

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	16-OIR-06
Project Title:	Senate Bill 350 Disadvantaged Community Advisory Group
TN #:	246728
Document Title:	Item 5 Transportation Investment Comments 10-21-2022
Description:	N/A
Filer:	Dorothy Murimi
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	10/21/2022 1:43:07 PM
Docketed Date:	10/21/2022

October 21, 2022

Re: Comments on the Clean Transportation Investment Plan

Dear Commissioner Monahan:

On behalf of the Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group (DACAG), we submit these comments on the Clean Transportation Investment Plan. As you are well aware, the DACAG has been extensively engaged in prior iterations of this plan for many years. We appreciate the CEC staff listening to us and seeking to incorporate our comments. This current investment plan provides an extraordinary opportunity not only to advance zero-emissions transportation, but also to do so in a way that benefits disadvantaged communities. We provide the following suggestions to the Commission as it finalizes the report and implements it.

- **Continued focus on zero-emissions.** The DACAG has consistently promoted the need to focus as much investments, if not all, on programs to advance zero-emissions transportation. We appreciate the continued focus of this plan and prior plans to shift towards this focus. The shift to zero-emissions in all forms of vehicles is critical to protecting the health of all Californians, but particularly critical to protect the health of disadvantaged communities. We appreciate the continued focus on this, and we look forward to seeing more and more projects roll out to provide infrastructure for vehicles large and small to electrify.
- **Ensure Equitable Distribution of Charging** – We are appreciative of the significant work the Commission has put in to advance equity in charging infrastructure, particularly for light-duty vehicles. We suggest the plan be consistent with the findings of the AB 2127 report, which identified a continued need to ensure equitable infrastructure deployments. This will mean continued focus on charging and other zero-emissions investments for the benefit of disadvantaged communities. We also suggest the funding continue to go to support infrastructure in places that have lagged in charging deployment (e.g. multi-unit dwellings).
- **Resources for Cities, Counties and Agencies** – We remain concerned that cities, counties, agencies, and tribal governments throughout California have staff that are stretched too thin to achieve this zero-emissions vision in California. We recommend exploring how these funds can help overcome these capacity barriers. We believe a good guiding post would be to focus resources on these capacity issues in cities, counties, and agencies to benefit communities identified through the AB 617 process. These types of investments could hasten the deployment of zero-emissions vehicles by helping to alleviate delays in the process of permitting and planning for zero-emissions. We recommend making sure public dollars do not just go to entities that can afford to hire expensive consulting firms to put together their applications. In addition, these capacity enhancing resources should be allocated to overcome barriers across vehicles sectors from light duty to heavy duty.
- **Provide Significant Investments to Public Agencies** – While we recognize private entities will necessarily receive significant funding under this program, the Commission should promote boosting investment for public agencies. Transit agencies, school districts, and other public entities are prime entities to move to zero-emissions. And, many of these agencies can provide discreet and concrete benefits to disadvantaged communities. Accordingly, we suggest shifting more resources to entities like transit agencies and school districts, especially as the Commission seeks to invest the recent additional money from this year's budget.

- **Offroad Equipment** – We continue to remain concerned that offroad equipment (ie locomotives, cargo equipment, etc) is imposing immense harm on disadvantaged communities through high levels of pollution. In addition, these sectors remain well behind other sectors in advancing zero-emissions solutions. To the extent permitted by law, we recommend the Commission identify how to use these funds to push forward zero-emission solutions in the offroad sector with a particular focus on large facilities impacting disadvantaged communities (e.g. railyards). Also, we encourage the Commission to use funding for Ports to push our seaports to advance zero-emissions in a broad range of equipment (e.g. commercial harborcraft, cargo-handling equipment, locomotives, and shipping).
- **Define Benefits More Effectively** – We remain concerned that some of the projects to invest in “clean” fuel deployments may not be providing benefits to disadvantaged communities. We suggest the Commission work hard to define benefits in a way that will mean emissions reductions because many fuel projects actually do not reduce emissions in the communities where the fuel is produced.
- **Work with DACAG on Program Design** – We encourage the Commission to continue to work with DACAG as it implements programs to ensure more equity. We are resources that we hope the agency will continue to engage.

We appreciate your consideration of these comments, and we look forward to continued work with the Commission on this vital program.