandemic. It's looking at
10 this from air pollution and the burdens of air pollution in
11 so many California communities, the impacts of climate change
12 and health inequities all at once. And I think that the plan
13 is really shaping up in a good direction to address these
14 challenges to public health, and so very happy to be a part
15 of the advisory committee to voice that.

16 We also, the Lung Association, strongly supports the
17 growing investment in the heavy-duty infrastructure category.
18 We think that that -- providing that certainty and really
19 making sure that we're moving all sectors in the
20 transportation sector to zero emission as quickly as possible
21 is critical.

22 We also appreciate the near-term investment and
23 light-duty infrastructure to really close that charging gap
24 to really I think in the plan it notes really want to make
25 sure that any lack of charging is not going to impact the

1 transition to zero emission. So supportive on that front as
2 well.

3 Would also really strongly agree with the Coalition
4 for Clean Air recommendations to increase targeted
5 investments to disadvantaged communities. We know that so
6 many of the challenges to lung health are felt mostly really
7 in our most impacted communities. And the cleanup and the
8 benefits of the transition to zero emission really do have to
9 be focused as much as possible in addressing those
10 inequities.

11 And then finally, to Question Number 1, what else can
12 be done? I think I would really just echo what Jimmy O'Dea
13 from UCS just walked through the importance of really moving
14 the funding, the projects out, the funding out as quickly as
15 possible so that these benefits are realized as expeditiously
16 as possible. We want to make sure that we're cutting harmful
17 pollution, building community resiliency, and really see that
18 as a key, that streamline investment as a key to making these
19 benefits real and really serving the public health.

20 So with that, I just want to end with saying thank
21 you for the very thoughtful plan that you've produced. We'll
22 likely follow up with some more detailed comments but really
23 we appreciate the work that's gone in and wanted to just
24 voice our support for kind of the direction you're moving and
25 the thought that's gone into it.

1 So thank you very much.

2 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Will.

3 Our next speaker is Zac Thompson.

4 MR. THOMPSON: All right. Can you hear me?

5 MR. KELLEY: Yes. Yes, sir.

6 MR. THOMPSON: Thanks. Good morning, everyone.

7 Just wanted to say thank you to the CEC staff for all
8 of your efforts and being super adaptive to our new situation
9 in making sure that this report reflects where we're at
10 today. And I'll be submitting, you know, more detailed
11 comments on the docket.

12 But I just wanted to say that we appreciate and
13 support CEC's focus on job creation economic recovery through
14 deployment of EV charging infrastructure while prioritizing
15 light-duty charging upfront and medium- and heavy-duty
16 charging later on.

17 We do have some concern around funding being
18 redirected away from the workforce development category as
19 we've been hearing from our medium- and heavy-duty
20 stakeholders that workforce training and development is going
21 to be critical to make EV adoption feasible for fleet
22 operators both in terms of having a sufficient workforce of
23 drivers as well as technicians to maintain both the vehicles
24 and the charging infrastructure. So we would encourage there
25 to be a focus on these types of efforts within the recovery

1 and reinvestment category.

2 And with that said, I'm also wondering if one year's
3 worth of funding for this category is going to be enough
4 given the economic impacts of COVID-19 are likely going to
5 last much longer than that.

6 And finally, we encourage the CEC moving forward with
7 implementation of the investment plan to work closely with
8 the disadvantaged community's advisory group as well as
9 members of this advisory committee who are focused on
10 workforce development to ensure that the funds within each of
11 these activities are used to promote equitable opportunities
12 within our historically disadvantaged communities that we
13 know are being disproportionately impacted by both the health
14 and economic crises associated with COVID-19.

15 So thank you.

16 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Zac.

17 Our next speaker is Eileen Tutt. Are you there,
18 Eileen?

19 MS. TUTT: Thank you. Can you hear me?

20 MR. KELLEY: Yes.

21 MS. TUTT: Okay. Thanks.

22 So I guess what I want to say is I do think that
23 this -- I really appreciate the staff and the Commissioner on
24 the effort to understand, you know, and help with the
25 recovery and reinvestment on COVID. And I think that is the

1 best way to help our communities as they try to recover
2 particularly economically.

3 I will say, and I don't know, Patty, if it will be
4 okay if -- Charles, I don't quite understand the recovery and
5 reinvestment program and what it is intended to do. And I'll
6 honestly admit I focused mostly on the zero-emission
7 infrastructure part of the report and I just haven't had time
8 to look into it. But maybe -- maybe just a quick five-minute
9 or less primer on kind of what the -- what that -- what that
10 is. Because, you know, Patrick just sort of said it but
11 without explaining what it is. And I know I should have read
12 it but I haven't had a lot of time the last three days, I
13 just haven't gotten to it.

14 I do want to say that I -- I'm a little -- I think
15 one thing that we need to do as we consider because I
16 supported the Coalition for Clean Air, Bill Magavern's
17 comments. But I also think that -- I think Richard Schorske
18 said, you know, sometimes the DAC leaves out a lot of
19 communities and programs. And when we talk about communities
20 that are suffering, it's really, you know, disadvantaged
21 communities that are identified by the -- the Cal EPA and the
22 low-income communities unemployed and underemployed.
23 California's communities of color in particular have been
24 hurt by this COVID-19 and it's not specifically spelled out
25 that way. And I think we need to expand this to include

1 specifically communities of color.

2 I also think -- I'm familiar with one program from
3 one of our Cal ETC members, Proterra, that helps people who
4 are -- who are working to on reentry or struggling with
5 reentry after incarceration which is a huge problem in these
6 communities from an economic perspective.

7 And I'll -- you know, some people don't struggle with
8 reentry economically, for example, Martha Stewart. And
9 others, they get out of incarceration and they literally can
10 never find a job again. And so these kinds of programs are
11 really important. And I just want to say if we are -- if
12 this recovery -- recovery and reinvestment program is going
13 to focus on companies and entities that work to create jobs
14 for those struggling economically in the COVID crisis or
15 exacerbated by the COVID crisis, those same people are
16 probably the same ones that were struggling before the crisis
17 hit and now it's worse. So I just would maybe expand upon
18 the definition there or really qualify what -- what -- what
19 communities are trying to lift up.

20 And then the other thing I just want to say in terms
21 of ZEV infrastructure, one thing that I want to point out is
22 that -- and this is brought up at the last advisory committee
23 and it struck me and I did a lot of work looking into it, and
24 that is that whatever we do with this money, what we don't
25 want to end up having is a situation where people in low-

1 income communities or communities that are struggling in ways
2 related to COVID or any kind of economic situation, we don't
3 want them to have to pay more for fuel than -- than -- than
4 the average person would or somebody living in a single-
5 family home like most of us on the phone.

6 And so I just want to think about making it a
7 priority that we consider that -- that if you're going to
8 make these investments in infrastructure in these
9 communities, that -- that the fuel cost be as low as
10 possible. And for example, in something like an MUD, keeping
11 the fuel cost as low as possible might mean something like
12 Level 1 charging across, you know, 100 Level 1 chargers or
13 something like that. And so I just want to be a little bit
14 more creative than just assuming everything's got to be
15 network and everything's got to be Level 2 or DC fast
16 charging because that's the not the lowest cost options.

17 So I'd like to see low cost fueling particularly in
18 these communities be a focus of these investments and not
19 just -- and not just the investments themselves and fuel's
20 available but it costs twice as much as it would if you had
21 your home that had its own garage where you would plug in for
22 next to nothing or much, much cheaper than gasoline.

23 So thank you.

24 MR. KELLEY: Thanks, Eileen.

25 I just want to mention again, if you are calling in,

1 we want to remind you, you can click star 9 to raise your
2 hand and star 6 to mute and unmute yourself.

3 Let's see here. Our next speaker is Jose Tengco.
4 You're unmuted.

5 MR. TENGCO: Okay. This is JB Tengco with BlueGreen
6 Alliance. Thanks all for -- and really CEC for its
7 leadership.

8 It's hard to go in the middle. I think a lot of
9 what's -- a lot of folks have already said all the things I
10 would have said or plan to say.

11 That said, you know, I agree with a lot of the
12 comments, I agree with Casey on his points around job
13 quality, his ideas around really lifting EV infrastructure
14 and manufacturing as ways to create good jobs. And Bill and
15 Will talked about investments in disadvantaged communities as
16 well. I completely agree with that.

17 The points I would add or that I think as CEC looks
18 at where to invest and I think Mary just sort of mentioned
19 Proterra as an example of this is looking at really how do
20 you embed job quality criteria into your investment to ensure
21 that you really do create good jobs? You know, from a labor
22 perspective, we would argue that job quality concepts are
23 about what are the skill standards? What are the wage
24 standards? What are the training programs that those
25 companies offer to have freedom of assembly or ways for

1 workers to voice their concerns? Do they have reentry
2 programs, targeted to higher programs? I think we've seen
3 that the models in other agencies both in the CEC as Casey
4 mentioned but through other agencies that have looked at how
5 do we ensure that the dollars we give out really lead to
6 creating a good job and not just a job?

7 I say particularly with the points you've raised at
8 the beginning as we all understand with the pandemic and then
9 the anger and frustration that come out with -- with through
10 George Floyd what we're seeing, you know, both anger, racism,
11 but issues of income inequality all playing out at one time.
12 And so how you invest and the companies you choose to invest
13 in really make a difference. Because, again, they can either
14 create a good job or they can create just a job.

15 You know, as an example, again, coming from a labor
16 perspective, we see that for African-Americans in the same
17 type of job union but holding for union versus nonunion
18 generally make 30 percent more for the same type of work.
19 The only difference is that they're in a union. For Latinos,
20 we see this 40 percent increase between being in a union and
21 not being in a union again for the same job.

22 And on the flip side, we've seen declines. As we've
23 seen declines in union jobs which I think for us is a quick
24 way of ensuring that you have the job quality standards that
25 are important, that the declining union jobs has led to a

1 third of income inequality that we see today.

2 So really, again, to the point of how you invest and
3 the companies you choose to invest in and you choose to award
4 in a way you provide (indiscernible) into agencies on how
5 they give out EV infrastructure matters because the end
6 result leads to a good job or not.

7 So, you know, from our perspective, we are really
8 excited about CEC's focus on promoting quality jobs and
9 really look forward to working together on making that
10 happen.

11 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, JB.

12 Our next speaker is Leela Rao. I'm going to ask her
13 to unmute now.

14 MS. RAO: Hi. I'm Leela Rao from the Port of Long
15 Beach.

16 So as you all know, the Port of L.A. and the Port of
17 Long Beach are really committed to the goals laid out in the
18 Clean Air Action Plan including our goal of 100 percent zero-
19 emission cargo handling equipment by 2030 and 100 percent
20 zero-emission drayage trucks by 2035. These goals would be
21 aggressive in the best of times and I think we've all seen
22 the impacts of COVID-19 have been really devastating to the
23 economy.

24 While we've seen signs of improvement recently at the
25 ports, there are still that great deal of uncertainty in the

1 months ahead and the road to full recovery may be very long.
2 So in that light, the ports really appreciate the CEC's pivot
3 to prioritize jobs in economic stimulus inequity in light of
4 the challenges presented by the COVID-19 pandemic.

5 I think in particular, the money allocated to
6 workforce development and additional money being put toward
7 manufacturing seem like they have the greatest potential to
8 provide long-term economic benefits.

9 So we do encourage workforce development. I think if
10 you prioritize in the new recovering funds, I think like
11 others, I'm still a little bit unclear as to how the recovery
12 funds sort of what -- how those role -- how that money will
13 really play out. But I think, you know, workforce
14 development we've seen through our own programs can be really
15 beneficial.

16 Like others have said, the proposal to focus on
17 light-duty vehicle infrastructure sort on the early years on
18 pivot to medium- and heavy-duty vehicle infrastructure later
19 really does align with the current needs of the ports. We're
20 in the midst of multiple demonstration projects. But many of
21 those have encountered significant delays due in part to the
22 COVID crisis.

23 So we do still need time for these early
24 demonstrations to play out so the ports and terminals can
25 gain valuable experience on the potential zero-emission

1 solutions and begin planning for large scale implementation
2 of zero-emission equipment. CEC funding is critical to
3 helping fund the transition to zero and so the additional
4 time to prepare for that next phase in infrastructure
5 projects is appreciated.

6 So we do also still need infrastructure design money
7 and so we hope the CEC continues to support the type of EV
8 blueprint planning projects that really have been so helpful
9 to the Port of Long Beach as a whole and will be critical to
10 the terminal and local fleets as they begin planning for
11 their individual transition.

12 So thank you to the CEC and to staff for the thoughts
13 that's gone into this plan and all the changes since the
14 COVID-19 crisis has hit.

15 Thanks.

16 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Leela.

17 Our next speaker is Jerome Carman. And I ask to
18 unmute him now.

19 MR. CARMAN: Are you able to hear me?

20 MR. KELLEY: Yes, sir. Go ahead.

21 MR. CARMAN: Great. Thank you, Commissioner. First
22 I want to say thank you for taking the time to acknowledge
23 the importance of equitable access to human rights and that
24 Black Lives Matter and using your position to talk about
25 this.

1 Also, thank you to the Commissioner and to CEC staff
2 in considering ways to leverage the funding pathways that you
3 managed to respond to economic impacts of this -- of this
4 pandemic. We support that.

5 Commenting on the recovery and reinvestment line
6 item, I do support the diversion from the fuel supply line
7 item. I think projects funded under that line item are
8 important. And noting that the Schatz Center does work in
9 this area particularly in biomass diversion pathways but we
10 consider combustion technologies as not a significant part of
11 our long-term clean transportation futures. I think I would
12 have made the same decision.

13 I think my comments on your recovery reinvestment
14 line item echo some of what others have said. I think to me
15 that section actually reads to me more like a flexible
16 general fund was created. So I think that's how I have
17 interpreted that section. And echoing that lack of clarity
18 on exact --

19 (No audio)

20 THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, this is the Court
21 Reporter, I think Mr. Carman has muted himself.

22 MR. CARMAN: Thank you. I don't know why that
23 happened. I'm not sure where I left off.

24 So I guess -- so to me the recovery reinvestment line
25 item reads more like a flexible general fund was created and

1 it's not clear to me how jobs created by this line item would
2 be different from those jobs created by other investment line
3 items.

4 A few ideas to elaborate on this point. Consider
5 focusing on permanent jobs as opposed to temporary
6 construction jobs. I interpret the recovery reinvestment
7 line item as having similar intention as the workforce
8 training line item. I don't know if that's true or not. But
9 the workforce training line item is intended how I read it to
10 realize permanent jobs as opposed to temporary construction
11 jobs.

12 And one idea just throwing out there that the
13 Strategic Growth Council Transformative Climate Communities
14 Program, they've been working on establishing a framework for
15 community driven projects that are tied to economic
16 development metrics. You could consider providing clean
17 transportation focused funding that complements work under
18 that program.

19 So thank you for the time to comment.

20 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Jerome.

21 Our next speaker is Michael Pimentel. Asking him to
22 unmute now.

23 MR. PIMENTEL: All right. Can you folks see me and
24 hear me?

25 MR. KELLEY: Yes, sir.

1 MR. PIMENTEL: All right. Fantastic. Well, thank
2 you, all. Really do appreciate this opportunity to weigh in
3 on this investment plan. I'm Michael Pimentel, deputy
4 executive director of the California Transit Association.

5 And just want to acknowledge that California's
6 transit industry is making very steady progress to deploy
7 zero-emission buses. By the end of the year we anticipate
8 based on estimates from the California Air Resources Board
9 that about a tenth of buses in California will be zero
10 emission or based on zero-emission technology, either battery
11 electric or hydrogen fuel cell. We see this as a bright spot
12 in electrification nationwide.

13 But unfortunately, I think this is something that
14 should be a call to action for all on this call and
15 particularly for the CEC. Transit budgets are cratering,
16 needs to speak that fund -- there will be a funding shortfall
17 in this next fiscal year that exceeds \$3.1 billion and that's
18 comprised of lost fare revenue and declines in sales tax
19 revenue. This when coupled with the expected decline in HVIP
20 vouchers from California Resources Board, we believe will
21 have a chilling effect on our agency's ability to continue to
22 deploy zero-emission buses and may compromise our ability to
23 achieve the goals of the (indiscernible) transit rule.

24 I'll note that given the composition of public
25 transit ridership and particularly the composition of public

1 transit ridership from the pandemic, this will have some
2 fairly significant impacts on disadvantaged communities
3 across the state.

4 And so with this, I do want to just make a call for
5 the California Energy Commission to do everything you can to
6 expedite the release of dollars that they have currently in
7 the current fiscal year and then also to expedite the release
8 of dollars that would be made available through this year's
9 investment plan.

10 In particular, I think where there could be some
11 expedited movement is with securing granted administrative
12 for the release of make ready infrastructure incentives.
13 That's a process that began late last year. There have been
14 some conversations earlier this year about moving it forward.
15 Transit agencies are in dire need of increased funding to
16 offset what are lost revenues and monies here that can be
17 provided and support zero emission deployment would be hugely
18 appreciated.

19 Additionally, I think that there can be some
20 expediting in terms of planning grants. There have been
21 conversations at the CEC level about making those dollars
22 available. I think it would be a misstep to allow those
23 grants to move out on a solicitation basis. Rather, the CEC
24 should consider establishing a baseline level of funding that
25 transit agencies can take receipt of and very quickly use to

1 begin building out blueprint documents for their
2 electrification efforts.

3 For those of you who have tracked the innovative
4 transit rule throughout its development, you know that large
5 agencies are required to submit their rollout plans this
6 summer. The California Resources Board has provided some
7 relief to transit agencies that need to delay that submittal
8 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. But what we don't want to see
9 or what we don't want to have to ask for is some further
10 release for those small agencies that are required to submit
11 their plans by 2023. There's a way for the CEC to support
12 these small agencies in particular early by releasing those
13 grants and we would encourage you to do so.

14 And then very finally, with regards to the monies
15 that are set aside for recovery and restoration, there's
16 probably a way to devote those dollars to programs that are
17 in existence already and get those dollars out quickly rather
18 than standing up a new program that will require a lot of
19 staff time and a lot of time for engaging stakeholders in
20 order to be fully actualized.

21 So with that, we just call for expediting the release
22 of dollars wherever possible. And of course we'll provide
23 you with written comments going to much more detail that
24 specific program decisions that we as a California transit
25 industry would like to see.

1 So thank you.

2 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Michael.

3 Our next speaker is Robert Meyer.

4 MR. MEYER: Good morning, everybody. I assume that
5 you can hear me.

6 I just wanted to thank on behalf of ETP the Energy
7 Commission's efforts in the plan and the comments this
8 morning. Certainly the speakers as well related to minority
9 communities of Black Lives Matter.

10 We appreciate the effort to expand investment in
11 manufacturing and certainly the efforts of reemployment. We
12 do think, however, that additional support needs to be
13 provided for workforce development, in particular in training
14 for the transit agencies. This to support the long-term
15 investment in both the implementation of the technology but
16 also in the career paths available.

17 Relative to COVID, we've enacted a rapid reemployment
18 and retraining pilot targeting new jobs and reemployment for
19 industries that are identified as essential to reopen the
20 economy. Our program focuses primarily on food chain
21 manufacturing and healthcare. It can be adapted. We will
22 submit the details of this pilot as part of our written
23 comment.

24 It does offer an infusion mechanism for small
25 businesses hiring employees back. I think that we've

1 identified is the real key to helping the small businesses
2 and small manufacturers weather the storm, so to speak. It
3 was enacted as part of a larger response plan for COVID where
4 we've offered flexibilities in documentation in training
5 delivery, specifically enabling employers to retrain workers
6 and how they will be doing their jobs or how they will be
7 conducting businesses with idea of physical distance moving
8 forward. This includes additional -- the safety training
9 needed around that.

10 ETP continues to advance and advocate paid for
11 performance investment relative to workforce development
12 tying any investment and contributions to real jobs and
13 particularly real jobs in economically disadvantaged
14 communities. In addition, we believe that complementing our
15 ability to support private for profit business investments
16 (indiscernible) training, that we support training and
17 continue to invest in public transit and fleet adoption of
18 zero-emission vehicle technologies. This includes pre-
19 apprenticeship and apprenticeship-based training models as
20 well as a wide -- just an established investment in the
21 quality of jobs wherever possible. So what that work really
22 looks like.

23 And then lastly, based on a listening session with
24 minority business associations about a week and a half ago,
25 the real desire is for access to procurement, the supply

1 chain, increasing that wherever possible. So in any of the
2 investments we make recommendations for disadvantaged
3 communities committee, please consider that. I think that
4 that seems to be, you know, an echoed request at any point.
5 And I think it really is time.

6 So we'll submit written summary as comment. And
7 thank you very much for the opportunity to come here.

8 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Robert.

9 Our next speaker is Kevin Hamilton. Going to ask him
10 to unmute now.

11 MR. HAMILTON: Good morning. This is Kevin Hamilton,
12 director of Central California Asthma Collaborative in San
13 Joaquin Valley. Thank you for the opportunity today.

14 I do want to thank Commissioner Monahan for the
15 impassioned intro in recognizing the challenges that these
16 communities are facing and supporting Black Lives Matter and
17 the fact that this state along with the rest of the country
18 is experienced the impact -- continuing to experience the
19 impact of hundreds of years of environmental and other types
20 of racism.

21 In this plan -- in the new spending plan, when I look
22 at recovery and reinvestment, I have to say as others have
23 commented, it seems pretty nebulous at this point. And
24 \$10 million for one year is certainly not going to be
25 adequate for the communities that I just mentioned. In the

1 low income and communities of color in San Joaquin Valley
2 that are described in 1550, these folks are way behind
3 already, COVID-19 has put them even further behind so I would
4 advocate for at least two years of continued spending in that
5 category to kind of make sure that people's pathway is a
6 little smoother and they're not dropped off a cliff at some
7 point.

8 I am really thrilled to see the continued increasing
9 investment in zero-emission vehicle infrastructure in the
10 medium- and heavy-duty area. Again, from the air pollution
11 perspective that myself as a registered respiratory therapist
12 asthma clinical specialist to cease the impact of these
13 emissions on families in the San Joaquin other were -- in
14 other places in California on a regular basis, removing the
15 emissions from these trucks as quickly as possible is
16 absolutely paramount. And I really appreciate the
17 Commission's increased investment, as I mentioned, over the
18 next three years as being critical in putting that
19 infrastructure in place that the industry needs in order to
20 buy these vehicles and be sure that they'll be able to use
21 them in the duty cycles for which they're dedicated.

22 I also want to agree with very strongly this dual
23 investment in the light duty side. Again, we need to get
24 this infrastructure out into these smaller communities. I
25 would argue that in the larger cities, at least the ones that

1 I spend my time in Sacramento, the Bay Area, inner city of
2 Los Angeles, downtown and on the west side and south side of
3 L.A. Outside the south side of the city, but as you get
4 outside the city limits moving south into Southern California
5 further, there's a ton of infrastructure going in all over
6 the place. Obviously it's a sponge and it could suck up more
7 but we don't want to leave anybody behind in this.

8 And while we have -- and then we want to make sure
9 that infrastructure tries to move in lockstep with the cars.
10 So I talked about this in the last meeting and the need to
11 integrate these programs with other programs that are
12 providing the other part of the infrastructure which is the
13 vehicles, the actual things that are going to use this
14 infrastructure. So seeing that collaboration happen would be
15 rewarding and beneficial to these communities in ways that I
16 don't think folks often understand.

17 I know one community that's done really well at
18 getting a lot of electrical infrastructure on the ground.
19 Because the average income in that community is about \$27,000
20 a year, vehicles have been much more difficult. So how do we
21 align those two things and how can CEC help out with that I
22 think is really critical.

23 Yeah, I support also this diversion from the fuel
24 supply line and funding that tech. I think that is not the
25 future of California and we need to start thinking in terms

1 of zero-emission future.

2 And this workforce development I just will leave with
3 that. You know, because it's not actual capital expenses for
4 equipment and putting things in the ground, construction, you
5 know, it often gets the smaller amount of money. I really
6 want to suggest that that amount be at least doubled. When
7 you start training people, you really should start paying
8 them. And it doesn't have to initially be the union scale
9 wage which I completely support, by the way, prevailing wage
10 should stand in all of this work as it continues to do and
11 it's critical that that happen. But folks who are being
12 trained from these communities have no assets, have no
13 resources.

14 Somebody mentioned the prison reentry programs. The
15 same thing, these folks have no assets, have no resources.
16 So we need to make sure that these programs wrap services
17 around them and enough support that they can clothe and house
18 themselves and feed themselves during the course of this
19 training. And the last thing, of course, is that there's
20 actually a job to walk in there -- into when they get done
21 with it.

22 So I'll leave it at that. Thank you very much.

23 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Kevin.

24 Our next speaker is Russell Teall. Asking -- okay.

25 MR. TEALL: Thank you for this opportunity to

1 participate in the advisory panel. And thank you to staff
2 and for putting together this tremendous work for the
3 investment plan, especially considering it's a multiyear
4 budget proposal.

5 So my comments should be taken in light of the fact
6 that I think it's a very good plan. These are just
7 suggestions for improvement. As the Recreational Boater
8 representative on the advisory panel, there's no support for
9 recreational motors. And so I think that in terms of EV
10 infrastructure, in light of the fact that several OEMs are
11 going to come up with electric vehicle pickups in the next
12 year or so, that emphasis should be placed on marinas and
13 launch ramps, et cetera, in order to represent the people
14 that are funding this program.

15 Overall, my vision for this budget, it is all of the
16 above. Whatever technology works, we should employ. And
17 the -- my concern is that long-term health effects
18 improvements for electric vehicle infrastructure in terms of
19 heavy-duty and medium-duty vehicles, it is being promoted
20 over short-term health effects in disadvantaged communities.

21 I support Bill Magavern's approach that 50 percent of
22 the funding should be directed towards DACs or a low-income
23 communities, but the infrastructure program needs of the
24 biofuels should be recognized in terms of encouraging a
25 short-term health effects fix to those communities.

1 I was encouraged by Charles Russell's statement that
2 the shift of \$10 million out of the biofuel's budget would be
3 used as examples for federal matching funds. For instance, I
4 would just like to point out that there's a current proposal
5 by the USDA for \$100 million for a high blend infrastructure
6 investment programs that's due August 13th and will continue
7 in future years. That's for high-level ethanol blends which
8 majority of the pickup trucks built in the U.S. support or
9 are flexible fuel vehicles that are capable of E85 and B20 B
10 biodiesel 5 percent of blend for distributors. So I think
11 that the reduction in the budget from \$20 million to zero
12 dollars for biofuels is a mistake and should be used for
13 supporting an all of the above strategy.

14 For instance in the investment program proposal, it
15 cites a low of minus 230 for renewable natural gas.
16 Actually, it's a low of 630 for dairy biogas used to charge
17 EVs in the latest CARB listings of carbon intensity for the
18 different pathways. So there were three pathways by SMUD for
19 dairy biogas listed in December of 2019.

20 I think that there should be an emphasis, continued
21 emphasis on renewable sources of electricity for charging EVs
22 which has been present in prior solicitations and should
23 continue to be. I think a vehicle to grid enhances the
24 reliability and especially if we're moving to medium-duty to
25 heavy-duty electric vehicles, that should be included as

1 well.

2 I would like to support the comments by Mary Solecki
3 and Richard Schorske for leveraged, the matching fund-based
4 of one to one. It is no longer adequate in the efforts by
5 Tim Olson to leverage those funds for investors at 20 to 1,
6 30 to 1, 40 to 1, et cetera. It should be encouraged and is
7 a proper use of the funds.

8 I agree with Matt Gregori from Southern California
9 Edison that \$10 million is not enough and zero dollars for
10 biofuels is not enough.

11 I conclude with a question which is on page 66 of the
12 PDF for the investment program. It defines -- it mentions
13 near zero-emission vehicles. I question what a near zero-
14 emission vehicle is. Is it driven by carbon intensity
15 pathway or what is that?

16 And with that question, I thank you very much for the
17 ability to comment.

18 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Russell.

19 Our next speaker is Ruben Aronin. I'm going to ask
20 him to unmute now. Perfect.

21 MR. ARONIN: Thanks so much, everyone.

22 I really appreciate the leadership -- real leadership
23 Patty and the staff's work on this revised proposal and I'm
24 just going to echo some of the comments that have been stated
25 already.

1 I think in light of the COVID and social unrest that
2 we're seeing are continued commitment to invest in California
3 and our world's future in a ZEV marketplace that we'll make
4 sure that we can all breathe healthier air is critical. And
5 I want to reinforce the comments by Will and Kevin about
6 ensuring that we are addressing the disproportionate health
7 impacts on disadvantaged communities, especially African-
8 American communities throughout California. And Bill
9 Magavern's recommendation of 50 percent makes a lot of sense
10 in the light duty and on the heavy duty side, perhaps we
11 could go even further.

12 On the ability to invest these dollars effectively, I
13 would urge staff to take a look at some of the model zero-
14 emission mobility projects that LACI and others are piloting
15 in disadvantaged communities, pairing infrastructure
16 investments with projects that are going to be used and
17 needed in communities in the near term to make sure that
18 these aren't stranded assets I think are really -- is really
19 important to be looking at as well.

20 I want to also just recognize the important long-term
21 vision of this multiyear plan in light of next week's
22 consideration IARB of the actual for nearly 135 million in
23 the medium- and heavy-duty sector. And it occurs to me that
24 in addition to looking at Richard Schorske's comments and
25 others who have said how can we leverage on the CEC's

1 leverage private sector investments from the recovery and
2 reinvestment program, CEC should look at how it can do that
3 across the board with its investments.

4 And with regards to the recovery and reinvestment, I
5 just want to echo Eileen and other points. It would be
6 helpful to get a little more detail on the options or
7 opportunities. It does seem like a to-be-determined-later
8 program and so I think having more definition around what
9 that specifically looks like and particularly how that is
10 driving high road job creations as JB had identified, I think
11 would be useful. And how the CEC can qualify, quantify the
12 direct and indirect jobs that it is creating through its
13 investments I think is really important.

14 I also think in light of the COVID recession that
15 we're facing, you know, accelerating investments and being
16 willing to make bets with the best information at hand but
17 perhaps not with the perfect outcome but being able to look
18 at providing what worked best and what didn't in, you know,
19 outcomes will be a useful model.

20 As future state and potentially federal investments
21 look at job creation investment opportunities, I hope that
22 electric infrastructure is one of those programs that can be
23 modeled on CEC investments so we can get more dollars into
24 the space. Because certainly this program is significant but
25 wholly inadequate to address all of the challenges that the

1 state was facing even before the current COVID crisis faced
2 us.

3 So thanks for the opportunity to participate and
4 comment.

5 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Ruben.

6 I believe Charles Smith wanted to answer Russell --
7 Russell Teall's question. I'm going to hand the mic over to
8 him. Charles.

9 MR. SMITH: Yeah, thanks, Spencer.

10 So this is just a really quick question Russell asked
11 about definition of near zero-emission vehicles. Those refer
12 to vehicles that have extremely low criteria pollutant
13 emissions, they're not quite zero but they're much lower than
14 conventional engine now. And they -- and these are also
15 vehicles that incorporate very low carbon fuel, sometimes
16 negative carbon intensity fuel.

17 So they are -- they are not zero-emission vehicles in
18 the sense that they do have a tailpipe that gives off some
19 criteria emissions. But, yeah, I hope that helps.

20 MR. TEALL: It helps in part, but what is the
21 specific standard? Is it a 99 percent reduction? Is it a
22 particular carbon intensity under LCFS?

23 MR. SMITH: I'm afraid I don't know the technical
24 definition at the moment. Yeah, but that is a good question.

25 We can follow up with you individually, Russ, if

1 you'd like a little bit more clarification.

2 MR. TEALL: Great. Thank you.

3 MR. KELLEY: Okay. Our next speaker is Tracy
4 Stanhoff. I'm going to ask her to unmute now.

5 MS. STANHOFF: Hello, everybody. I just wanted to
6 say a couple of things on behalf of our community on these
7 three points.

8 One of them is somebody already said it. Procurement
9 is a huge issue in recovering on this COVID issue. We need
10 to really have some practical applications on how to
11 integrate businesses all the way from the smaller ones who
12 could use bite-sized portions of the contract all the way up
13 to our larger ones. And we do have several larger in our
14 minority business group and our group here in the American
15 Indian Chamber.

16 So we're looking for pragmatic solutions, not just
17 thoughts, not just technical support which is very important
18 but actual connections and relationship building to those who
19 are going to be building out this infrastructure for the
20 transportation -- transportation programs. So that needs to
21 be really I think more defined in these plans.

22 The other thing is we're very much engaged in
23 workforce development as secondary and very -- also very
24 important. And we believe every time we go into the energy
25 sector that these jobs are mainly in the bill belt and not in

1 the -- maybe in this instance it might be more in
2 maintenance. But training programs to get people integrated
3 into something like that.

4 And third, and I kind of sound like a broken record
5 at times, we need a lot more energy buildout in the rural
6 areas and on tribal lands for -- we don't have enough of that
7 right now and we cannot participate in these programs without
8 these -- these investments made and the infrastructure to
9 help our people.

10 So that's all I had to say and this is a great
11 discussion. Thank you.

12 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Tracy.

13 Our next speaker is Patricio Portillo -- Portillo.
14 Sorry.

15 MR. PORTILLO: It's okay. Always gets butchered.

16 So thank you. This is Patricio Portillo with the
17 Natural Resources Defense Counsel.

18 Thank you to Commissioner Monahan and CEC staff for
19 all your hard work on this excellent investment plan.

20 A lot of people have already raised the points I
21 wanted to make so I'm just going to reinforce a few comments.

22 Bill Magavern's comment about the importance of
23 prioritizing spending in disadvantaged communities and
24 allocating at least 50 percent of funds there I think is a
25 great idea.

1 I agree with Jimmy O'Dea about the need to get this
2 one out the door faster so they could have a material effect
3 as soon as possible. It would really be helpful to see how
4 quickly CEC can do this in a streamlined way.

5 It was also talked about fully exploring how
6 additional objectives can be met with this money to maximum
7 this impact. So using CEC funds to solicit private sector
8 matching is crucial, particularly if overall state spending
9 contracts due to this economic downturn.

10 We also talked last time, I believe, about using CEC
11 infrastructure spending to create a carrot to get local
12 jurisdictions to adopt permit streamlining. And this remains
13 critical.

14 And then finally I just wanted to say that I strongly
15 agree with what JB Tengco said regarding high-quality jobs.
16 It's great to see that CEC is focusing on creating not just
17 any jobs but high-quality jobs. And this is vital. In order
18 to make sure that the CEC spending actually results in a
19 durable economic recovery, we need to ensure that the jobs
20 created and provide family sustaining wages, a safe work
21 environment, comprehensive benefits, and career paths for
22 California's workers.

23 And so with that, you know, thank you for this
24 opportunity to share some thoughts.

25 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Patricio.

1 Our next speaker is Katherine Garcia. I'm going to
2 ask her to unmute now.

3 MS. GARCIA: Hi. Good morning.

4 MR. KELLEY: Good morning.

5 MS. GARCIA: This is Katherine Garcia. This is
6 Katherine Garcia with Sierra Club California. Thank you for
7 CEC and Commissioner Monahan for framing our discussion.

8 I want to commend the CEC for pivoting to a focus of
9 economic development and equity. It's hard to believe how
10 much the world has changed since March when we were all
11 together discussing this investment plan and having, I think
12 our first Advisory Committee meeting. And you know the world
13 has just changed so much since March. And particularly today
14 on Juneteenth, I think it's really important that we have
15 this focus on equity.

16 I want to reiterate and just underscore Bill
17 Magavern's Point about investing in disadvantaged
18 communities. As we've seen communities of color
19 disproportionately affected by COVID, and this is one of the
20 reasons why I want to highlight this point of pivoting
21 towards equity.

22 I wanted to mention that the Sierra Club has put
23 together a report that's in response to the economic impact
24 of COVID and ways to direct stimulus money during this
25 particular time through pivotal important investments. The

1 report, and I will highlight this report in my written
2 comments, but it is called Millions of Good Jobs, a Plan for
3 Economic Renewal. And in this report, it talks about what
4 types of investments will have the most return for important
5 communities in light of the economic situation that we're in.

6 So there -- it goes through the types of national
7 jobs that can be gained from investing in clean public
8 transit, investing in school buses. These are nationwide
9 numbers but just for example, making EVs more affordable can
10 create 635,000 jobs nationwide. So I think this is a good
11 way of looking at economic renewal. And I wanted to
12 highlight the importance of in this new update the
13 infrastructure jobs, focus on infrastructure jobs especially
14 zero emission, light-duty charging equipment.

15 You know, right now we do have our goal of 250,000
16 chargers by 2025. We don't want to lose momentum for that
17 goal so prioritizing light-duty is very important. I want to
18 thank Ruben Aronin for mentioning the Advanced Clean Trucks
19 Rule that would be considered by CARB next week. And in
20 regards to the heavy-duty infrastructure investments later
21 down the line, I think the success of the ACT rule will
22 really hinge on having heavy-duty infrastructure and so I
23 want to underscore that that is a very important investment.

24 And finally, in terms of manufacturing jobs, just
25 recently the CEC hosted an IEPR workshop focused on light-

1 duty. And a really great speaker named Judy Kruger from the
2 L.A. County Economic Development Corporation had an excellent
3 presentation talking about the manufacturing jobs. I was
4 really impressed with the information that she shared and
5 just wanted to highlight for folks that missed that
6 particular workshop, you know, no other state, other than
7 California, has a clean transportation ecosystem like we have
8 here. So really investing in manufacturing jobs here is
9 super important and key to economic recovery.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Katherine.

12 Our next speaker is Larry Engelbrecht. Let me ask to
13 unmute him now. Perfect.

14 Mr. ENGELBRECHT: Hello. Can everybody hear me?

15 MR. KELLEY: Yes sir.

16 MR. ENGELBRECHT: Okay. Hi. Okay. Larry
17 Engelbrecht, Educational Consultant. I am going to be
18 addressing the Discussion Question Number 2, especially the
19 part that says to create jobs quickly.

20 Regarding the report on page 63, the third paragraph
21 from the bottom, second sentence that says: A next step will
22 be to strategically evaluate innovations in training that can
23 lead to higher wages through automotive service excellence,
24 ASE, certifications for automotive and truck zero-emission
25 vehicle technologies at the high school.

1 These should be added through the college level.
2 Because that is -- really, the pathway starts from high
3 school and continues through college.

4 Regarding automotive and truck technician job
5 postings. I haven't seen any that ask for certificates or
6 even degrees, but they overwhelmingly specify ASE
7 certification. So the pathway continuing from high school
8 through the community college, without unnecessary
9 duplication of instruction at the community college level,
10 and class scheduling to encourage the working person to come
11 back and continue their program, is critical to program
12 completer success.

13 Per the technician certification tables and chart on
14 my March 23rd comment that was filed, it's called Funding ASE
15 Programs are Critical Need. The chart over there shows that
16 Advance Level Professional Technician certification for L3,
17 which is hybrid training, can be reduced from three years to
18 as little as one year. And the ASE accreditation to the
19 program is really key to that. I posted these things if you
20 look at my LinkedIn posts. And I will comment some more of
21 this in an upcoming comment I will file.

22 I have three recommendations to go in this direction.
23 Number one is support ZEV technology funding through high
24 school and community college auto and truck programs that are
25 currently ASE accredited.

1 My second item, a recommendation, is to support ZEV
2 technology funding training to high schools and community
3 colleges that demonstrate the commitment to have their auto
4 or truck programs ASE accredited to see what kind of support
5 we can provide to them.

6 And the third item is to support updates in community
7 college auto and truck curriculums to optimize the pathways
8 from the high school ASE accredited auto and truck programs.

9 If we talk about workforce development, we have to --
10 we have to include the discussion about ASE accreditation for
11 the program so that the students can become ASE certified. I
12 did take a look at the, some of the -- one of the
13 apprenticeship programs. Apparently, apprenticeship programs
14 for automotive technicians seems to be popular in Northern
15 California. I'm from San Diego. In Southern California, I
16 hardly ever hear about this, about apprenticeship programs.

17 But I did look at one that said mobile mechanic up in
18 Northern California. And when I looked at the pay steps and
19 the training hours and the various levels of promotion, they
20 really fall far short of what a technician trained through
21 ASE accredited high school and community college programs
22 could earn, as little as half the earnings. So the -- if
23 any -- there are any proposed apprenticeship programs, I
24 would like the opportunity to review the competencies and
25 task lists. And we may find that they may parallel with the

1 programs that are currently -- standards that are -- have
2 already been currently established for the high school and
3 community college auto and truck programs.

4 That is all.

5 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Larry. Our next speaker is
6 Bill Elrick.

7 Mr. ELRICK: Great, thank you. I think I want to
8 start just recognizing all the great comments and supporting
9 most everything I've heard so far from the panelists,
10 especially around the job creation and the focus on those
11 most impacted areas.

12 And to that, we should really applaud what the
13 program already had within it. You know, CTP was already
14 very business motivated and starting to make some shifts
15 towards the right policy environment and market signals,
16 including some of the recent GFOs that are appropriately
17 encouraging greater private investment to scale up and create
18 these as sustainable marketplaces and that put us on that
19 pathway towards the end of public subsidies.

20 And so as the -- the report and the previous workshop
21 demonstrated and highlighted how far we are behind many of
22 our goals and objectives, especially the state's 5 million
23 ZEV objective and the 250,000 charger and 200 hydrogen
24 station targets that go with it, really clearly stating we
25 need to do so much more and that we need every ZEV we can get

1 to really all of these technologies, and we need them as
2 quick as possible.

3 And to that, you know, the program already is -- is
4 exciting and dramatic in many ways on how it's aggressively
5 and appropriately aiming for success in these. And I'll
6 specifically point out to the battery ZEV market approaches
7 by the Commission. First and foremost, frontloading the
8 infrastructure investments to accelerate the consumer
9 adoption, you know. that's where we really need to pick up
10 more and see even more of that, as was noted by others.
11 These are local jobs. To the very point of this versus the
12 last workshop, we need these local jobs more than ever.

13 But we're also seeing or have seen the funding of
14 NREL to create the EVI-Pro tool that identifies those rollout
15 gaps towards those targets, and even the Bloomberg analysis
16 on better understanding the needs and opportunities. You
17 know, these really are comprehensive, they're well thought
18 out, they're aiming for success. And they're the kind of
19 things that will help us build this into a successful
20 sustainable ZEV market that's going to achieve our
21 environmental goals, as well as expand on California's
22 leadership and leverage the economic opportunities these
23 technologies can bring and that we really need now more than
24 ever. And move us, again towards requiring unending public
25 subsidies.

1 My primary request and comment to all of this is to
2 see something similar in approach, in energy and commitment
3 across the ZEV technologies, and specifically for hydrogen
4 and fuel cells. And I'll give three very important reasons
5 around these opportunities.

6 First, the last investment plan and CEC analysis
7 highlighted that despite being the last technology to the
8 commercial market, you know, the CEC investment so far in
9 hydrogen and fuel cell vehicles have already demonstrated the
10 greatest air quality reductions and petroleum displacement
11 progress of all the ZEV technologies.

12 Second, numerous reports are coming out from around
13 the globe showing that green hydrogen and fuel cell vehicles
14 not only can achieve price parity with conventional fuels
15 this decade, they're doing so through an understood and sound
16 business case that can create economic opportunities. The
17 ones we need now and really are focused on today, and gives
18 us an exit strategy from government subsidies.

19 That 200-station goal for hydrogen is crucial part of
20 reaching that parity. And the most recent CEC-funded
21 stations that are opening up are already demonstrating that
22 success and getting closer to that parity. So having the CTP
23 aim solidly and confidently behind the 200-station target, as
24 well as the 1,000-station target that supports the 5 million
25 ZEV goal, is absolutely crucial.

1 And then finally, the public hydrogen stations that
2 are being created through this program are accessible to all
3 California citizens. You know, they're enabling ZEV
4 opportunities in every one of our communities. And the
5 hydrogen fueling infrastructure development is enabling a
6 just transition for the small business fuel retailers into a
7 ZEV market. You know, they can go and do this themselves.

8 So I think we've heard a lot of great feedback. I
9 want to thank the Commissioner and staff and everyone working
10 on this program. It's -- it's well done. It's the right
11 direction. We need to now apply that commitment and
12 dedication across the technologies and accelerate the
13 activities to address both our environmental and our economic
14 objectives.

15 So I'll pause there because most everything else
16 we've -- we've heard. So thank you.

17 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Bill.

18 That was the last person with their hand raised. Is
19 there any other comments from any of the panelists?

20 MR. ECKERLE: Hi, this is Tyson. Can you hear me?

21 MR. KELLEY: Yes, sir.

22 MR. ECKERLE: That's good. Great, thank you. So yeah, I'll
23 jump in here.

24 So I wanted to go over a number of points, but Patricio
25 brought up the permit streamlining thing and I just wanted to

1 point out that is working really well. With CALeVIP having
2 that as one of their criteria, we've been able to really
3 reach into those communities that are looking to get charging
4 stations going. And we have a lot of work to do but, yeah,
5 thanks for keeping focus on that.

6 The second one, you know, the private capital we
7 agree with wholeheartedly, especially as you look in
8 these -- these challenging budget times. We'll probably have
9 a challenged budget in the state for a while and, you know,
10 this program puts more pressure on it of course. But the --
11 getting additional leverage out of that, and we're eager to
12 partner with the Energy Commission on that from the GO-Biz
13 perspective. I think CALeVIP is doing a really great job of
14 bringing in more private capital. The hydrogen program is as
15 well, and so it's very exciting to see those developments.

16 I wanted to also throw out, you know, a couple other
17 thoughts. One on equity, in terms of, you know, I agree we
18 need to focus in and get as much access as possible. One
19 idea that came in recently that I just want to throw out for
20 the group is, you know, one that I feel like may be helpful.

21 But you know, as we're looking into growing the
22 second end ZEV market and getting, you know, electric
23 vehicles into the hands of -- of, you know, economically
24 disadvantaged areas. I think one of the areas that we might
25 want to focus in on more is workplace charging in places

1 where those communities might work. I think we need to get
2 better data, and we're working on that, you know, with all
3 the charging companies.

4 But it seems workplace charging seems to be going
5 really well in, you know, like the Silicon Valley-type of
6 places of the world. But as far as the other places that
7 people work, there might be room for focus there and that can
8 help open up that market, especially in the areas where it's
9 difficult to get multifamily charging in. And then, you
10 know, if we're relying on DC fast charging, of course that
11 means that those consumers are paying more for electricity.
12 We want to try to avoid that.

13 I think on the workforce stuff, I think the focus is
14 great and we really need to focus in, you know, on those
15 communities and most in need. And so I'm not quite sure how
16 to do that but I know there's a lot of experts there. But I
17 think leveraging what the Energy Commission has and some of
18 the ideas that came up already.

19 And then the last thing, I just kind of, I should
20 just jump on what Bill said, you know in terms of hydrogen.
21 And I think really using the plan to help strengthen that
22 200-station goal. I think we're starting to see private
23 investment coming in in a big way, you know, both here and
24 then internationally. But really with a focus in on
25 California, as California is the place to prove up the

1 concept and the idea that cost parity is on the horizon. You
2 know, really the vision associated with hydrogen fuel cells
3 is one of equity and access, as Bill talked about. And so I
4 think that's, we just wanted to reinforce that.

5 And thank you, and also before I forget, thank you
6 Commissioner Monahan for your -- the way you started the
7 meeting. I think that was really, really well done. So and
8 thanks to Energy Commission for all your leadership on this.
9 This is -- this is a very solid plan.

10 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Tyson.

11 Our next speaker is Heidi Sickler. I'm going to ask
12 to unmute you now. Perfect.

13 MS. SICKLER: Great, thank you. Good morning,
14 Commissioner Monahan and Advisory Committee members. And
15 thank you, again, for your leadership during these
16 challenging times, Commissioner. Thanks to you and your
17 staff for your work on the investment plan and for ensuring
18 that zero-emission transport investments support communities
19 hardest hit by COVID-19 and climate change.

20 I want to talk a little bit about a proposal that has
21 been put forth through the Governor's Economic Recovery Task
22 Force, specifically the Climate Reality Subcommittee. And
23 it's very much focused on supporting California's efforts to
24 creatively finance deployment of medium- and heavy-duty
25 vehicles. So as we know on a national basis, trucks and

1 buses make up 10 percent of all vehicles, but they are
2 contributing to nearly 30 percent of total carbon emissions
3 in the transport sector. And they operate near ports and
4 heavily populated areas. Specifically, a lot of underserved
5 communities.

6 So most of you may have seen earlier this week the
7 EDF released a report on the economic impacts of CARB's
8 proposed ACT rule. And they're recommending that
9 policymakers take a look at developing new financing options
10 to counterbalance the upfront cost difference and encourage
11 broad uptake, particularly for small businesses without
12 access to attractive financing terms.

13 So to help address California's current severe fiscal
14 barriers to ZEV deployment, as we saw in the May revised
15 budget, the Climate Reality Subcommittee of the governor's
16 Economic Recovery Task Force has recommended that Low Carbon
17 Fuel Standard Commercial -- an LCSF Commercial Fleet Loan
18 Program, which the leadership group strongly supports. It's
19 an innovative financing mechanism to support the adoption of
20 commercial zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles.
21 And the Governor's Office has expressed an interest in this
22 creative financing solution. We're coordinating with
23 CALSTART and NRDC on developing three financing options.

24 So one recommendation, which we respectfully submit
25 for your recommendation, for your consideration,

1 Commissioner, and to the staff is it -- within the recovery
2 and reinvestment funding category would be to provide some
3 level of seed funding for this innovative financing mechanism
4 that the investment bank might develop.

5 The purpose of the program would be to solve the
6 upfront capital challenge that is hindering adoption of
7 commercial zero-emission buses and trucks. And it envisions
8 reducing these barriers by facilitating loans for ZEV fleet
9 owner purchases by helping fleets leverage the stream of LCFS
10 credits they receive when using electricity or hydrogen as a
11 replacement fuel for diesel.

12 So depending on the initial seed funding available,
13 the leadership group CALSTART, NRDC, and hopefully the Dan
14 Adler in GO-Biz, he's the -- he's the Governor's climate
15 finance advisor, we propose three potential options.

16 So one, a fully public loan program with sufficient seed
17 funding run by the iBank, a loan or loss reserve program to
18 encourage increased private lending to commercial fleets with
19 smaller seed funding, or a hybrid approach that combines both
20 1 or 2. So again, this is because the challenge today for
21 fleets is, they generally lack a means to monetize future
22 streams of value, and this would bring it up front.

23 So looking forward for opportunities to discuss this
24 proposal with you further. And thank you for the opportunity
25 to provide comment.

1 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Heidi.

2 MS. SICKLER: Uh-huh.

3 MR. KELLEY: Our next speaker is Sandy Naranjo.

4 Sorry, again.

5 MS. NARANJO: Hi. Good morning. Can you all hear
6 me? Okay.

7 MR. KELLEY: Yes.

8 MS. NARANJO: Thank you. So good morning, everyone.
9 I really want to thank Commissioner Monahan for your comments
10 in recognizing Juneteenth and for the California Energy
11 Commission in drafting a plan that is, you know, reflecting
12 the current global crisis that we're in and how we're moving
13 forward.

14 I really want to uplift, you know, the Harvard study
15 that was published in April that found the person living
16 decades in a county with high levels of fine particulate
17 matter is 8 percent more likely to die from coronavirus in a
18 region with one unit less of fine particulate pollution. So
19 as we see this investment plan, as we're talking about
20 protecting the environment, but also to talking about
21 protecting the public health and really uplifting good
22 quality jobs because we -- as we see these areas that are
23 disadvantage in the CalEnviroScreen, these are also the areas
24 that are having high levels of unemployment.

25 And so what I'd really like to see is, what is the

1 guiding criteria that were setting in these funds if we're
2 talking about investing in disadvantaged that we're seeing
3 impact? So one, I would like to see in consideration of
4 matching the funds with the AB 617, that we have the AB 617
5 funded areas so we can ensure that we're really uplifting
6 these communities. And also, too, pivoting into funding that
7 will have deeper impacts so seeing the longer term of medium
8 and heavy duty because we see those impacts in our
9 Environmental Justice Communities.

10 And thank you.

11 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Sandy.

12 Our next speaker is Alfred Artis. Let me, there.

13 Oops. Where is he? Okay, Alfred.

14 MR. ARTIS: Hello there. Oh, there.

15 Thank you, Commissioner Monahan and staff for having
16 us. We really appreciate the chance to comment on this
17 report.

18 A lot of what I would like to say has already been
19 said so I'd just like to echo some of what Eileen had to say
20 about charging infrastructure investments.

21 We need to -- we would appreciate it if the CEC could ensure
22 that charging infrastructure investments for light-duty
23 vehicles, ensure that consumers receive the lowest low-cost
24 fueling. One of the major advantages of electric vehicles
25 for consumers is the potential for lower fueling costs. And

1 electric vehicles will only benefit consumers if the fuel
2 that powers them is at the lowest possible cost. This is
3 especially important for consumers who live in multifamily
4 dwellings.

5 We also support the use of funds for recovery and
6 reinvestment and we welcome more information about how those
7 funds might be allocated. We agree with others who suggested
8 that recovery funds should be spent in low-income and
9 disadvantaged communities. And otherwise, we just are very
10 grateful for the chance to comment on this process.

11 Thank you for your time.

12 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Alfred. We had one panelist
13 raise her hand -- raise his hand earlier.

14 Rey Leon, I was wondering if you still had a comment?

15 MR. LEON: Yeah. You know, I raised it when I was on
16 my phone and then I jumped into my laptop and I was waiting
17 and luckily, I got some help and you realized it. So I'm
18 amazed.

19 MR. KELLEY: Yes. Sorry, Rey.

20 MR. LEON: But anyhow, so definitely first and
21 foremost, let me just say Black Lives Matter and happy
22 Juneteenth.

23 You know, here in the -- on the west side of the
24 valley there's -- there's -- we're very heavily impacted and
25 we still are by the drought. Of course -- of course COVID-19

1 has just made it way worse. Also during the seasons when our
2 farm workers come in, you know, you still see that there's
3 buses and there's vans, and really there's no physical
4 distancing taking place. And therefore I think that's also
5 why you have a lot of, kind of some spikes in infections.
6 In Huron right now we have 51 infections. That's for a
7 community of the size of about 7200 people. We're faring a
8 little better than other similar sized communities in our
9 county. But -- but it's, you know, we're being hit hard
10 nonetheless. You know, with the small businesses already
11 having to deal with a -- with a slow economy, you know.

12 And before I continue, let me say that in support of
13 Bill Magavern's proposal recommendation of 50 percent of the
14 funds be invested in DACs. And I think they must -- got to
15 figure out how to do it to where not just the big cities like
16 L.A., or San Diego, or whatever, you know, get -- get it all,
17 you know. And that's kind of what I've observed within the
18 other agencies. You know, some of the CalEPA BDOs and that's
19 always concerning, you know, because there's also small
20 communities like Huron that are even smaller than Fresno.
21 You know, it seems like there is three different tiers of the
22 sizes of cities, so we got to be pensive in terms of how we
23 distribute the resources as well to lift all votes, you know.

24 And I would add further that at least to give 25
25 percent of those resources be invested to impact DACs

1 indirectly. A lot of our folks from our communities really
2 don't work within our communities. They have to commute
3 to - - other areas and so that being one, you know, that
4 those resources be able to, as mentioned earlier, be able to
5 also employ folks. And maybe the expansion of EV
6 infrastructures so that when we get these folks who have
7 electric vehicles, then they can plug in when they get to
8 where they got to go.

9 You know, we have farm workers in our community
10 because farmland is becoming less -- less available to the
11 low-intensive labor of production of orchards. You know,
12 they have to commute out an hour, two hours, three hours, you
13 know, to the coast. I've heard also to the Sacramento area.
14 And it's -- it's, you know, it's been a toll. And that means
15 the local economy is being hit, you know. They're not coming
16 home to, you know, buy their groceries, or fill up their tank
17 or whatever it is. Which filling up the tank in the future
18 will be just plugging in, right?

19 But so the other thing is that I want to make sure to
20 mention is, you know, remembering to not get stuck in the
21 sidles. You know, there's a lot of money out there. You
22 know, what I've been noticing here on the west side of the
23 valley is that there's -- one good thing is that land that
24 has been put out for production that is high on salinity
25 levels has been developed, a good part of it, with solar

1 farms, which is good because you can't do anything else on
2 it.

3 You know, but what I've also been seeing is that some
4 of the prime and subprime farmlands have been -- have been
5 getting solar farms as well. And in my calculations, over
6 1,000 acres of prime or even subprime farmland takes out 250
7 jobs from the local economy. And the impact of that in the
8 20-year lifespan of the solar panels is -- is over a
9 \$100 million dollars. When you calculate how much they're
10 making per kilowatt hour or however they calculate it, it's
11 more like over \$800 million dollars.

12 So I'm thinking, so I think there's money out there
13 and I think that it's just got to be reconfigured, you know.
14 There's got to be a replacement in terms of priorities. And
15 farmworkers have been essential workers and it's not just all
16 of a sudden. But now we we've learned that terminology and I
17 would say farmworkers are more than essential workers. There
18 are a lot of the cities that -- that house them that are
19 their residencies, like Huron, are essential communities.
20 And the local economies are being hit really hard. So how do
21 we use this opportunity to -- to counter that? You know,
22 especially during the COVID-19 which is just making it that
23 much worse?

24 And so, you know, just in -- behind me you see a
25 picture of a Chevy boat and that, behind that there's a shop.

1 That's where we have the Green Raiteros, an electrical
2 ridesharing program, where we get farmworker families to
3 their medical, nonemergency medical appointments and other
4 service appointments. But, you know, we need more of that.
5 We need more of that.

6 We need, you know, we have -- I mentioned last time,
7 about 24 electric vehicle chargers in the community. But
8 still the residents, we probably have between the nonprofit,
9 and the city, and the public, we probably have six, seven
10 electric vehicles. So with that, and that's us going out
11 there and providing awareness on the Clean Vehicle Rebate
12 programs out there. But it's just, apparently,
13 it's -- there's more that needs to be done. More investment
14 needs to be put on the table to help families get their --
15 their electric vehicles. And so still a lot of work to be
16 done.

17 So, you know, helping the folks get their electric
18 vehicles, especially in the rural areas because they're
19 geographically isolated. And sometimes that's challenging
20 because these same communities are linguistically isolated.
21 So it takes organizations kind of like our own, LEAP
22 Institute, to be able to engage them in the language they
23 understand.

24 And also with the rideshare programs, empowering them
25 to make sure that there's access to where folks need to get

1 to. And I'm not talking about trying to get to the casinos
2 or anything, I'm talking about getting to places where folks
3 really need to get to for their health, for their economic
4 advancement, for their educational advancement.

5 And also just the public transit. You know, making
6 sure that in the urban areas that there's a very substantive
7 public transit that's electric and could help the folks
8 within the urban core do the same. Get to where they got to
9 get to, areas of importance.

10 But that's it for now. Thank you, folks.

11 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Rey.

12 I don't see anyone else with their hands up. Is
13 there any more comments?

14 MR. LEON: I just want to say, Patricia you still
15 haven't checked out our Green Raiteros shop out here in Huron
16 corridor. Everybody's welcome.

17 COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: Yeah. As soon as --

18 MR. LEON: (Indiscernible.)

19 COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: As soon as social distancing
20 ends, I'm there, Rey.

21 MR. KELLEY: Okay. I don't --

22 COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: But we -- oh, go ahead then.

23 MR. KELLEY: Oh, I was just going to say I don't see
24 any further comments and I was going to turn it over to
25 Patrick, but Patty if you want to talk, go ahead.

1 MR. BRECHT: Yes, sure.

2 COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: Well first I want to say
3 thanks to everybody who joined, and we recognize, you know,
4 this is not an ideal way to have a discussion. And I have
5 these dreams, oh we could have Zoom breakout rooms so we can
6 have more of a discussion and there would be more question
7 and answer and more, you know, engagement.

8 And the best -- because of our -- we have to make
9 sure that our meetings are accessible to the public, and it
10 was just impossible to do it. So I just want to thank
11 everybody. I mean, it's hard. I think we all know,
12 probably, if you're like me, getting a little tired of Zoom,
13 even though I think there's a lot it can do and, you know,
14 it's really lucky that we're able to work remotely. I mean,
15 that is these days just, you know, not so easy for many
16 folks. And we can socially distance, remain safe, and still
17 engage and still hear your comments and reactions to our
18 advisory -- I mean, to our investment plan.

19 And I just want to say that we are listening to you.
20 I've been taking notes and we'll -- we'll have a thoughtful
21 processing after this of all the comments that we've received
22 today verbally, but also just strongly encourage you to
23 submit comments in writing if you feel like you were not able
24 to communicate what you want to communicate, there just isn't
25 time. Please do submit comments in writing.

1 And we want to get to the finish line on this
2 investment plan and bring it to our business meeting in
3 August because, you know, it's -- there's always a tension
4 between trying to get it perfect and just getting it out on
5 the street. So I think, you know, we want to -- we want to
6 get it out on the street and make it as good as possible,
7 recognizing there are many uncertainties that we're wrestling
8 with.

9 We had originally thought of having a lightning round
10 where everybody can say --

11 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can you hear me?

12 COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: We -- we can hear you. Who's
13 that speaking?

14 Well anyway, we had originally talked about having a
15 lightning round but there, I -- let me check on our time.
16 Well I guess we do have -- we do have time for a lightning
17 round. We also considered this idea of responding to some of
18 the questions that are coming up but we haven't, you know, I
19 think at this point for the staff who've really been working
20 hard just to get on to this call, it's a lot to ask them,
21 then, to respond to questions that they may not be able to
22 all answer on the spot.

23 But Patrick, I, you know, our original thinking was
24 to have a lightning round of just one-minute final comments.
25 I think we could -- we could try, and I would ask folks if

1 you want to do just one minute, a final comment. I think we
2 should still use the hand raise function instead of calling
3 on people just in case you've stepped away from your
4 computer. And it'll just be, I think move more smoothly and
5 quickly if you are able to raise your hand.

6 But it -- our thinking was one minute where you just
7 focus on very, you know, if you haven't gotten something that
8 communicated that you wanted to or maybe the one thing you
9 would say of all the recommendations, here's the one that is
10 most important to me. That, I think, would be a helpful way
11 to move forward. So just final remarks. One minute, and
12 then we're going to move to public comment.

13 MR. KELLEY: Okay. We have three people that have --
14 three speakers that have raised their hands.
15 The first is Russell Teall. Has to unmute.

16 MR. TEALL: Your -- your question for the lightning
17 round is different from your first meeting where we were
18 asked to rate our position in the family.
19 So I think the overall strategy of the CEC should be all the
20 above. And placing all your eggs in one basket is a recipe
21 for uncertainty. You should spread the money around,
22 somewhat, to the biofuels.

23 In terms of solving all the problems of disadvantaged
24 communities, that's the shortest route to mitigating health
25 effects from heavy-duty trucks is to fund infrastructure and

1 distribution for biofuels in the disadvantaged communities
2 and low-income communities.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Russell.

5 Our next speaker is Jerome.

6 MR. CARMAN: Hi. Thank you. Actually, I wanted to
7 propose if we do have time proposing a question to CEC staff.
8 Someone had raised earlier the -- being interested in hearing
9 what your thoughts or intentions were around the recovery and
10 reinvestment line item. And my opinion, it being wrote
11 somewhat vague, that might have been the intention being a
12 bit vague. I think it would be, I'd be interested to hear
13 what your thoughts, or getting -- elaborating on your
14 thoughts around that.

15 MR. KELLEY: Okay. Our next speaker is Bill
16 Magavern.

17 MR. MAGAVERN: Yeah, Bill Magavern with Coalition for
18 Clean Air.

19 And first, I want to thank all the committee members
20 who supported the proposal that at least 50 percent of the
21 funds be invested in disadvantage and low-income communities
22 as defined by AB 1550. I'm sure that that really came across
23 to CEC as something that -- that really should be
24 incorporated into the plan.

25 And then secondly, I wanted to propose one other way

1 where I think we could raise the bar, which is on renewable
2 hydrogen which is discussed on page 49. I would recommend
3 that CEC set a goal of raising the renewable portion of
4 hydrogen fuel in the state to 100 percent by 2030 and to have
5 the plan try to get us to that goal.

6 And within the renewable hydrogen category, I think
7 there should be an emphasis on ramping up green electrolytic
8 hydrogen from renewable electricity as discussed in the plan
9 which can -- can actually help with the grid and smoothing
10 out the infamous duck curve. Thanks.

11 MR. KELLEY: Okay. Our next speaker is William
12 Barrett.

13 MR. BARRETT: Hi. Thank you. Will Barrett with the
14 American lung Association.

15 And just a final thought. We know that the plan is
16 angling towards increasing the deployment of zero-emission
17 technologies. We know how critical that is to meeting our
18 clean air and climate standards. But also, I just wanted to
19 call attention to a line in the document that really, I
20 think, is important as well. And I appreciate seeing it in
21 there that the Commission is going to continue looking at
22 ways to integrate infrastructure and -- and e-Mobility
23 choices with sustainable community strategies that are being
24 put forward to help build healthier communities, reduce
25 vehicle miles traveled, and -- and really take a

1 comprehensive look at cleaning up the transportation sector
2 in ways that allow California to grow healthier and more
3 sustainable going forward.

4 So I just wanted to flag the fact that that's in
5 there. I appreciated seeing the emphasis on the sustainable
6 community strategies as a critical public health and climate
7 tool.

8 So thank you very much.

9 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Bill.

10 Our next speaker is Casey Gallagher.

11 MR. GALLAGHER: Thank you again, and thanks everyone
12 for this great conversation.

13 Kind of to echoing Jerome's point on -- I would like
14 to know more about the recovery and reinvestment funds and
15 what is kind of the vision of the CEC in this and according
16 to this plan. As well as how will align and complement other
17 funds being based on recovery and reinvestment within this
18 pandemic and these issues, similar to what Robert Meyer from
19 ETP mentioned was -- was the run -- the running the COVID
20 pilot program on retraining and as well as folks entering a
21 certain job market.

22 Just curious about that and also what standards can
23 be set if their method to implant. Because as many folks
24 have mentioned, even prior to the -- to the pandemic, a lot
25 of communities are hurting. A lot of low-income and

1 communities of color, and the pandemic just heightened a lot
2 of income inequality and other forms of exclusion. And
3 focusing on what we need to do along equity to actually lift
4 up both social, economic, and environmental injustice.

5 Thank you.

6 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Casey.

7 Next speaker is Ruben Aronin.

8 MR. ARONIN: Hi. Thanks for a second bite at the
9 apple, Commissioner Monahan.

10 I'm just going to echo and reinforce that this is
11 really a jobs investment program. And so teasing out the
12 direct job benefits from the investments as well as capturing
13 the accelerated electric vehicle marketplace that will also
14 create domestic manufacturing jobs and other service jobs is
15 really important to capture in -- in promoting this and
16 making sure.

17 And I can never agree on just one thing. The
18 investments in both our traditional DAC communities, but as
19 Kevin Hamilton and others have pointed out, making sure that
20 all of our communities in California are touched by
21 investments in rural California, particularly as we look to
22 accelerating towards 100 percent zero-emission vehicles in
23 light and heavy duty. We need to make sure that the
24 infrastructure to support that begins to percolate all of our
25 communities as quickly as possible.

1 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Ruben.

2 Our next speaker is Jose Lopez.

3 MR. LOPEZ: Hi, can everybody hear?

4 MR. KELLEY: Yes.

5 MR. LOPEZ: Excellent. Well I just want to thank
6 Commissioner Monahan for the very thoughtful calm opening
7 this morning and thank you CEC staff and all the rest of the
8 committee members.

9 I want to just emphasize the need to clarify and just
10 get more clarity on the recovery and reinvestment funded
11 activity, as others have already mentioned. That will be
12 great.

13 And also would like to echo what Bill Magavern has
14 already mentioned and others. (Indiscernible) prioritizing
15 at least 50 percent of investments in disadvantaged
16 communities.

17 I would also would like to, for staff and also maybe
18 to think about how do we clearly define equity in this
19 context. See if we have seen in the report and others have
20 mentioned the need to define that.

21 So thank you, everybody.

22 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Jose.

23 Our next speaker is Kevin Hamilton.

24 MR. HAMILTON: Yes, thank you. And again, thank you
25 for this opportunity and thank my fellow panelists for all

1 these really great comments and suggestions.

2 I want to reinforce and support comments made by
3 Bill, and Will, and Jimmy, and a few others, Ruben, on the
4 focus of where these investments should happen. Also the
5 point that our communities have been suffering long before
6 COVID-19 reared its ugly head. And this change in how our
7 behavior response to these things is not short term, this
8 will be long term. And we need to be thinking that way.
9 This is not the first and it won't be the last of these kinds
10 of infectious diseases that sort of sweep around the world.

11 In this recovery and reinvestment, \$10 million, I
12 just want to be sure we're considering those who've been
13 doing existing work in this arena. I know a lot of them have
14 been really hampered. We have a number of partners in the
15 valley, including Mr. Leon, who are invested in this work and
16 part of this work that CEC funds. And of course COVID-19 has
17 forced some dramatic changes in how that work moves forward.
18 And we need to see that all of those folks are, continue to
19 be supported and we develop strategies to continue that kind
20 of work in the face of these restrictions that we'll be
21 facing now and probably well into the, at least the first
22 part of next year.

23 With regard to manufacturing, electrification
24 manufacturing is almost always a winner for us unless it
25 doesn't reduce the air pollution from the manufacturing

1 process. So simply putting a diesel truck, charging
2 infrastructure is not going to be enough. We're going to
3 have to figure out how CEC can support electrification of the
4 many manufacturing processes that generate the pollution but
5 are critical to California's economy. So we look at that
6 with great concern and we'd really like to see that laid out
7 exactly how that -- that will happen in that particular way.

8 I do want to echo Bill's comments on the hydrogen
9 highway, as many of us call it. Right now it's a hydrogen
10 dirt path and we need to do some construction there if we're
11 going to see that vision realized. That's the only quote
12 unquote "alternative fuel" that I see is worth investing in.
13 Everything else is short term. If we can't cross that
14 boundary eventually, we're never going to get there to
15 completely clean air and a lifecycle in emissions that isn't
16 sort of neutral against those other types of carbon-based
17 fuels.

18 Again, I want to repitch, and I've asked questions in
19 the comments and will follow-up with Patrick and others, in
20 how CALeVIP hits the ground. The first iteration did three
21 counties in the San Joaquin Valley, which seemed quite
22 arbitrary to most of us. Those who have been left out who
23 have really large populations are pretty frustrated by that.
24 And in those counties where the money did drop, I think you
25 may have noticed that the money disappeared within a month,

1 month and a half. So similar to the Los Angeles experience
2 but even faster.

3 So you can see that these communities are looking
4 forward to this technology. They have a need for it. They
5 are early adopters and the geography down there really
6 requires diverse investments in that portfolio that allow
7 connecting more distance cities from the local business
8 commerce sites together, so we don't leave them isolated.
9 It's not uncommon for many people who work in the larger
10 cities to live 20 miles outside the city, 30 miles outside
11 the city because that's the cheapest property around. It's
12 the only rent they can afford. So we're geographically
13 isolating these folks from this infrastructure, however
14 unintentionally and that needs to be corrected.

15 So again, I want to thank everybody for their time
16 today and I look forward to seeing the next draft of -- of
17 this proposal.

18 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Kevin.

19 Our next speaker is Matt Gregori. You there, Matt?

20 MR. GREGORI: Yeah, sorry. Caught me stepping away
21 trying to get a piece of paper.

22 Thank you for the opportunity for some follow-up
23 comments. I wanted to just follow up on Russell Teall's note
24 that, you know, an all of the above strategy is very
25 important. AB 8 requires the CEC to take a diverse approach

1 in funding alternative transportation initiatives. We do
2 have a question about the last six months of hydrogen funding
3 being only \$5 million, and we think that is underfunded of
4 what is required by AB 8, but we'll include that in our
5 written comments.

6 And I want to support Sandy Naranjo's comments that
7 air pollution reduction is extremely critical in focusing all
8 the funds on a more expensive pathway like electrification
9 could actually result in less air pollution reductions,
10 especially when it comes to asthma inducing diesel
11 particulate matter. So we encourage the CEC to create a
12 diverse portfolio for GHG reductions in air pollution
13 reductions looking at electricity, hydrogen, and biofuels.

14 As was mentioned, you know, we're starting to see a
15 lot of private investment in hydrogen and we're seeing
16 private investment in biofuels production facilities as well
17 from the SoCal gas side. And some of these fuels may be
18 better suited to address disadvantaged communities. I'm
19 thinking of high-density housing. Somebody mentioned, you
20 know, everybody on the call is probably used to living in a
21 single-family detached home, but there are a lot of other use
22 cases for vehicles including apartment complexes, apartments
23 downtown L.A. that don't actually have any parking spaces.
24 So what are alternatives that we can use to reduce emissions
25 for those use cases and all of the citizens in California?

1 And with that, I will thank everybody for an
2 excellent discussion today.

3 MR. KELLEY: Sorry, my mic wasn't unmuting.

4 Our next speaker is Richard Schorske.

5 MR. SCHORSKE: Hi, thank you. Can you hear me?

6 MR. KELLEY: Yes.

7 MR. SCHORSKE: Great. Yeah, I just want to
8 reemphasize a couple of points and note that a great way to
9 effectively and efficiently utilize the surplus funding for
10 the recovery is -- is to focus on MUDs to right a historic
11 area of neglect I think in the marketplace. And specifically
12 to do so with an emphasis on both shared charging and shared
13 mobility. And -- and again to think a little bit outside the
14 four-wheel box and consider e-Bikes and even e-Scooters as
15 forms of share mobility, particularly in inner cities where
16 the travel distances are less.

17 So those are my principal areas of concern. I'll
18 just note another issue that hasn't been raised yet today is
19 the fact that the HVIP infrastructure allocations for,
20 specifically for school buses and I believe for other vehicle
21 types has gone away. And I'm sure that's something that the
22 CEC is paying attention to in terms of where school districts
23 could get access to charging infrastructure funding as that
24 transition occurs. So if there's a way to look at that kind
25 of funding, I think it would be appropriate.

1 And again, in terms of metrics, you know, the amount
2 of cost per VMT enabled, or per pass -- I'm sorry, per
3 passenger mile -- per passenger mile enabled gives you a
4 really strong rationale for investing in school buses just as
5 cost per unit, or per number of households enabled for EV
6 access and EV charging would advantage appropriately
7 multiunit and shared solution. So I want to encourage
8 thinking along those lines for an efficient approach.

9 And lastly, and I very much respect the intention
10 behind Bill Magavern's comment on the 50 percent, but I would
11 suggest that a much more efficient approach would be to
12 target low- and moderate-income housing wherever it exists in
13 the state. There's a lot of distorted investment as we heard
14 about the, for instance, the many more chargers than EVs in
15 Huron. Not to pick on Huron but we don't want to repeat that
16 situation all over state, that would not be a good use of
17 funding and would not serve the purposes that we have and
18 that we share.

19 So I would suggest a more nuanced approach would be
20 wherever those pockets of low- and moderate-income housing
21 are particularly multiunit we focus extra revenue, excuse me,
22 extra -- extra resources there rather than -- (no audio). Go
23 along with it with a rather flawed DAC mechanism.

24 So thank you very much.

25 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Richard.

1 Our next speaker is Larry Engelbrecht.

2 MR. ENGELBRECHT: Hello, is my audio on?

3 MR. KELLEY: Yes, sir.

4 MR. ENGELBRECHT: Okay. Thank you very much.

5 Larry Engelbrecht, Educational Consultant. I'm not talking
6 about the minimum wage technicians that you see at like these
7 quick oil change places or tire stores. I'm addressing the
8 highly qualified technicians that are supplying their own
9 tools. With an effective pathway beginning at the high
10 school level, master and even advance level technician status
11 can be achieved in as soon as the first year of college.

12 Regarding higher wages which was mentioned on
13 page 63, and this excerpt is also out of my March 23rd
14 comment funding ASE programs are critical need. I'll just
15 read the section out of the Industrial Welfare Commission,
16 Order Number 9, subsection B. When tools or equipment are
17 required by the employer or are necessary to the performance
18 of a job, such tools and equipment shall be provided and
19 maintained by the employer except that an employee whose
20 wages are at least two times the minimum wage.

21 An interesting section here is subsection B. This
22 does not apply to a practical (indiscernible) --

23 THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. I'm sorry. This is
24 the court reporter.

25 Could everybody mute their lines? Somebody's washing

1 dishes or something and it's obscuring the words of the
2 speaker. Thank you.

3 MR. ENGELBRECHT: Thank you. Basically what the
4 Commission order says is if you are required to supply your
5 own tools, like if you are in the service bay at a
6 dealership, you are -- you are required to be paid at least
7 double minimum wage.

8 And the last section here says this subsection shall
9 not apply to apprentices regularly indentured under the State
10 Division of Apprenticeship Standards.

11 As I mentioned earlier, it seems that apprenticeships
12 are more popular in Northern California regarding automotive
13 related apprenticeships.

14 And at the end of this month, on July 1st in the City
15 of Los Angeles for employers that have more than 25
16 employees, car dealerships basically, minimum wage is \$15 an
17 hour. So if you're a quick-change lube, you know, minimally
18 trained person, you're going to be paid minimum wage. But if
19 you are required to have your own tools, you have your own
20 service bay, you get double that. So \$15 an hour becomes \$30
21 an hour. That works out to \$62,400 a year. That's really
22 impressive pay coming out of the first year of college.

23 And again this is really important. As I mentioned
24 earlier, the employers are looking for ASE certifications for
25 the technicians. And they can get that a year or even two

1 years earlier if they complete a program at an ASE accredited
2 college. That's a big reason why I'm pushing ASE
3 accreditation for the schools. And as opposed to private
4 postsecondary programs that offer automotive training, those
5 costs are upwards of \$40,000. This can be done at low-cost
6 community colleges.

7 Any other comments or questions to that, I'll be
8 happy to answer. Thank you very much again for allowing me
9 to participate.

10 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Larry.

11 Our next speaker is Eileen Tutt.

12 MS. TUTT: Oh, thank you. So I just want to just say
13 a huge, we -- we believe that in California, it makes
14 absolute sense -- sense to be investing the majority, if not
15 all, of this funding in zero-emission vehicle technologies.
16 So really want to support that. And I understand that there
17 are other fuels but at this point in our history in
18 California, this plan is definitely going in the right
19 direction.

20 I want to emphasize for all of those that are really
21 invested in moving the state to zero as fast as possible,
22 what came up at the beginning of this meeting is that 51
23 million is not secure yet. And we need this Committee that
24 is -- that is committed to zero- emission transportation
25 technologies, needs to make sure the Energy Commission gets

1 that 51 million in the budget. Probably likely in August.

2 And so CalETC is working with a number of folks on
3 this phone call and if you are interested in helping us
4 support, and you're not already working with us, to get the
5 CEC that 51 million. We thought we had it, it was in the
6 Governor's budget. It's not in the budget currently being
7 considered by the Governor from the legislature. And we need
8 to make sure that it gets in there and that CEC gets this
9 money and they can use it for the good work they're doing as
10 outlined in this plan.

11 So thank you.

12 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Eileen.

13 Our next speaker is Robert Meyer. I'm going to
14 unmute him.

15 MR. MEYER: Thank you, again. I just wanted to
16 underscore the support for the apprenticeship training model
17 and just make one important note. So wanting to be,
18 certainly funds and support apprenticeship training. We have
19 worked with a number of employers that have implemented
20 apprenticeship-based training models where they are basically
21 slowly moving and adopting and edging closer, particularly in
22 Southern California. So they see the value of that
23 investment proposition for apprenticeship.

24 They, you know, I -- maybe it's an apprenticeship
25 with small a. So while we certainly, you know, want to steer

1 them and support them as they move forward to DAS recognition
2 in California, we certainly support the involvement of the --
3 the DOL on a federal level and -- and in working with an
4 employer to fund job skills training, or reimburse the cost
5 of it, we certainly support of an employer doing that with,
6 you know, a mindset that they are working towards
7 apprenticeship-style training.

8 Also the feeder programs, particularly the high
9 schools in disadvantaged communities that are providing
10 career foundational levels and styles of training, that
11 should also be thought of in the spectrum of that type of
12 apprenticeship. We also agree with ASE, and we fund that
13 through the community colleges in California.

14 And then my last comment that -- well, second to
15 last. The pivot regarding COVID, I think will be an
16 important means of -- of supporting the goals of the
17 administration. And I'm hopeful that's supportive of their
18 returning the funds of the 51 million.

19 And then lastly, I am going to express disappointment
20 in the COVID for impacting the ability to have cookies passed
21 out about this time in the meeting. I know we had cookies
22 last time and thank God it wasn't Tyson that offered the
23 salad. So I'm just a little sad right there.

24 But thank you, and I hope we do get to meet again.

25 MR. KELLEY: Thanks, Robert. I miss cookies as well.

1 Charles had a couple points he wanted to touch on. I'm going
2 to hand the mic over to Charles.

3 MR. SMITH: Yeah. Thanks, Spencer. So I kind of
4 wanted to speak a little bit about the recovery and
5 reinvestment allocation that a lot of folks have commented
6 on.

7 You might sort of see from the description in the
8 text, we've kind of left it -- left it a bit open-ended to
9 give ourselves a little bit more flexibility to identify
10 opportunities for -- that we could pursue that would sort of
11 maximize recovery and reinvestments within the state. Still
12 very much within the clean transportation space.

13 This is still a really dynamic time. California
14 economy still reopening in a lot of ways and even reopening
15 with some restrictions still. So we kind of wanted to try to
16 acknowledge that there were still a lot of options and
17 opportunities on the table for us. Most of the other funding
18 allocation that you see written into our investment plan
19 target a pretty specific combination of fuel-type and supply
20 chain phase, like fuel production, infrastructure, vehicles.

21 We -- we wanted to kind of leave ourselves a little
22 bit of room to identify further priorities. There might be
23 combinations of those supply chain and fuel types that aren't
24 already written into the investment plan, and so -- and so we
25 want to sort of keep that option available to find projects

1 that don't fall neatly into those preexisting types.

2 The other comment that I heard was that 10 million
3 might not be enough for this category for just one year. I
4 might add that so inasmuch as this is an investment plan that
5 we're looking to cover the next three and a half years, we're
6 still going to be have our investment plan update process on
7 an annual basis. So when we approach the development again
8 of the investment plan starting up again already in the fall,
9 we will be looking at, you know, whether we need to provide
10 more funding for this category or whether there's specific
11 activities that we want to expand upon for the next
12 investment plan.

13 And then the last thing that I kind of want to
14 mention is that your ideas are really welcome and appreciated
15 on, again whether there are project types that would maximize
16 these goals. And I know that we're trying to incorporate
17 these goals into all of our funding allocations. But again
18 if there are particular activities that maybe don't fit
19 neatly into those other categories, this would be a great
20 opportunity to hear from it.

21 Initial ideas that we've had are sort of laid out in
22 the investment plan. They include things like possibly
23 supporting for continuation or restarting operation,
24 operation of maintenance activities, whether in like the ZEV
25 manufacturing facilities, or low carbon fuel production

1 facilities. I talked about the opportunity for federal cost
2 sharing already. We'll also be looking at the docket that
3 Tim Olson has opened within the Energy Commission on high
4 leverage funding solutions to help inform our approach here
5 as well.

6 But again, ideas are very much welcome. We have not
7 set a specific course for this part of funding yet. And so
8 we welcome comments in the docket.

9 Thank you.

10 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Charles.

11 I saw one more hand go up. Bill Elrick, are you
12 ready to speak?

13 MR. ELRICK: Yes. Thanks. And let me, just looking
14 at our time, answer first the focus question on what's the
15 one point. And I think with everything we've discussed,
16 looking forward suggesting that CEC and the CTP, the program
17 concentrates on economic development opportunities and really
18 ensuring all the funding that's distributed is putting a
19 strong consideration focus on outlining clear business cases
20 and a timeline to move away from government subsidies. That
21 way we can get this into accelerating the transportation,
22 clean energy transition, and accelerating the development of
23 those sustainable clean fuel marketplaces.

24 I want to then quickly just comment on some of the
25 earlier comments around green hydrogen. We absolutely need

1 to set a timeline to 100 percent green hydrogen. And I know
2 there's a lot of discussion around the stakeholder base now
3 working on this with many of the current hydrogen stations
4 already open and operating with 100 percent green hydrogen.
5 CEC has funded stations that are already, all of them, a
6 market leading 33 percent renewable content throughout the
7 network. And the hydrogen production for transportation can
8 actually move faster being disconnected than -- than grid
9 produced or other renewable energy production. So that's an
10 exciting opportunity to put those together.

11 However, we've got to be very careful to put the goal
12 in front of us not the pathway. Meaning, let's be careful
13 not to lock in a single pathway, we need to have a lot of
14 flexibility in achieving that objective and really put the
15 standard we want to achieve, not the how. That's something
16 California's always done really well.

17 So then just thanks again for all the hard work CEC's
18 done and on this investment plan and everything. And we look
19 forward to working with Staff on accelerating the ZEV
20 activities to reach our common environmental and economic
21 goals.

22 MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Bill.

23 I wanted to transition the mic to Patrick. Are you
24 there Patrick?

25 MR. BRECHT: Thank you, Spencer.

1 Yes, this is Patrick Brecht. I think it's a good
2 time for us to transition to public comment and I would
3 instruct those who would like to speak during the public
4 comment period to raise their hand, and we will go in order.

5 COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: Patrick, while we're, while
6 folks are, the public is figuring out how to raise their hand
7 and provide comments, I just want to thank the Advisory
8 Committee members for -- for giving us a thoughtful advice,
9 for bearing with us as we use Zoom as a platform to be able
10 to have these conversations. And we are listening and
11 really, you know, paying attention to what you say.

12 So I'm not sure how many of the members of the
13 Advisory Committee want to stay for public comment. You are
14 of course welcome to stay for public comment, but you're not
15 required. So if you want to go eat some lunch, you should
16 feel free to do so.

17 So Patrick, I'm passing the time over to you. But I
18 just didn't want the Advisory Committee members to feel like
19 they had to stay for public comment. We are staying for the
20 public comments, but the Advisory Committee members are free
21 to do whatever they want.

22 MR. BRECHT: I think it might be a good -- a good
23 moment to try our poll.

24 COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: Yeah, let's do it. While
25 folks are figuring out how to raise their hand and provide

1 public comment.

2 MR. BRECHT: Yeah, we just -- we wish to have a poll
3 here to gauge just how -- how successful this -- this format
4 was. And if that can be popped up there, I think we'll have
5 about 30 seconds to answer the question.

6 COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: Oh, panelists can't vote. So
7 it's only going to be the folks that are remote accessing in.
8 We'll have to do a different way to ask the Advisory
9 Committee this question.

10 MR. BRECHT: Okay. I can certainly follow-up with
11 everyone.

12 COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: Yeah, I think --

13 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I just want to say I appreciate all
14 the work that people put -- the staff of CEC put into this.
15 This is not easy, especially changing practices. So much
16 respect and appreciation.

17 MR. ENGELBRECHT: It does say at the bottom host and
18 panelists can't vote.

19 COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: Yeah. I think what we'll do
20 is we will try to do a similar poll for the Advisory
21 Committee. Because we're trying to figure out how we can do
22 this. Is this -- what we can do better and also how is this
23 platform working for you.

24 All right. Patrick, should we move to public
25 comment?

1 MR. BRECHT: Yeah, I think we should.

2 Spencer, would you go ahead and -- or Dorothy, are
3 you going to assist with going down the line and having
4 public comment?

5 MS. MURIMI: Oh, yeah. Hi, everybody. So thanks,
6 Patrick.

7 And we still have a few minutes in the morning so
8 good morning, everyone.

9 So first I'll call on folks on Zoom using the raise
10 hand feature and then will move to folks on the phone line.
11 And just as a quick reminder, you can take a moment and press
12 the star 9 feature if you're on the phone.

13 And to all participants, please don't use the speaker
14 phone feature, folks won't be able to hear you clearly. And
15 once your line is open, you may need to unmute on your end.
16 Please state and spell your first and last name. Give your
17 affiliation and specify the funding category or topic you'll
18 be speaking on for the record. And in order to make time for
19 attendees, public comments will be limited to three minutes
20 per speaker.

21 And so we will start with Jaimie Levin. Jaimie
22 Levin.

23 Again, we'll start with Jaimie Levin.

24 MR. LEVIN: Yeah. Sorry, I guess I was on mute.
25 Hadn't realized.

1 Jaimie Levin, J-A-I-M-I-E; Levin, L-E-V-I-N with the
2 Center for Transportation and the Environment. Wanted to
3 thank Patty and staff for putting together this very
4 thoughtful development plan.

5 But specifically I would like to emphasize in
6 response to your first two questions, the importance of being
7 able to fund as a priority infrastructure, heavy-duty
8 infrastructure for transit. Transit plays a huge role. It
9 will play a very important role in bringing back our economy,
10 but it also plays a really important role in helping people
11 in disadvantage communities and urban centers where transit
12 is necessary to get to and from jobs.

13 And infrastructure is extremely critical to be able
14 to fund that given that the transit industry is suffering as
15 Michael Pimentel pointed out, suffering considerable losses
16 in both fare box revenues and sales tax funding. So I know
17 you're moving forward with a transit infrastructure project,
18 or funding opportunity very soon. I want to emphasize how
19 important that is and give a shout out for hydrogen as a
20 major contributor to addressing zero-emission vehicle
21 technology. In -- as a complement to battery electric.

22 Thank you very much.

23 MS. MURIMI: Thank you, Mr. Levin.

24 Next, we'll move to Mahlon Aldridge. Please state
25 and spell your name. Give your affiliation. And specify the

1 funding category you're speaking on.

2 MR. ALDRIDGE: Great. Hi. Thank you. My name is
3 Mahlon Aldridge. That's M-A-H-L-O-N; Aldridge,
4 A-L-D-R-I-D-G-E. I'm with Ecology Action. We're a
5 nonprofit. Works throughout California to help deliver
6 infrastructure such as water energy and electric vehicle
7 infrastructure to support low-income and hard to reach
8 communities. I wanted to just say thank you for the
9 opportunity to speak and the great direction that this is
10 going.

11 I wanted to echo a couple things that I heard already
12 today from, one was Richard Schorske and Eileen Tutt. Both
13 emphasized the -- well the need for MUD and for low cost
14 fuel. And I wanted to just point out that we've spent a lot
15 of time working on identifying the market failure in the MUD
16 space. And that 60 percent of people in urban areas in
17 California live in MUDs and only 10 percent of the vehicle
18 ownership, electric vehicle ownership is in MUD. So
19 obviously, a big problem.

20 The main challenges there are that the MUD property
21 owners don't have any profit motive. And the EVSE providers
22 of the world who usually who have done a great job across
23 works -- workspaces, destination charging, and corridor.
24 They -- their business models collapse in that setting
25 because it's a residential charging situation, but it's set

1 inside of a -- of a commercial entity which is the MUD. And
2 that's the crux of that failure is there -- is caused by that
3 lack of alignment of business motivations.

4 So the solutions that we've identified really rely on
5 being able to use lower power solutions. And many policies
6 and funding sources do not allow lower powered solutions such
7 as L1 or load sharing L2, lower powered load sharing L2. So
8 really encourage the openness to that, as well as the use of
9 assigned parking. Because that is the tradition, and 80
10 percent of the MUDs have assigned parking rather than shared.
11 Parking is so tight that while some MUDs will allow for
12 shared parking to be used, they really don't want to give up
13 parking. And an assigned MUD solution really needs to be
14 allowed. It doesn't, it can complement a shared solution but
15 if we want to scale, it can't be an impediment. All of it
16 can't be required to be shared. But the L1 solutions just
17 would need to be future proofed for a time when there's more
18 panel capacity. We don't want the perfect to be the enemy of
19 the good.

20 And finally I'd just like to say that, like to pair
21 low -- low-power -- I'm sorry, vehicle demand programs with
22 the charging infrastructure deployment in those facilities.
23 And that's being demonstrated in Silicon Valley Clean
24 Energy's Pilot Programs for Innovation. And it's one to
25 watch so that in those MUD areas you're getting, and the DAC

1 areas and low-income you're getting the benefit of the used
2 vehicle programs being pushed in conjunction with the
3 infrastructure.

4 MS. MURIMI: Mr. Aldridge, your time. Would you like
5 to conclude your comment?

6 MR. ALDRIDGE: Thank you. I took more than my time.
7 Thank you for the opportunity.

8 Thank you.

9 MS. MURIMI: Thank you, Mr. Aldridge.

10 Next, we have John Shears. John Shears. Please give
11 your name, spell it, and give your affiliation. Thank you.

12 MR. SHEARS: Sorry, I was waiting for Zoom to let me
13 unmute. Can people hear me?

14 MS. MURIMI: Yes, we can. Go ahead.

15 MR. SHEARS: Good day. My name's John Shears. I'm a
16 former Advisory Committee member and I'm the clean
17 transportation lead for the Center for Energy Efficiency and
18 Renewable Technologies.

19 Also want to thank staff again for the hefty lifting
20 in producing another updated investment plan. One that now,
21 you know, is allowed to be a little more forward seeking in
22 laying out plans for the next three years. Recognizing still
23 have to go through -- through an annual process with the
24 legislature on the funding given, you know, the current --
25 current context with deficits, et cetera.

1 I just want to speak in support of comments
2 regarding, you know, supporting hydrogen, especially
3 renewable hydrogen, and its ability to also function and help
4 support the grid. And take advantage of excess renewables.
5 And also want to support, you know, focusing a lot of the
6 funding towards disadvantaged communities. Also recognizing
7 Richard Schorske's observations about, you know, how some of
8 our screening tools are still, still need, you know, further
9 refinement. So want to just put in another vote for making
10 sure that we're not, you know, missing some of those -- those
11 challenged communities. Those disenfranchised communities in
12 using, you know, these tools which are useful but at the same
13 time I just want to make sure we're not missing important
14 opportunities for those disadvantaged and disenfranchised
15 communities.

16 So thanks a lot. Thanks again to everyone,
17 Commissioner Monahan, and the staff for the great work.

18 MS. MURIMI: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Shears.

19 At this time we don't have anyone else with the
20 raised hand. I'm going to take a moment. Remind everyone
21 you can utilize the star 9 feature if you're on the phone and
22 also if you go to the bottom of your screen if you're on a
23 mobile device, or if you go to the attendee panel and go to
24 the bottom, you'll be able to click raise hand and be able to
25 comment.

1 I see one more raised hand has come up. Dmitri
2 Diment please, pardon me. Please, once your line is open,
3 please unmute on your end. State and spell your name and
4 give your affiliation. Thank you.

5 MR. DIMENT: Hi, my name is Dmitri Diment. Can you
6 hear me?

7 MS. MURIMI: Yes, we can.

8 MR. DIMENT: Gotcha. I just was going to give you my
9 name is Dmitri Diment. I'm calling with CALSTART. I just
10 wanted to delay you guys for a second because I couldn't chat
11 this in, but we're about to have someone call in within a
12 minute to give comment. So I just wanted to make sure that I
13 got that in because I couldn't chat you that.

14 Thank you.

15 MS. MURIMI: Thank you, Dmitri.

16 Next, we have Alycia Gilde. Alycia Gilde. Please
17 state and spell your name, give your affiliation, and specify
18 the funding category or topic.

19 MS. GILDE: Hi. Yes, my name is Alycia Gilde. I'm a
20 senior director at CALSTART.

21 And in particular, wanted to provide comments
22 regarding the block grant.

23 MS. MURIMI: Okay.

24 MS. GILDE: So thank you for this great opportunity
25 to provide some input. I really have appreciated the

1 opportunity for public to give feedback on the proposed
2 solicitations as these are very important as we look at
3 opportunities to advance medium- and heavy-duty zero-emission
4 infrastructure in the state, which is absolutely critical.

5 There's three points that I just wanted to emphasize
6 that are really important to CALSTART. And that is one, is
7 carrying a continuous streamlined funding program for
8 infrastructure to also support and complement other existing
9 continuous medium- and heavy duty-advanced ecotechnology
10 incentive programs like HVIP. I think it's really important
11 that there are ways in which we are streamlining funding for
12 both infrastructure and vehicles at the same time and making
13 sure that we're giving industry those signals that funding is
14 available to support.

15 Also secondly, administering a statewide first come,
16 first served streamlined infrastructure instead of programs.
17 So really looking at ways in which we can get funding out the
18 door faster so that we can really support fleets in meeting
19 their timelines to implement and install infrastructure.

20 And then lastly, the other important point that we
21 wanted to make is to make sure that we're providing resources
22 for technical assistance and site planning. I think what's
23 really important is that we're helping fleets evaluate what
24 energy source is going to be the most appropriate for their
25 operation and business case. So if we could set aside a

1 portion of block grant funds to support with this initial
2 analysis, would really help fleets better understand what
3 technology's going to be best for them.

4 So thank you for this great opportunity to provide
5 comment and looking forward to seeing this funding program
6 come up.

7 MS. MURIMI: Thank you, Alycia.

8 I see no more comments at this time. We'll take a moment to
9 see if anyone else has any comments.

10 Again, please press the star 9 feature if you're on
11 the line and go to the bottom of your screen or device and
12 click the hand, and so we can know you want to make a
13 comment. We will wait one moment.

14 I see we have a comment from the panelist, Casey
15 Gallagher.

16 MR. GALLAGHER: Yes. Casey Gallagher, Advisory
17 Committee but also with the California Labor Federation,
18 workforce site development department.

19 I just wanted to add and lift up and thank the CEC
20 for mentioning Joint Apprenticeship Committees and
21 apprenticeship in the -- the plan. I see a whole lot of
22 potential because they are as joint labor management
23 apprenticeship programs being the gold standard in workforce
24 development in California and also in the United States.
25 That I think we can lift those kind of programs up further as

1 we prepare for kind of reinvestment while classroom
2 instructions good and very helpful and (indiscernible).

3 However, it's that combination of both theory and
4 practice that will prepare our future workers more equitable
5 opportunities that leads to (indiscernible). And I'm happy
6 to continue this conversation in any kind of way or link
7 programs to -- that do exist with each one of these sectors
8 and technologic changing industries.

9 Thank you.

10 MS. MURIMI: Thank you for that comment.

11 At this time I'm going to pass the baton on to
12 Commissioner Monahan, seeing no further public comments.

13 COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: Great. Well thanks everybody,
14 again, for participating remotely. And we'll reach out to
15 the Advisory Committee just to do maybe a quick survey about
16 what -- what we can do. I mean, I have a sense that we'll be
17 sheltering in place for a while. Our next meeting will
18 probably be remote again so we'd love your feedback on what
19 worked and what didn't work and how we can make it better
20 given our priority in making sure that these are open
21 meetings that the public can access.

22 So again thanks everybody. Look forward to your
23 written comments. Again, you'll see on the screen how to
24 submit written comments. They're due by July 6th. So please
25 do provide written comments if you feel like you didn't

1 communicate what you wanted to do today verbally.

2 So thanks, and this meeting comes to an end.

3 (Thereupon, the Hearing was adjourned at 12:09 p.m.)

4 --oOo--

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24