

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	23-SB-02
Project Title:	SB X1-2 Implementation
TN #:	269790-2
Document Title:	Draft Transportaton Fuels Transition Plan Appendix A
Description:	N/A
Filer:	Bryan Hsieh
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	5/1/2026 5:09:03 PM
Docketed Date:	5/1/2026

Draft Transportation Fuels Transition Plan
Appendix A
Public Engagement

Draft Transportation Fuels Transition Plan Appendix A: Public Engagement

Workgroup Meetings Summary Report

Introduction

Senate Bill X1-2 directs the California Energy Commission (CEC) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop a Transportation Fuels Transition Plan (TFTP) for the state. This plan will outline strategies to support the state’s transition away from petroleum-based fuels in a manner that is reliable, safe, equitable, and affordable. The plan should align with California’s projected decline in in-state petroleum demand and be informed by the State’s most recent [Climate Change Scoping Plan](#), which details how the state plans to phase out reliance on fossil fuels. The agencies developed the report through a collaborative process involving other agencies and a wide range of interested parties.

To support this effort, the Center for Law, Energy & the Environment, in partnership with CARB and CEC, convened a workgroup as a forum for input into the TFTP. The workgroup’s goal was to provide public feedback to inform the drafting of the TFTP. Representatives hailed from environmental justice, labor, environmental protection, land use, and public health groups; the state’s fuel producers and refiners; and key state, regional, and local agencies. From August 2024 through March 2025, the workgroup met four times. Each session featured panel discussions and/or breakout groups that enabled focused dialogue among experts and other interested parties. A complete list of participating organizations and agencies is available here: [TFTP Workgroup Participants List](#).

This report captures the key themes that emerged from the four workgroup discussions. It provides a summary of each meeting, including its topic focus, insights, and resulting recommendations, followed by a consolidated set of overarching recommendations for the TFTP.

Workgroup Meeting I: Supply and Demand-Options to Mitigate Price Spikes and Feasible Options Moving Forward (Aug 27, 2024)

The first meeting of the Transportation Fuels Transition Plan workgroup focused on assessing and prioritizing strategies from the Transportation Fuels Assessment (Assessment), an assessment led by CEC, in consultation with CARB, to evaluate strategies to reduce gasoline price spikes and examine topics such as fuel demand, supply, and infrastructure. Below are the strategies presented to the group:

Storage Strategies

The State proposed several storage strategies to help maintain an adequate buffer supply that, upon the release of the stored supply, can allow for a short-term boost to overall supply and mitigate in cases of supply shock.

- Stock Minimums for Refiners and Terminals: Require refiners and terminals to maintain contingency reserves of gasoline fuel in refineries and terminals. During supply shocks, temporary release of minimum requirements to supply the market.
- Utilization of Existing Non-Operating Storage: Lease tankage at closed refineries to hold gasoline in reserve in the event of supply shortages.
- State-Owned Product Reserve: Establish new state-owned product (e.g., gasoline or blending components) reserves in the North and South Regions to allow rapid deployment of fuel when needed.

Production Enhancement Strategies

Production enhancement covers several distinct approaches that have different features but are categorized as attempting to increase the supply of gasoline by modifications to standards outside of any sort of interstate agreement.

- E15: Allow increased blending of ethanol with CARBOB (California Reformulated Gasoline Blendstock For Oxygenate Blending) from 10 percent (E10) to 15 percent (E15), effectively augmenting existing CARBOB supply.
- RVP Modification: Consider various modifications to RVP requirements to address tight supply conditions. Examples include early allowance for winter grade RVP, shifting the time period of winter RVP, or a permanent modification of summer RVP specification.
- Non-CARBOB Fee-Based Allowance: Create a fee-based non-CARBOB allowance program that can be activated during a price spike or in response to a reasonable expectation of one. Revenue from fees would be used for air quality improvement strategies in non-attainment regions or other EJ communities.
- CARBOB for Reno: Supply CARBOB gasoline and diesel into Reno market terminals long-term. This will make more storage available for CARBOB products or blendstocks in northern California refineries and large storage terminals.

Alignment of Gasoline Specifications for Western States

- Establish a unified gasoline specification for several states in the West.

Import Strategies

Import strategies intend to increase supply directly or indirectly by bringing in fuel from refineries outside of the state. Across all strategies listed, timing is a critical challenge.

- Resupply Compensation: If companies or traders are reluctant to purchase gasoline during a price spike or supply shortage, a program could provide compensation to those parties to stimulate transport of CARBOB fuel to California.
- Short-Term Imports: The state creates a program or hires a trading company that takes on a series of regular delivery contracts during critical risk periods to augment gasoline supply via imports for a defined period.
- Reliable Imports: As the transition unfolds, California may wish to consider developing a relationship with a supplier and refiner or marketer to bring CARBOB into California via regular ship loads so consumers are assured a reliable import supply.
- State-leased or state-owned (i.e., state-managed) vessels may provide resiliency if the right refineries can produce the necessary gasoline for the state's needs in a timely fashion.

The meeting emphasized feasibility, effectiveness, environmental impacts, and equity. Across presentations and breakout sessions, several overarching themes emerged that participants identified as important for consideration in the state's transition away from petroleum-based fuels, as follows:

Public Health and Environmental Justice

Participants consistently stressed that strategies must safeguard public health and avoid exacerbating pollution burdens, particularly for refinery-adjacent communities. For example, many participants raised concerns about the potential air quality impacts of the agency proposals in the Assessment that involve fuel storage expansion, ethanol blending (E15), or adjustments to fuel specifications. Many emphasized that environmental justice analyses should accompany all strategies to ensure equitable outcomes.

Labor and Economic and Impacts

Job security and economic stability were central concerns. Participants highlighted the risk of in-state job losses if production shifts to other states, as well as the vulnerability of small businesses to fuel price spikes. Participants expressed strong interest in strategies that preserve California jobs and labor standards while ensuring that policymakers and industry support communities and workers throughout the transition.

Implementation Challenges and Long-Term Uncertainty

Participants noted significant regulatory and logistical barriers to new storage and production strategies, such as seismic upgrades, and the limited shelf life of fuels. Participants also raised questions about the long-term behavior of refiners as in-state demand declines, including potential increases in both exports (for in-state refineries unable to find a sufficient market domestically) and imports (for meeting in-state demand if in-state

production is insufficient). This uncertainty underscores the need for flexible, adaptive policies.

Maintaining High Standards and Avoiding Backsliding

Participants broadly agreed that California should not compromise its rigorous health, safety, and environmental standards in pursuit of short-term supply stability. They viewed proposals such as relaxing Reid Vapor Pressure (RVP, a measure of gasoline volatility that affects emissions) requirements or imported non-CARBOB fuels (gasoline blends that do not meet California's cleaner-burning fuel standards) with skepticism, due to the risks of worsening air quality and undermining California's climate leadership.

Need for Robust Data and Analysis

Across all discussions, participants called for more evidence-based evaluation of the proposed strategies. They wanted further analysis of public health impacts, environmental consequences, economic costs, and legal authorities before the state advances specific policies. This demand for greater clarity and transparency reflects the complexity of balancing fuel reliability with California's climate and equity goals.

Strategic and Regional Considerations

Participants recognized California's unique position with limited pipeline connections to other states' fuel markets. They viewed proposals for adopting a unified fuel specification across Western states, likely based on California's standards, as a significant political challenge. They expressed concerns about whether other states would be willing to adopt California's stringent fuel standards and the potential political and logistical difficulties of coordinating such an effort.

They generally viewed imports as a last-resort option, with concerns about reliability, costs, and implications for refinery workers. Some participants urged greater attention to demand management strategies, such as transit and carpooling, rather than focusing solely on supply.

Ultimately, while participants shared a commitment to ensuring a reliable, safe, equitable, and affordable fuel transition, they emphasized the complexity of the task ahead for the state. Key tensions emerged between the need for short-term supply stability and long-term decarbonization; economic preservation and environmental justice; and in-state leadership versus multi-state coordination. Moving forward, participants requested transparent analysis, careful policy design, and strong protections for both vulnerable communities and workers.

Key comments & recommendations from Workgroup Meeting I

Below is a summary of the key recommendations from the discussion:

1. **Prioritize public health and environmental justice** in all strategies, especially in disadvantaged communities.
2. **Avoid expanding fossil fuel infrastructure** that could delay the transition to cleaner energy.
3. **Maximize use of existing storage and production infrastructure** instead of building new facilities.
4. **Retrofit existing infrastructure** with pollution controls like vapor recovery systems.
5. **Require detailed environmental and economic impact analyses** before implementing strategies like E15 blending or RVP modifications.
6. **Maintain California's high air quality standards**, even during fuel supply disruptions.
7. **Support in-state fuel production** to preserve jobs and uphold safety and environmental standards.
8. **Support imports as a second source of refined fuel**, not as a replacement for in-state production, and avoid reliance on non-CARBOB fuel.
9. **Explore regional and federal coordination**, but assess feasibility and political challenges carefully.
10. **Ensure a just economic transition** for workers, small businesses, and vulnerable communities affected by fuel system changes.

Workgroup Meeting II: Supply and Demand-Planning for Diminished In-State Fuel Demand (Oct 1, 2024)

The second workgroup meeting focused on how California can manage the decline in fossil fuel demand while ensuring equitable access to affordable transportation alternatives, particularly for rural and low-income residents. As gasoline demand declines in the coming years, refiners and suppliers will need to determine how to modify their operations as demand declines for CARBOB. These actions may differ among refiners due to each having different perceived market risks as demand profiles decline. Below are two general response pathways presented at the meeting. The actual response pathway may represent a combination of different responses from each refiner and within Northern or Southern California.

Pathway 1: Reduced Gasoline Production

In this scenario, refiners would reduce crude refining runs to lower the production of gasoline. Eventually, declining refinery operations will lead to refinery closures or

conversions to non-gasoline biofuels. Imports of aviation fuel will likely increase, as demand for the fuel likely remains strong, even as overall gasoline demand declines.

Pathway 2: Maintain Crude Runs and Export Non-CARBOB Gasoline

In light of declining demand for CARBOB, some refiners may maintain crude processing and export gasoline or gasoline blendstocks to other states or foreign countries. The likely main export markets would be to foreign countries via marine cargos. Imports of aviation fuel would likely remain similar or increase less than in the Pathway 1 scenario.

Discussions centered on the above two potential pathways for transitioning California's refineries, the tradeoffs between them, and the roles of the federal and state government in ensuring a just and equitable transition. Several cross-cutting themes emerged, as follows:

Balancing Environmental, Economic, and Public Health Goals

Participants largely agreed that the transition away from petroleum must advance environmental and public health goals without neglecting economic realities. Participants generally viewed Pathway 1 (phasing out fossil fuels) as a clearer option for reducing emissions and avoiding the offshoring of environmental harm. Pathway 2 (exporting fuels) raised concerns about shifting emissions abroad, price instability, and continued community exposure to refinery pollution. Many participants expressed skepticism about over-reliance on carbon capture or biofuels and preferred zero-emission alternatives and public transit investments.

Worker and Community Impacts

Participants expressed concern regarding the effect of a phase out on refinery workers and the communities dependent on tax revenues from refineries. Without proactive planning, closures could trigger economic decline, job losses, and land contamination challenges. Participants emphasized the need for clear pathways for a transition to new industries, targeted skill retraining, and long-term economic diversification strategies to prevent harm to already vulnerable communities.

The Role of Government in a Just Transition

Participants stressed the importance of proactive and coordinated government leadership at all levels. Federal, state, and local governments will need to collaborate to develop detailed roadmaps for refinery decommissioning, land use remediation, and workforce transitions. Participants widely viewed California's current \$26.7 million Displaced Oil and Gas Worker Pilot Fund (through Employment Development Department)¹ as inadequate to

¹ The Employment Development Department (EDD) has awarded four organizations a total \$26.7 million from the State of California General Fund for the Displaced Oil and Gas Workers Fund grant opportunity. This

meet workforce needs and called for significantly greater investment in retraining and clean energy job creation. They also recommended stronger oversight and accountability mechanisms—such as polluter-pays models—to ensure companies fund environmental remediation and do not shift those costs onto the affected communities.

Equity and Environmental Justice

Equity was a recurring theme throughout the meeting. Participants highlighted that environmental justice communities, often located near refineries, have long borne the brunt of pollution and health burdens. They wanted any transition strategy to prioritize these communities by ensuring their equitable access to clean energy, affordable transit, and economic opportunities. Some attendees suggested free or low-cost public transit during fuel price spikes as one way to reduce economic strain on vulnerable populations.

Planning for Economic and Energy Stability

Participants raised concerns about potential fuel price shocks and supply disruptions during the transition. They suggested increasing emergency storage capacity and exploring demand-side strategies, such as investments in transit and walkable communities, to reduce reliance on fuel. These approaches could potentially help stabilize both the fuels market and household costs during the shift away from fossil fuels.

The second meeting underscored the urgency of comprehensive, government-led planning for refinery transitions. Many participants called for policies that simultaneously protect public health, advance climate goals, preserve economic stability, and ensure equity for workers and frontline communities. Success will likely require robust financial investment, transparent governance, and sustained collaboration across all levels of government, in order to deliver a just transition that leaves no community or worker behind.

Key comments & recommendations from Workgroup Meeting II

1. **Develop comprehensive, long-term transition plans** for refinery closures, land reuse, and economic redevelopment to avoid community and workforce disruption.
2. **Significantly increase investment in workforce retraining and job placement**, especially in clean energy and high-wage sectors, to support displaced refinery workers.
3. **Prioritize zero-emission transportation alternatives** over biofuels, given concerns about biofuels' environmental and health impacts.

funding will help the awarded organizations provide a pathway to future employment for displaced oil and gas workers.

4. **Provide free or subsidized public transit**, especially during fuel price spikes, to reduce economic burden on low-income communities and lower emissions.
5. **Integrate environmental justice into all planning and policy decisions**, ensuring that frontline communities receive targeted support and are not left behind.
6. **Implement stronger government oversight and accountability** to ensure companies fulfill environmental cleanup obligations during refinery closures.
7. **Explore financial assurance mechanisms** (e.g., polluter taxes or bonds) to fund remediation and protect public resources.
8. **Avoid reliance on fossil fuel exports** as a long-term strategy due to environmental offshoring risks and economic instability.
9. **Enhancing regional fuel storage capacity** to mitigate short-term price shocks without locking in fossil fuel infrastructure.
10. **Foster coordinated action among federal, state, and local governments** to ensure a just, equitable, and strategically aligned transition.

Workgroup Meeting III: Equitable Transition of the Workforce & Community Impacts (Nov 19, 2024)

The third workgroup meeting examined the workforce and community impacts of shutting down fossil fuel production infrastructure, focusing on strategies to equitably transition workers into clean energy and other industries while protecting local economies. Presentations and panel discussions from labor and workforce agencies, union representatives, and community members highlighted the challenges of ensuring economic stability, job quality, and environmental remediation during the transition. Several cross-cutting themes emerged, as follows:

Workforce Transition Challenges

Participants underscored that displaced oil and gas workers face steep wage reductions, diminished pensions, and reduced hours, with some considering relocation due to a lack of stable employment. While programs like the state's \$26.7 million Displaced Oil and Gas Workers Fund offer some support, the benefits are limited - offering partial transition pay, and retraining opportunities that are often difficult for workers to access given their often-demanding work schedules. Union members raised concerns that new green jobs often lack union protections, benefits, or adequate safety standards, leaving workers skeptical of a "just transition" as policy makers typically envision. Many emphasized the need for recognition of existing skills, realistic timelines for electrification, and policies that provide stability, dignity, and long-term career pathways.

Community and Economic Impacts

Refinery closures risk destabilizing local economies that rely heavily on refinery jobs,

business activity, and tax revenue. Breakout discussions highlighted fears of short-term economic strain in frontline and low-income communities, even as long-term health benefits may accrue from improved air quality. Participants called for proactive planning to replace lost revenues, prevent disinvestment in public services, and support local businesses. Some cited models such as taxing refineries to fund transition programs, requiring industry to finance site cleanup, or converting refinery sites for new uses (e.g., housing, desalination plants, new clean industries, etc.) as potential solutions.

The Role of Government and Policy Design

Participants stressed the importance of proactive, comprehensive, and enforceable policies led by the state and local governments. Participants generally viewed current funding—such as California’s \$30 million displaced worker fund as insufficient to address the scale of the challenge. Some of their recommendations included mandating industry contributions to retraining and retirement programs, developing enforceable cleanup guarantees, and aligning state workforce grants with existing skilled labor capacity rather than requiring duplicative training. A recurring theme was the need for clear, long-term state planning to avoid abrupt economic shocks and to ensure equity across workers, families, and communities.

Workers’ Voices and Equity

Some workers in the communities expressed frustration with feeling excluded from climate policy decision-making, noting that policy makers often discuss their concerns but rarely address them. They emphasized that they support climate goals but want meaningful roles in shaping the transition, as well as clarity on how their skills fit into the future energy landscape. Equity concerns also extended beyond workers to frontline communities, with calls to ensure that policies prioritize health, affordable transportation, and access to new economic opportunities.

Pathways Forward

Participants generally agreed that California can achieve carbon neutrality, but some questioned the feasibility of reaching 100% electrification in the near term, citing grid and charging infrastructure and transmission constraints. These participants favored a more balanced, incremental approach that emphasizes carbon neutrality, clean energy investments, and pragmatic timelines. They viewed both public and private sectors as critical to success and urged government leaders to provide clarity, incentives, and accountability while leveraging private-sector investment and partnerships.

Key Comments & Recommendations from Workgroup Meeting III

1. **Develop a comprehensive, statewide workforce transition plan** that includes job training, wage protection, pension security, and site remediation for affected workers and communities.

2. **Mandate industry-funded transition programs**, such as refinery taxes or polluter-pay models, to support worker retraining, job placement, and environmental cleanup.
3. **Ensure early, community-led planning** for refinery closures and land use transitions, prioritizing local voices and long-term resilience.
4. **Create formal certification pathways** that recognize existing skills of refinery workers to ease transitions into clean energy or infrastructure jobs.
5. **Address wage disparities and job quality** by enforcing strong labor standards in clean energy sectors, including union representation, safety regulations, and benefits.
6. **Expand and stabilize the Displaced Oil and Gas Workers Fund**, ensuring long-term support beyond pilot programs and addressing shortfalls in current funding.
7. **Provide targeted public investments in infrastructure and economic diversification** for vulnerable communities, especially those dependent on fossil fuel tax revenues.
8. **Advance site cleanup legislation** to ensure environmental liabilities are addressed by the oil industry, not shifted to local governments or taxpayers.
9. **Align clean energy investment with job creation in affected communities**, replicating the labor standards and industrial growth strategies found in the now largely repealed Inflation Reduction Act.
10. **Support bottom-up, place-based approaches** that recognize rural vs. urban differences (e.g., Kern County, with its leading fossil fuel production in a generally rural setting vs. Los Angeles County, with much urban fossil fuel production) in transition strategies.
11. **Incorporate labor and community benefit agreements** into development projects to ensure equity and shared prosperity in redevelopment efforts.
12. **Strengthen public-private partnerships** with clearly defined incentives and roles to attract clean energy investment without displacing union labor or communities.
13. **Conduct detailed statewide analyses** of tax revenue losses, job displacement, and economic ripple effects to guide future policy decisions.
14. **Center environmental justice in all transition efforts**, ensuring frontline communities are prioritized in investments, public health improvements, and job access.

In summary, participants emphasized the need for a proactive, worker-centered transition that includes strong labor protections, industry accountability, sustained public investment, and community-led planning. Key strategies involved funding workforce retraining, securing pensions and benefits, enforcing high labor standards in green jobs, repurposing refinery sites responsibly, and ensuring that environmental justice communities are prioritized. By

integrating these policies, participants believed California can achieve a more equitable and sustainable shift away from fossil fuels while supporting the workers and communities most impacted. Without a stronger commitment to worker protections and community investment, the promise of a “just transition” risks falling short.

Workgroup Meeting IV: Community Impacts of Refinery Closures (March 4, 2025)

The fourth meeting focused on the community-level impacts of refinery closures and transitions, with discussion grounded in the recently completed CARB-CEC community listening sessions in Richmond, Bakersfield, and Wilmington. A panel of environmental justice and advocacy leaders emphasized that communities near refineries have long borne disproportionate health and environmental burdens and that the energy transition should avoid replicating these inequities. Participants highlighted both the risks and opportunities of refinery phasedowns ranging from economic instability to the potential for cleaner air and diversified local development.

Community Concerns and Environmental Justice

Participants highlighted as a central theme the legacy of environmental racism and the urgent need for equitable transition planning. Residents in frontline communities reported persistent health harms and inadequate government response from the current fossil fuel infrastructure, as well as fears that new clean energy systems may remain unaffordable or inaccessible to them. They also expressed concerns regarding rising utility costs, limited electric vehicle access, and lack of fuel affordability. Panelists stressed that effective transition policies must prioritize community voices and ensure affordable, clean, and reliable energy for all.

Economic and Workforce Impacts

Communities expressed worry about job losses, declining tax revenues, and disruptions to local economies. Panelists underscored the importance of anticipatory planning to avoid abrupt shocks, highlighting the need for new, high-quality jobs in clean technology like renewable energy and electric vehicle infrastructure. They identified labor engagement as critical to ensuring that workers do not face wage cuts, weaker protections, or unsafe conditions in emerging industries. Without stable career pathways, the promise of a “just transition” risks could fall short for both workers and the communities they support.

Health and Safety Priorities

Speakers emphasized that refinery transitions must address both historic and ongoing health harms. They identified investments in site cleanup, pollution reduction, and preventive health protections as central to safeguarding communities long burdened by high asthma rates, toxic exposure, and cumulative impacts from fossil fuel pollution. They

wanted comprehensive transition plans to integrate health considerations alongside economic and workforce strategies.

Planning, Policy, and Accountability

The discussion reinforced the need for proactive, community-centered planning and strong state leadership. Recommendations included:

- Ensuring community-led decision-making and transparency in planning, funding, and cleanup.
- Implementing polluter-pays models, such as refinery taxes, to hold industry accountable for transition costs.
- Tailoring strategies to regional differences (e.g., rural Kern County vs. urban Los Angeles, as referenced above).
- Establishing long-term revenue replacement programs and funding for public services.
- Creating enforceable labor and community benefit standards to secure fair conditions in new industries.

Opportunities for Equitable Transition

While challenges remain, participants identified opportunities to reshape local economies, reduce pollution, and create high-road jobs. Investments in workforce retraining, infrastructure, local hire provisions and local economic diversification can provide lasting benefits if policy makers design them in partnership with communities and labor.

The fourth meeting highlighted that refinery transitions are not only technical or economic shifts but also deeply social and community-centered processes. Ensuring justice requires policy makers to recognize past harms, prevent new inequities, and embed community leadership in all aspects of planning. Participants stressed that without adequate planning, funding and accountability, refinery closures could worsen disparities. But with meaningful engagement, strong state coordination, and enforceable industry responsibility, the transition can instead deliver healthier, more resilient, and more equitable communities.

Conclusion

Across all workgroup meetings, community discussions, and expert panels, clear themes emerged. California's transition away from fossil fuels should be guided by principles of equity, accountability, and proactive planning, along with a recognition that refinery closures and fuel transitions represent not only technical and economic challenges but also deeply social ones, impacting the health, livelihoods, and resilience of the affected communities. Participants emphasized that without intentional policies, investments, and community leadership, the transition risks repeating the inequities of the past—exacerbating health disparities, economic shocks, and environmental injustice.

At the same time, the process offers a rare opportunity to repair historical harms, create high-road jobs, and build healthier, more sustainable local economies. Key priorities could include centering frontline voices in decision-making, ensuring affordable access to clean energy and transportation, protecting public health, supporting workers through training and stable career pathways, and holding industry accountable for transition costs. State leadership and cross-agency coordination can help align economic, environmental, and social goals, while providing transparency and consistency for communities and workers.

Ultimately, a successful transition requires more than phasing out fossil fuels—it demands building systems that are resilient, inclusive, and just. By embedding equity at every stage and treating impacted communities as partners, California policy makers can not only meet climate targets but also set a national example for how to achieve a fair and people-centered energy transition.

CARB and CEC plan to convene a fifth workgroup meeting following the release of the draft Transportation Fuel Transition Plan to discuss the draft plan and gather additional recommendations and feedback from participants.

Community Engagement Meetings

To hear directly from those who live, work, and breathe the air near refineries, CARB and CEC staff held three in-person meetings in early 2025 in Richmond (January 28th), Bakersfield (February 4th), and Wilmington (February 5th). At these meetings, staff presented background on the State’s climate and air quality goals as laid out in the 2022 Scoping Plan, fuel dynamics described in the TFA, and plans for the mid-transition development of a transportation fuels transition plan to ensure that the supply of transportation fuels is affordable, reliable, equitable, and adequate to meet declining demand. The meetings each lasted approximately two hours, with most of the time dedicated to listening and gathering feedback and recommendations based on the communities’ historical context and lived experiences. In all, there were over 150 participants in attendance, most of whom contributed substantially to the conversation on what the State should consider during this important transition. Participants represented a wide range of interested parties, including community-based organizations, local governments, labor, residents, academics, industry, and interested individuals.

Each community meeting had unique concerns and recommendations, with several key themes emerging across all three meetings, including:

Air quality, environmental justice, safety, and public health concerns from continued fossil and alternative fuel production,

The need and desire to collaborate across agencies, community, labor, and industry to ensure the workforce transition is done in an equitable way,

Questions about the tradeoffs associated with imports and exports of fuels, which will be required to meet the State's future fuel demand,

How this transition might affect the tax base in refinery communities including industries indirectly impacted, and who will pay for these changes,

Concerns about the pace of the transition and whether it is too rapid or not rapid enough,

Potential fuel unaffordability and access issues in communities that cannot transition to EVs as quickly as others,

The need to focus on labor impacts since oil and gas-related careers tend to include well-paying, highly-skilled, union jobs that are accessible to those without a college degree.

This feedback reinforced many of the central themes discussed at the workgroup meetings summarized earlier in this appendix. The community meetings also made it clear that the State must account for regional considerations when planning for a managed transition away from fossil fuels while simultaneously moving forward on ZEV priorities. Certain communities that have a larger share of their workforce dedicated to the fossil fuel industry, such as Bakersfield and the greater Kern County, expressed considerable interest in stabilizing fuel production and keeping these jobs in-state rather than focusing on imports from outside of California. Many residents of Richmond and Wilmington stressed the desire to transition away from in-state refinery operations sooner due to personal experiences with adverse health impacts from local air quality, and that equity must come first when proposing strategies.

Comments and discussions provided at community meetings as well as follow-up meetings with interested parties have been invaluable. New partnerships associated with the development of the TFTP will support continued collaboration and coordination as communities envision new opportunities for community transformation.