



SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
900 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90017
T: (213) 236-1800
www.scag.ca.gov

REGIONAL COUNCIL OFFICERS

President
Art Brown, Buena Park

First Vice President
Curt Hagman, County of San Bernardino

Second Vice President
Cindy Allen, Long Beach

Immediate Past President
Jan C. Harnik, Riverside County Transportation Commission

COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Executive/Administration
Art Brown, Buena Park

Community, Economic & Human Development
Frank Yokoyama, Cerritos

Energy & Environment
Deborah Robertson, Rialto

Transportation
Tim Sandoval, Pomona

MEETING OF THE

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Members of the Public are Welcome to Attend In-Person & Remotely

Thursday, November 2, 2023

9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

To Attend In-Person:

**SCAG Main Office - Regional Council Room
900 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90017**

To Watch or View Only:

<https://scag.ca.gov/scag-tv-livestream>

To Attend and Participate on Your Computer:

<https://scag.zoom.us/j/253270430>

To Attend and Participate by Phone:

**Call-in Number: 1-669-900-6833
Meeting ID: 253 270 430**

PUBLIC ADVISORY

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Maggie Aguilar at (213) 630-1420 or via email at aguilarm@scag.ca.gov. Agendas & Minutes are also available at: www.scag.ca.gov/committees.

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. SCAG is also committed to helping people with limited proficiency in the English language access the agency's essential public information and services. You can request such assistance by calling (213) 630-1420. We request at least 72 hours (three days) notice to provide reasonable accommodations and will make every effort to arrange for assistance as soon as possible.



Instructions for Attending the Meeting

To Attend In-Peron and Provide Verbal Comments: Go to the SCAG Main Office located at 900 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1700, Los Angeles, CA 90017 or any of the remote locations noticed in the agenda. The meeting will take place in the Regional Council Room on the 17th floor starting at 9:30 a.m.

To Attend by Computer: Click the following link: <https://scag.zoom.us/j/253270430>. If Zoom is not already installed on your computer, click “Download & Run Zoom” on the launch page and press “Run” when prompted by your browser. If Zoom has previously been installed on your computer, please allow a few moments for the application to launch automatically. Select “Join Audio via Computer.” The virtual conference room will open. If you receive a message reading, “Please wait for the host to start this meeting,” simply remain in the room until the meeting begins.

To Attend by Phone: Call **(669) 900-6833** to access the conference room. Given high call volumes recently experienced by Zoom, please continue dialing until you connect successfully. Enter the **Meeting ID: 253 270 430**, followed by #. Indicate that you are a participant by pressing # to continue. You will hear audio of the meeting in progress. Remain on the line if the meeting has not yet started.

Instructions for Participating and Public Comments

Members of the public can participate in the meeting via written or verbal comments.

1. **In Writing:** Written comments can be emailed to: ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov. Written comments received **by 5pm on Wednesday, November 1, 2023**, will be transmitted to members of the legislative body and posted on SCAG’s website prior to the meeting. You are **not** required to submit public comments in writing or in advance of the meeting; this option is offered as a convenience should you desire not to provide comments in real time as described below. Written comments received after 5pm on Wednesday, November 1, 2023, will be announced and included as part of the official record of the meeting. Any writings or documents provided to a majority of this committee regarding any item on this agenda (other than writings legally exempt from public disclosure) are available at the Office of the Clerk, at 900 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1700, Los Angeles, CA 90017 or by phone at (213) 630-1420, or email to aguilarm@scag.ca.gov.

OUR MISSION

To foster innovative regional solutions that improve the lives of Southern Californians through inclusive collaboration, visionary planning, regional advocacy, information sharing, and promoting best practices.

OUR VISION

Southern California’s Catalyst for a Brighter Future

OUR CORE VALUES

Be Open | Lead by Example | Make an Impact | Be Courageous



2. **Remotely:** If participating in real time via Zoom or phone, please wait for the presiding officer to call the item for which you wish to speak and use the “raise hand” function on your computer or *9 by phone and wait for SCAG staff to announce your name/phone number.
3. **In-Person:** If participating in-person, you are invited but not required, to fill out and present a Public Comment Card to the Clerk of the Board or other SCAG staff prior to speaking. It is helpful to indicate whether you wish to speak during the Public Comment Period (Matters Not on the Agenda) and/or on an item listed on the agenda.

General Information for Public Comments

Verbal comments can be presented in real time during the meeting. Members of the public are allowed a total of 3 minutes for verbal comments. The presiding officer retains discretion to adjust time limits as necessary to ensure efficient and orderly conduct of the meeting, including equally reducing the time of all comments.

For purpose of providing public comment for items listed on the Consent Calendar, please indicate that you wish to speak when the Consent Calendar is called. Items listed on the Consent Calendar will be acted on with one motion and there will be no separate discussion of these items unless a member of the legislative body so requests, in which event, the item will be considered separately.

In accordance with SCAG’s Regional Council Policy, Article VI, Section H and California Government Code Section 54957.9, if a SCAG meeting is “willfully interrupted” and the “orderly conduct of the meeting” becomes unfeasible, the presiding officer or the Chair of the legislative body may order the removal of the individuals who are disrupting the meeting.

OUR MISSION

To foster innovative regional solutions that improve the lives of Southern Californians through inclusive collaboration, visionary planning, regional advocacy, information sharing, and promoting best practices.

OUR VISION

Southern California’s Catalyst for a Brighter Future

OUR CORE VALUES

Be Open | Lead by Example | Make an Impact | Be Courageous



TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

TELECONFERENCE AVAILABLE AT THESE ADDITIONAL LOCATIONS*

<p>Adele Andrade-Stadler 2956 West Shorb Street Alhambra, CA 91803</p>	<p>Elizabeth Becerra City of Victorville - City Hall Conference Room A 14343 Civic Drive Victorville, CA 92392</p>	<p>Brian S. Berkson City of Jurupa Valley - City Hall 8930 Limonite Avenue Jurupa Valley, CA 92509</p>
<p>Russell Betts City of Desert Hot Springs - City Hall 11999 Palm Drive, Council Chambers Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240</p>	<p>Daniel Brotman City of Glendale - City Hall 613 E Broadway, Suite 200 Glendale, CA 91206</p>	<p>Ross Chun City of Laguna Hills - City Hall 24035 El Toro Road Laguna Hills, CA 92653</p>
<p>Denise Delgado City of Coachella - City Hall 1515 6th Street Coachella, CA 92236</p>	<p>Andrew Do County Administration North 400 West Civic Center Drive 6th Floor, Conference Room A Santa Ana, CA 92701</p>	<p>Jonathan Dumitru City of Orange - City Hall 300 E Chapman Avenue Orange, CA 92866</p>
<p>James Gazeley City of Lomita - City Hall 24300 Narboone Avenue City Council Office Lomita, CA 90717</p>	<p>Jason Gibbs City of Santa Clarita - City Hall 23920 Valencia Boulevard First Floor, Orchard Room Santa Clarita, CA 91355</p>	<p>Brian Goodell City of Mission Viejo - City Hall 200 Civic Center Serenata Conference Room Mission Viejo, CA 92691</p>
<p>Fred Jung City of Fullerton - City Hall 303 W. Commonwealth Avenue Fullerton, CA 92832</p>	<p>Trish Kelley City of Mission Viejo - City Hall 200 Civic Center Serenata Conference Room Mission Viejo, CA 92691</p>	<p>Linda Krupa City of Hemet - City Hall 445 E Florida Avenue Sister City Room Hemet, CA 92543</p>
<p>Bridgett Lewis City of Torrance - City Hall 3031 Torrance Boulevard Assembly Room - 3rd Floor Torrance, CA 90503</p>	<p>Malcolm Lilienthal City of Hemet - City Hall 445 E Florida Avenue Sister City Room Hemet, CA 92543</p>	<p>Richard Loa Law Offices of Richard Loa 536 East Palmdale Boulevard Palmdale, CA 93550</p>
<p>Clint Lorimore City of Eastvale - City Hall 12363 Limonite Avenue, #910 Eastvale, CA 91752</p>	<p>Ken Mann City of Lancaster - City Hall 44933 Fern Avenue Conference Room A Lancaster, CA 93534</p>	<p>Steve Manos City of Lake Elsinore - City Hall 130 South Main Street Conference Room B Lake Elsinore, CA 92530</p>



TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

<p>Marsha McLean City of Santa Clarita - City Hall 23920 Valencia Boulevard First Floor, Orchard Room Santa Clarita, CA 91355</p>	<p>Carol Moore City of Laguna Woods - City Hall 24264 El Toro Road Laguna Woods, CA 92637</p>	<p>Ara Najarian 50 N Brand Boulevard, Suite 830 Conference Room Glendale, CA 91203</p>
<p>Maria Nava-Froelich Calipatria Unified School District 501 W. Main Street, Room 4 Calipatria, CA 92233</p>	<p>Frank J. Navarro City of Colton – City Hall Council Conference Room 650 N La Cadena Drive Colton, Ca 92324</p>	<p>Sharona Nazarian City of Beverly Hills - City Hall 455 N. Rexford Drive Beverly Hills, CA 90210</p>
<p>Gil Rebollar Calipatria Unified School District 501 W. Main Street, Room 4 Calipatria, CA 92233</p>	<p>Ed Reece City of Claremont - City Hall 207 Harvard Avenue Council Office Room Claremont, CA 91711</p>	<p>Celeste Rodriguez City of San Fernando - City Hall 117 Macneil Street San Fernando, CA 91340</p>
<p>Crystal Ruiz 674 Sunnyside Boulevard San Jacinto, CA 92582</p>	<p>Suely Saro City of Long Beach - City Hall 400 W Ocean Blvd., 11th Floor Long Beach, CA 90802</p>	<p>Zak Schwank City of Temecula - City Hall 41000 Main Street Mayor's Office - Third Floor Temecula CA, 92590</p>
<p>Marty Simonoff City of Brea - City Hall 1 Civic Center Circle Management Services Room Brea, CA 92821</p>	<p>Karen Spiegel 1800 S. Main Street Corona, CA 92882</p>	<p>Cynthia Sternquist 6131 Camellia Avenue Temple City, CA 91780</p>
<p>Steve Tye City of Diamond Bar - City Hall 21810 Copley Drive Grand Conference Room Diamond Bar, CA91765</p>	<p>Michael M. Vargas City of Perris - City Hall Office of the Mayor 101 N. D Street Perris, CA 92570</p>	<p>Scott Voigts County Administration North 400 West Civic Center Drive 6th Floor, Conference Room A Santa Ana, CA 92701</p>
<p>Donald P. Wagner County Administration North 400 West Civic Center Drive 6th Floor, Conference Room A Santa Ana, CA 92701</p>	<p>Alan D. Wapner City of Ontario - City Hall 303 East B Street Conference Room 1 Ontario, CA 91764</p>	<p>Jeff Wood Lakewood City Council Chamber/Offices 5000 Clark Avenue Lakewood, CA 90712</p>

* Under the teleconferencing rules of the Brown Act, members of the body may remotely participate at any location specified above.



TC - Transportation Committee *Members – November 2023*

1. **Hon. Tim Sandoval**
TC Chair, Pomona, RC District 38
2. **Hon. Mike Judge**
TC Vice Chair, VCTC
3. **Hon. Adele Andrade-Stadler**
Alhambra, RC District 34
4. **Hon. Konstantine Anthony**
Burbank, RC District 42
5. **Hon. Kathryn Barger**
Los Angeles County
6. **Hon. Elizabeth Becerra**
Victorville, RC District 65
7. **Hon. Brian Berkson**
Jurupa Valley, Pres. Appt. (Member at Large)
8. **Hon. Russell Betts**
Desert Hot Springs, CVAG
9. **Hon. Daniel Brotman**
Glendale, AVCJPA
10. **Hon. Art Brown**
Buena Park, RC District 21
11. **Hon. Ross Chun**
Aliso Viejo, OCCOG
12. **Hon. Denise Delgado**
Coachella, Pres. Appt. (Member at Large)
13. **Sup. Andrew Do**
Orange County CoC
14. **Hon. Jon Dumitru**
Orange, RC District 17
15. **Hon. JJohn Dutrey**
Montclair, SBCTA

OUR MISSION

To foster innovative regional solutions that improve the lives of Southern Californians through inclusive collaboration, visionary planning, regional advocacy, information sharing, and promoting best practices.

OUR VISION

Southern California's Catalyst for a Brighter Future

OUR CORE VALUES

Be Open | Lead by Example | Make an Impact | Be Courageous



TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

- 16. Hon. James Gazeley**
Lomita, RC District 39
- 17. Hon. Jason Gibbs**
Santa Clarita, NCTC
- 18. Hon. Brian Goodell**
OCTA Representative
- 19. Sup. Curt Hagman**
San Bernardino County
- 20. Hon. Jan C. Harnik**
RCTC
- 21. Hon. Laura Hernandez**
Port Hueneme, RC District 45
- 22. Hon. Lauren Hughes-Leslie**
Lancaster, NCTC JPA
- 23. Hon. Heather Hutt**
Los Angeles, RC District 57
- 24. Hon. Fred Jung**
Fullerton, OCCOG
- 25. Hon. Trish Kelley**
TCA Representative
- 26. Hon. Paul Krekorian**
Los Angeles, RC District 49/Public Transit Rep.
- 27. Hon. Linda Krupa**
Hemet, RC District 3
- 28. Hon. Bridgett Lewis**
Torrance, Pres. Appt (Member at Large)
- 29. Malcolm Lilienthal**
Hemet, WRCOG
- 30. Hon. Richard Loa**
Palmdale, NCTC
- 31. Hon. Clint Lorimore**
Eastvale, RC District 4

OUR MISSION

To foster innovative regional solutions that improve the lives of Southern Californians through inclusive collaboration, visionary planning, regional advocacy, information sharing, and promoting best practices.

OUR VISION

Southern California's Catalyst for a Brighter Future

OUR CORE VALUES

Be Open | Lead by Example | Make an Impact | Be Courageous



- 32. Hon. Ken Mann**
Lancaster, RC District 43
- 33. Hon. Steve Manos**
Lake Elsinore, RC District 63
- 34. Hon. Ray Marquez**
Chino Hills, RC District 10
- 35. Hon. Larry McCallon**
Highland, RC District 7/Air District Rep.
- 36. Hon. Marsha McLean**
Santa Clarita, Pres. Appt. (Member at Large)
- 37. Hon. Tim McOsker**
Los Angeles, RC District 62
- 38. Hon. L.Dennis Michael**
Rancho Cucamonga, RC District 9
- 39. Hon. Linda Molina**
Calimesa, Pres. Appt. (Member at Large)
- 40. Hon. Carol Moore**
Laguna Woods, OCCOG
- 41. Hon. Ara Najarian**
Glendale, SFVCOG
- 42. Hon. Maria Nava-Froelich**
ICTC
- 43. Hon. Frank Navarro**
Colton, RC District 6
- 44. Hon. Sharona Nazarian**
Beverly Hills, WSCCOG
- 45. Hon. Gil Rebolgar**
Brawley, RC District 1
- 46. Hon. Ed Reece**
Claremont, SGVCOG
- 47. Hon. Celeste Rodriguez**
San Fernando, RC District 67

OUR MISSION

To foster innovative regional solutions that improve the lives of Southern Californians through inclusive collaboration, visionary planning, regional advocacy, information sharing, and promoting best practices.

OUR VISION

Southern California's Catalyst for a Brighter Future

OUR CORE VALUES

Be Open | Lead by Example | Make an Impact | Be Courageous



- 48. Hon. Crystal Ruiz**
San Jacinto, WRCOG

- 49. Hon. Ali Saleh**
Bell, RC District 27

- 50. Hon. Suely Saro**
Long Beach, RC District 29

- 51. Hon. Zak Schwank**
Temecula, RC District 5

- 52. Hon. Marty Simonoff**
Brea, RC District 22

- 53. Hon. Jeremy Smith**
Canyon Lake, Pres. Appt. (Member at Large)

- 54. Hon. Ward Smith**
Placentia, OCCOG

- 55. Hon. Jose Luis Solache**
Lynwood, RC District 26

- 56. Sup. Hilda Solis**
Los Angeles County

- 57. Hon. Wes Speake**
Corona, WRCOG

- 58. Sup. Karen Spiegel**
Riverside County

- 59. Hon. Cynthia Sternquist**
Temple City, SGVCOG

- 60. Hon. Steve Tye**
Diamond Bar, RC District 37

- 61. Hon. Michael Vargas**
Riverside County CoC

- 62. Hon. Scott Voigts**
Lake Forest, OCCOG

- 63. Sup. Donald Wagner**
Orange County

OUR MISSION

To foster innovative regional solutions that improve the lives of Southern Californians through inclusive collaboration, visionary planning, regional advocacy, information sharing, and promoting best practices.

OUR VISION

Southern California's Catalyst for a Brighter Future

OUR CORE VALUES

Be Open | Lead by Example | Make an Impact | Be Courageous



TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

64. Hon. Colleen Wallace
Banning, WRCOG

65. Hon. Alan Wapner
SBCTA

66. Hon. Thomas Wong
Monterey Park, SGVCOG

67. Hon. Jeff Wood
Lakewood, RC District 24

OUR MISSION

To foster innovative regional solutions that improve the lives of Southern Californians through inclusive collaboration, visionary planning, regional advocacy, information sharing, and promoting best practices.

OUR VISION

Southern California's Catalyst for a Brighter Future

OUR CORE VALUES

Be Open | Lead by Example | Make an Impact | Be Courageous



TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Southern California Association of Governments
900 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1700 – Regional Council Room
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Thursday, November 2, 2023
9:30 AM

The Transportation Committee may consider and act upon any of the items on the agenda regardless of whether they are listed as Information or Action items.

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(The Honorable Tim Sandoval, Chair)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD (Matters Not on the Agenda)

This is the time for public comments on any matter of interest within SCAG's jurisdiction that is **not** listed on the agenda. For items listed on the agenda, public comments will be received when that item is considered. Although the committee may briefly respond to statements or questions, under state law, matters presented under this item cannot be discussed or acted upon at this time.

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval Items

1. Minutes of the Meeting – October 5, 2023 PPG. 10

Receive and File

2. Transportation Committee Agenda Outlook and Future Agenda Items PPG. 20
3. Recommendation and Authorization to Release the Connect SoCal 2024 Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) (State Clearinghouse No.: 2022100337) PPG. 25
4. 2020 Sustainable Communities Program – Overview PPG. 38
5. Update on SCAG's Broadband Program PPG. 47
6. Sustainable Communities Program - Smart Cities & Mobility Innovations Call for Projects: Parking Bundle Project Outcomes PPG. 52

ACTION ITEMS

7. FY2023-FY2026 Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) Guidelines 10 Mins. PPG. 67
(Warren Whiteaker, Department Manager)

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Recommend that the Regional Council: 1) approve CRP Program Guidelines; and 2) authorize Executive Director to initiate call for projects consistent with approved guidelines.



TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

INFORMATION ITEMS

- | | | |
|---|----------|----------|
| 8. Smart Freeways – An Introduction to the Next Generation of Freeway Traffic Management Systems
<i>(Darren Henderson, Technical Director – Freeway Operations and Advanced Traffic Management, GHD)</i> | 30 Mins. | PPG. 81 |
| 9. SCAG's Clean Transportation Technology Compendium
<i>(Sam Pournazeri, Senior Director of Clean Transportation and Energy, ICF)</i> | 15 Mins. | PPG. 97 |
| 10. Federal Transportation Funding in the SCAG Region: The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act
<i>(Warren Whiteaker, Department Manager)</i> | 10 Mins. | PPG. 270 |
| 11. 2023 Go Human Safety Strategies Outcomes
<i>(Alina Borja, Community Engagement Specialist)</i> | 15 Mins. | PPG. 281 |
| 12. SB 671 Clean Freight Corridor Efficiency Assessment Update
<i>(Scott Strelecki, Planning Supervisor)</i> | 15 Mins. | PPG. 297 |

CHAIR'S REPORT

(The Honorable Tim Sandoval, Chair)

METROLINK REPORT

(The Honorable Art Brown, SCAG Representative)

STAFF REPORT

(David Salgado, Government Affairs Officer, SCAG Staff)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADJOURNMENT



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (TC)
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2023**

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES IS A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (TC). A VIDEO AND AUDIO RECORDING OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE AT: <http://scag.iqm2.com/Citizens/>

The Transportation Committee (TC) of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) held its regular meeting virtually (telephonically and electronically), given the declared state of emergency (pursuant to State of Emergency Proclamation dated March 4, 2020) and local public health directives imposing and recommending social distancing measures due to the threat of COVID-19, and pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(e)(1)(A). A quorum was present.

Members Present:

Hon. Adele Andrade-Stadler, Alhambra	District 34
Hon. Liz Becerra, SBCTA/SBCTA	District 65
Hon. Brian Berkson, Jurupa Valley	Pres. Appt. (Member at Large)
Hon. Russel Betts, Desert Hot Springs	CVAG
Hon. Daniel Brotman, Glendale	AVCJPA
Hon. Art Brown, OCTA	District 21
Hon. Andrew Do	Orange County CoC
Hon. Jonathan Dumitru, Orange	District 17
Hon. John Dutrey, Montclair	SBCTA/SBCCOG
Hon. James Gazeley, SBCCOG	District 39
Hon. Jason Gibbs, Santa Clarita	NCTC
Hon. Brian Goodell, Mission Viejo	OCTA
Hon. Curt Hagman	San Bernardino County
Hon. Jan Harnik	RCTC
Hon. Laura Hernandez, VCOG	District 45
Hon. Mike T. Judge, (Vice Chair)	VCTC
Hon. Fred Jung, Fullerton	OCCOG
Hon. Trish Kelley	TCA
Hon. Linda Krupa, Hemet	District 3
Hon. Malcolm Lilienthal, Hemet	WRCOG
Hon. Clint Lorimore, Eastvale	District 4
Hon. Ken Mann, Lancaster	District 43



Hon. Steve Manos, Lake Elsinore	District 63
Hon. Ray Marquez, Chino Hills	District 10
Hon. Larry McCallon	Air District Representative
Hon. Marsha McLean, Santa Clarita	Pres. Appt. (Member at Large)
Hon. Tim McOsker, Los Angeles	District 62
Hon. Carol Moore, Laguna Woods	OCCOG
Hon. Ara Najarian, Glendale	AVCJPA
Hon. Maria Nava-Froelich	ICTC
Hon. Frank Navarro, Colton	District 6
Hon. Sharona Nazarian, Beverly Hills	WSCCOG
Hon. Ed Reece, Claremont	SGVCOG
Hon. Crystal Ruiz, San Jacinto	WRCOG
Hon. Ali Saleh, Bell	District 27
Hon. Tim Sandoval, Pomona (Chair)	District 38
Hon. Zak Schwank, Temecula	District 5
Hon. Marty Simonoff, Brea	District 22
Hon. Ward Smith, Placentia	OCCOG
Hon. Jose Luis Solache, Lynwood	District 26
Hon. Speake, Wes, Corona	WRCOG
Hon. Karen Spiegel	Riverside County
Hon. Cynthia Sternquist, Temple City	SGVCOG
Hon. Michael Vargas	Riverside County CoC
Hon. Scott Voigts, Lake Forest	OCCOG
Hon. Don Wagner	Orange County
Hon. Alan Wapner, Ontario	SBCTA/SBCOG
Hon. Thomas Wong, Monterey Park	SGVCOG
Hon. Jeff Wood, GCCOG	District 24
Mr. Paul Marquez, Caltrans District 7	Ex-Officio Member

Members Not Present:

Hon. Konstantine Anthony, Burbank	District 42
Hon. Kathryn Barger	Los Angeles County
Hon. Ross Chun, Aliso Viejo	OCCOG
Hon. Denise Delgado, Coachella	Pres. Appt. (Member at Large)
Hon. Heather Hutt, Los Angeles	District 45
Hon. Paul Krekorian, Los Angeles	District 49/Public Transit Rep.
Hon. Bridgett Lewis, Torrance	Pres. Appt.
Hon. Richard Loa, Palmdale	NCTC
Hon. L. Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga	District 9
Hon. Linda Molina, Calimesa	Pres. Appt. (Member at Large)



Hon. Gil Rebollar, ICTC	District 1
Hon. Suely Saro, Long Beach	District 29
Hon. Jeremy Smith, Canyon Lake	Canyon Lake
Hon. Hilda Solis	Los Angeles County
Hon. Steve Tye, Diamon Bar	District 37
Hon. Wallace, Colleen, Banning	WRCOG

CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Vice Chair Mike Judge, Simi Valley, Ventura County Transportation Commission, called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. A quorum was present.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Vice Chair Judge opened the Public Comment Period and outlined instructions for public comments. He noted this was the time for persons to comment on any matter pertinent to SCAG's jurisdiction that were not listed on the agenda. He reminded the public to submit comments via email to TCPublicComment@scag.ca.gov. Ruben Duran, Board Counsel, acknowledged there were no public comments received by email before or after the deadline.

Seeing no public comment speakers, Vice Chair Judge closed the Public Comment Period.

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

There were no requests to prioritize agenda items.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Vice Chair Judge opened the Public Comment Period.

Seeing no public comment speakers, Vice Chair Judge closed the Public Comment Period. Vice Chair Judge noted that there would be a revision to the minutes of the July 6, 2023 meeting to indicate that Committee member, Hon. Trish Kelley, Mission Viejo, is the Committee representative for the Transportation Corridor Agencies and not Orange County Council of Governments.

Approval Items

1. Minutes of the Meeting – July 6, 2023
2. 2025 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Guidelines

Receive and File

3. Acceptance of FY24 Office of Traffic Safety Grant Funds
4. Sustainable Communities Program – Civic Engagement, Equity, and Environmental Justice Award Recommendation
5. South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 2202 Amendment
6. Transit Ridership Update
7. LOSSAN Rail Corridor Resiliency Subcommittee Update
8. Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) 2.0 Program Update
9. Gas Tax Revenue Decline and Zero Emission Vehicle Transition

A MOTION was made (Harnik) to approve Consent Calendar Item 1 (as revised) and 2, and Receive and File items 3 through 9. The motion was SECONDED (Solache) and passed by the following roll call votes.

AYES: Becerra, Betts, Brotman, Brown, Do, Dumitru, Dutrey, Gazeley, Gibbs, Goodell, Hagman, Harnik, Judge, Jung, Kelley, Krupa, Lilienthal, Lorimore, Mann, Manos, Marquez, McCallon, McLean, Moore, Najarian, Nava-Froelich, Navarro, Nazarian, Reece, Ruiz, Saleh, Sandoval, Schwank, Simonoff, W. Smith, Solache, Speake, Sternquist, Vargas, Wagner, Wapner, Wong, Wood (43)

NOES: None (0)

ABSTAIN: None (0)

INFORMATION ITEMS

10. Transportation Committee Outlook and Future Items

There were no Public Comments on Item 10.

Annie Nam, SCAG staff, provided a report on the committee outlook through June 2024. Ms. Nam noted that the outlook was organized for three program areas: Connect SoCal, Local Assistance Program and regional updates. She shared that staff would provide support to assist local partners for the Regional Early Action Program (REAP 2.0), the County Transportation Commission

partnership program and Regional Pilot Initiative (RPI) among others. She also noted that they would bring upcoming state and federal funding opportunities and provide SCAG's role in these programs.

11. Smart Cities Update: Future Communities (FCPP) & Mobility Innovations (SCP Call 3)

There were no Public Comments on Item 11.

Marisa Laderach, SCAG staff, reported on Future Communities Pilot Program and the Smart Cities Innovations. Ms. Laderach shared the FCPP was a \$4 million program with a goal to apply new technologies and data analytics to reduce vehicles miles travelled and greenhouse gas emissions. She noted that it would promote pilots that can be replicated in the region. She explained that the program began in 2019 but was disrupted by COVID and noted most of the projects had been concluded but four would conclude within months and a final report would be issued. The projects are an integrated real-time parking guidance in Anaheim, online permitting in Cerritos, facilitation of BlueLA fleet in Los Angeles and broadband implementation in Ontario. She also provided an overview of the completed projects in Glendale, Monrovia, Riverside and San Bernardino County. She highlighted that these projects were successful in reducing vehicle miles travelled and could be modeled by other jurisdictions. For example, online permitting in Riverside increased significantly with the introduction of the Integrated Electronic Plans reducing miles travelled by 6,200 monthly. San Bernardino, the nation's largest county, realized VMT reduction with the development of their Remote Electronic Warrants Program. Modernizing the process with technology provided efficiency and time savings. She also reported on the Mobility Innovations projects. She noted the Sustainable Communities Program (SCP) supports implementation of 2020 Connect SoCal. Curb space management has risen as an important area for mobility innovation, and she reviewed the curb space projects stating there are eight research efforts in cities regionally to evaluate curb space usage and potential opportunities for innovation. Ms. Laderach reported the findings indicating that online portals are very popular, and demand is growing particularly for permitting, warranting and other administrative activities that can be more efficient with modernization.

Hon. Curt Hagman, San Bernardino County, commented that their Remote Electronic Warrants Program has been successful in bringing efficiency and time savings to their warranting process. It has resulted in the reduction of 250,000 vehicle miles travelled.

Hon. Karen Spiegel, Riverside County, asked if education was a part of these pilot programs particularly those involving senior citizens. Ms. Laderach responded that education and user assistance was a pilot component.

Hon. Trish Kelley, Mission Viejo, TCA, suggested that these successful pilot projects can be shared out as part of SCAG's Toolbox Tuesday program. Ms. Laderach responded that it would be a great addition to the series and would look into scheduling it.

12. Regional Mobility Hubs Strategy

There were no Public Comments on Item 12.

Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, SCAG staff, reported on Regional Mobility Hubs Strategy. She noted that mobility hubs are part of a mix of mobility strategies identified in Connect SoCal 2020 to promote regional mobility. Mobility hubs are locations where travelers can connect to multiple modes of transportation in a safe, comfortable environment serving as one-stop mobility centers. These options can include public transit/rail, active transportation and shared mobility services. The goal of the strategy is to expand the network of mobility hubs in the region and develop a connected network. Hubs also encourage greater participation and coordination by those providing these services and shape greater system integration. Ms. Freduah-Agyemang provided examples of mobility hubs in the region including Union Station, Hollywood Station, and Wilshire/Vermont as connections with car share, bike share, bus shelters and transit. Fontana and Montclair Transit centers were highlighted in San Bernardino County. She reviewed mobility hub strategies in the region which plan for future sites and strategies in each county. Additionally, hub site criteria was reviewed which helped identify good locations such as those near major sports events. She reviewed next steps including developing guidance on design and implementation and continued work with stakeholders.

Hon. Larry McCallon, Air District Representative, commented that hubs also include the San Bernardino Downtown Transit Center which connects Arrow Service, Metrolink, Omnitrans bus service and serves as a vibrant mobility center for the city and greater area.

Hon. Marsha McLean, NLAC, District 67, announced that on October 20, 2023 there will be a grand opening of the North County Vista Canyon multi-modal center which will connect with Metrolink and other mobility options.

13. Transportation System Performance Update – Vehicle Miles Traveled

There were no Public Comments on Item 13.

Jeremy Marks, SCAG staff, provided an update on transportation system performance. He stated these updates sought to identify how travel behavior has changed since COVID and would be quarterly. He reviewed vehicle miles traveled noting a significant drop off at the start of the pandemic but nearly recovering November/December 2021 along with holiday activity. Vehicle

delay was examined, and data indicated it decreased during the pandemic and had returned with increased traffic although not fully to pre-pandemic levels perhaps due to the increase in work at home and other societal changes.

CHAIR'S REPORT

Hon. Tim Sandoval, Pomona, District 38, welcomed new members Tim McOsker, Los Angeles, District 62, Jeff Wood, Lakewood, Gateway Cities COG, and Daniel Brotman, Glendale, AVCJPA. He also reported that SCAG's 14th Economic Summit would be held December 7, 2023 and elected officials were welcome to attend for free.

METROLINK REPORT

Hon. Art Brown, Buena Park, District 21, reported that beginning October 23, Metrolink would add four additional weekday trains and six additional weekend trains on the Antelope Valley Line. The new schedule included a late-night weekday train departing L.A. Union Station at 11:39 p.m. Along with the October schedule change, the city of Santa Clarita would open its new Vista Canyon station, adding a new access point to the Metrolink system. Also in August, Metrolink relaunched its low-income discount program with a new branding called the "Mobility-4-All" program. Metrolink passengers with a California Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) card are eligible for a 50% discount on all Metrolink tickets and passes. Since Metrolink began the program in September 2022, it has sold more than 80,000 tickets with the discounted fare.

STAFF REPORT

David Salgado, SCAG staff, reported that applications for the Regional Utilities Supporting Housing Pilot Program were now open through November 6, 2023. He noted that the call for projects funding program would award \$35 million regionally. He also shared that in November the Draft Connect SoCal would be released followed by public workshops throughout the region and members were encouraged to look for events in their area.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Hon. Ken Mann, Lancaster, requested a discussion on formulaic funding for the Infrastructure Investment in Jobs Act including a breakdown for cities in the region.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Sandoval adjourned the Transportation Committee meeting at 11:03 a.m.



[MINUTES ARE UNOFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED BY THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE]

//

MEMBERS	CITY	Representing	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB
Andrade-Stadler, Adele	Alhambra	District 34					1				
Anthony, Konstantine	Burbank	District 42	1	1							
Barger, Kathryn		Los Angeles County		1							
Becerra, Liz	Victorville	District 65	1	1			1				
Berkson, Brian	Jurupa Valley	Pres Appt.	1	1			1				
Betts, Russell	Desert Hot Springs	CVAG		1			1				
Brotman, Daniel	Glendale	AVCJPA					1				
Brown, Art	Buena Park	District 21	1	1			1				
Chun, Ross	Aliso Viejo	OCTA	1	1							
Delgado, Denise	Coachella	Pres. Appt.	1	1							
Do, Andrew		Orange County	1	1			1				
Dumitru, Jonathan	Orange County	District 17		1			1				
Dutrey, J. John	Montclair	SBCTA	1	1			1				
Gazeley, James	Lomita	District 39	1	1			1				
Gibbs, Jason	Santa Clarita	NCTC		1			1				
Goodell, Brian	Mission Viejo	OCTA	1	1			1				
Hagman, Curt		San Bernardino Cnty	1	1			1				
Harnik, Jan	Palm Desert	RCTC	1	1			1				
Hernandez, Laura	Prt Hueneme	District 45		1			1				
Hutt, Heather	Los Angeles	District 57									
Judge, Mike	Simi Valley	VCTC	1	1			1				
Jung, Fred		OCCOG	1	1			1				
Kelley, Trish	Mission Viejo	OCCOG	1	1			1				
Krekorian, Paul	Public Transit Rep	District 49									
Krupa, Linda	Hemet	WRCOG	1	1			1				
Lewis, Bridgett	Torrance	Pres. Appt.		1							
Lilienthal, Malcolm	Hemet	WRCOG	1	1			1				
Loa, Richard	Palmdale	NCTC		1							
Lorimore, Clint	Eastvale	District 4	1	1			1				
Mann, Ken	No. L.A. County	District 43	1	1			1				
Manos, Steve	Lake Elsinore	District 63	1	1			1				
Marquez, Paul	Caltrans District 7	Ex-Officio	1	1							
Marquez, Ray	Chino Hills	District 10	1	1			1				
McCallon, Larry	SBCTA/SBCCOG	District 7					1				
McLean, Marsha	No. L.A. County	District 67	1	1			1				
McOsker, Tim	Los Angeles	District 62					1				
Michael, L. Dennis	Rancho Cucamonga	District 9	1	1							
Molina, Linda	Calimesa	Pres. Appt.	1	1							
Moore, Carol	Laguna Woods	OCCOG	1	1			1				
Najararian, Ara	Glendale	AVCJPA	1	1			1				
Nava-Froelich, Maria		ICTC	1	1			1				
Navarro, Frank	Colton	District 6		1			1				
Nazarian, Sharona	Beverly Hills	WSCCOG	1	1			1				
Rebollar, Gil	ICTC	District 1	1	1							
Reece, Ed	Claremont	SGVCOG	1	1			1				
Ruiz, Crystal	San Jacinto	WRCOG	1				1				

Saleh, Ali	City of Bell	GCCOG	1	1		1			
Sandoval, Tim	Pomona	District 38	1	1		1			
Saro, Suely	Long Beach	District 29	1	1					
Schwank, Zak	Temecula	District 5	1	1		1			
Simonoff, Marty	Brea	District 22	1	1		1			
Smith, Jeremy	Canyon Lake	Canyon Lake							
Smith, Ward	Placentia	OCCOG	1	1		1			
Solache, Jose Luis	Lynwood	District 26	1			1			
Solis, Hilda		Los Angeles County							
Speake, Wes	Corona	WRCOG	1	1		1			
Spiegel, Karen		Riverside County		1		1			
Sternquist, Cynthia	Temple City	SGVCOG	1	1		1			
Tye, Steve	Diamond Bar	District 37		1					
Vargas, Michael		Riverside County		1		1			
Voigts, Scott	Lake Forest	Orange County		1		1			
Wagner, Don	Orange County	Orange County	1	1		1			
Wallace, Colleen	Banning	WRCOG	1	1					
Wapner, Alan		SBCTA	1	1		1			
Wong, Thomas	Monterey Park	SGVCOG	1	1		1			
Wood, Jeff	GCCOG	District 24				1			



AGENDA ITEM 2
REPORT

Southern California Association of Governments
November 2, 2023

To: Transportation Committee (TC)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S
APPROVAL

From: Annie Nam, Deputy Director
(213) 236-1827, Nam@scag.ca.gov

Subject: Transportation Committee Agenda Outlook and Future Agenda Items

Kome Ajise

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Receive and File

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The draft Policy Development Framework (“Policy Framework”) for Connect SoCal 2024 was presented to the Transportation Committee (TC) on April 7, 2022. Following the Regional Council adoption of the Framework on June 2, 2022, staff developed a 12-month TC Outlook, to realize the goals and discussions committed to in the Policy Framework and develop consensus around the policy priorities that will become final recommendations in Connect SoCal 2024. For FY2024, the TC Outlook reflects outcomes of the 2023 Executive Administration Committee (EAC) Retreat and discussions with the TC Chair and Vice Chair. The Committee Outlook and Future Agenda Items will be updated monthly as a receive & file item.

BACKGROUND:

Policy Development Framework for Connect SoCal 2024

The draft Policy Framework for Connect SoCal 2024 was presented to the TC on April 7, 2022 and was adopted by the Regional Council at the June 2, 2022 meeting. The Policy Framework is intended to facilitate the engagement of SCAG’s Policy Committees in the data, emerging issues and policy recommendations that will be presented in Connect SoCal 2024. In furtherance of the adopted Policy Framework, staff developed “Committee Outlook” for each of the three Policy committees (CEHD, TC and EEC) organized around three areas: Connect SoCal, Local Assistance Program and Regional Updates.

Transportation Committee Outlook and Framework

Building on the Policy Framework and the commitment to creating more transparency and engagement in the policy development process, staff updated the Outlook for the Transportation Committee (TC) for FY2024.

The Outlook organizes content into three programmatic areas:

- 1. *Connect SoCal:*** Items within this area will center on efforts to implement Connect SoCal 2020, updates on the plan development process for 2024, and discussion of key policy issues and emerging trends for the 2024 Connect SoCal. Presentations will offer best practices, lessons learned and emerging trends in key policy areas centered on transportation. The FY2024 Outlook summarizes the items that will be coming before the TC that is related to the development of Connect SoCal 2024.
- 2. *Local Assistance Program:*** In this programmatic area, staff will present informational and action items related to programs that provide assistance to local partners. Programs that will be highlighted through the TC include: the development and implementation of the Regional Early Action Planning Grant program 2.0 (REAP 2.0) along with milestone updates, with a focus on the County Transportation Commission (CTC) Partnership Program and the Regional Pilot Initiatives (RPI) Program; the Last Mile Freight Program; the Future Communities Pilot Program; and the Go Human Program, amongst others.
- 3. *Regional Updates:*** This programmatic area will focus on updates and approvals, such as the Trade Corridor Enhancement Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program, Surface Transportation Block Grant and Carbon Reduction Program. Committee members may also recommend other policy topics for exploration.

The Committee Outlook is tracked to when the draft 2024 Connect SoCal will be published. Staff will ensure that the various policy and strategy recommendations in Connect SoCal 2024 will be reviewed and discussed by SCAG's policy committees through April 2024. The topics and panels covered may change based on speaker availability, progress on the targeted programs, and other requests from the Committee Chair and Vice Chair as well as members. To request future agenda items, Policy Committee members may request that the agenda item be pulled for discussion or they may send a request directly to the Chair or committee staff for consideration and reporting out at the next meeting. Agenda items that are recommended by Policy Committee members will be discussed with the Chair and Vice Chair to assess relevance to the TC and the considerations noted above.



FISCAL IMPACT:

Work associated with this item is included in the FY 2024 Indirect Cost Program (810.0120.20: Planning Policy Development).

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. TC Outlook for FY24_Nov 2023

Transportation Committee Agenda Outlook for FY2024

Anticipated major actions and information items. Does not include all Receive/File and Program Updates.

Date	Connect SoCal	Local Assistance Program	Regional Update
July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ü Transit Target Setting (R&F) ü Connect SoCal 2024 Outreach Update 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ü REAP 2.0 CTC Partnership Program Project Selection ü REAP 2.0 Regional Pilot Initiatives Program Framework ü GO Human Community Hubs: Project Award List Highlight 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ü LOSSAN Rail Corridor Resiliency Subcommittee Update
Sept	Joint Policy Committee: Connect SoCal 2024 Draft Plan Review		
Oct-Dec	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ü Connect SoCal 2024: Release of Draft for Public Review and Comment ü 2025 FTIP Guidelines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clean Technology Compendium Findings ü SCAG Mobility Hub Strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advanced Air Mobility (moved to Jan-March) • Highways to Boulevards Regional Study (moved to Jan-March) • Guest Speaker Series: Smart Freeways • Clean Technology Compendium Findings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptance of CPUC Local Agency Technical Assistance (LATA) Funds (see Broadband Program update) • Broadband Program Update ü Future Communities Pilot Program Update ü Smart Cities & Mobility Innovations (SCP Call 3) Update • Climate Pollution Reduction Grants Update (moved to Jan.-March) • Go Human Program Overview/Highlights/Success • Carbon Reduction Program: CTC Program Guidelines & Call for Projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TC 12 Month Agenda Outlook • Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP)/SB 671 Update (R&F) • CMAQ/STBG/CRP MOU with County Transportation Commissions (R&F) (see CRP guidelines)

Transportation Committee Agenda Outlook for FY2024

Anticipated major actions and information items. Does not include all Receive/File and Program Updates.

Date	Connect SoCal	Local Assistance Program	Regional Update
Jan-Mar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connect SoCal 2024: Summary of Comments and Revision Approach • Zero Emission Truck Infrastructure Study (ZETI) Outreach Findings • Transportation Pricing & Incentives Joint MPO Research Update • Comprehensive Goods Movement Plan Update (moved to June) • Guest Speaker Series: Replacing the Gas Tax • Guest Speaker Series: Congestion Pricing & Equity • Guest Speaker Series: Mobility Hubs • Clean Technology Compendium Findings (moved to Nov.) • Highways to Boulevards Regional Study • Advanced Air Mobility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curb Space Management Update (R&F) • Carbon Reduction Program: CTC Program Project Selection (moved to June) • Last Mile Freight Program Update • Broadband LATA Update (moved to Nov.) • SCAG ATP Cycle 7 Regional Program & AT&S Sustainable Communities Programs Guidelines • Climate Pollution Reduction Grants Update 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metrolink Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Study • Broadband Permit Streamlining Report Findings • EV Oasis Project Update • REAP 2.0 Regional Pilot Initiatives Program Update
April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connect SoCal 2024: Final Adoption • Proposed Final Transportation Conformity Analysis for Connect SoCal 2024 • Recommendation for RC to Adopt the Connect SoCal 2024 Final PEIR (R&F) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LOSSAN Rail Corridor Resiliency Subcommittee Update (R&F)
May	General Assembly		
June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connect SoCal 2024: Implementation Strategies • Comprehensive Goods Movement Plan Update 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REAP 2.0 CTC Partnership Program and Regional Pilot Initiatives Update • Carbon Reduction Program: CTC Program Project Selection 	Smart Cities Vision Plan Update



AGENDA ITEM 3
REPORT

Southern California Association of Governments
November 2, 2023

To: Community Economic & Human Development Committee (CEHD)
Energy & Environment Committee (EEC)
Transportation Committee (TC)
Regional Council (RC)

From: Karen Calderon, Senior Regional Planner
(213) 236-1983, calderon@scag.ca.gov

Subject: Recommendation and Authorization to Release the Connect SoCal 2024
Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) (State Clearinghouse
No.: 2022100337)

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S
APPROVAL**

Kome Ajise

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR EEC:

Recommend that the Regional Council authorize the release of the Connect SoCal 2024 Draft PEIR for a 65-day public review and comment period beginning November 9, 2023, and ending January 12, 2024, and direct staff to carry out administrative tasks for the 2024 Draft PEIR public release.

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR CEHD AND TC:

Receive and File

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR RC:

Authorize the release of the Connect SoCal 2024 Draft PEIR for a 65-day public review and comment period beginning November 9, 2023, and ending January 12, 2024, and direct staff to carry out administrative tasks for the 2024 Draft PEIR public release.

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 2: Advance Southern California’s policy interests and planning priorities through regional, statewide, and national engagement and advocacy.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Over the past year, SCAG’s Energy and Environment Committee (EEC) and Regional Council (RC) have been kept abreast of the development progress, approaches to major components, and summary of contents of the 2024 Draft PEIR. It culminated in today’s recommended actions. Since there will be no EEC and RC meetings in December due to SCAG’s 14th Annual Southern California Economic Summit, staff is seeking EEC’s recommendation that the RC authorize and RC’s authorization of the official release of the 2024 Draft PEIR on the same day. This will allow for a 65-day CEQA public review and comment period beginning November 9, 2023, and ending on the same day as the comment period for the Plan on January 12, 2024.

Background and CEQA Basis for a PEIR:

As required by federal and state law, SCAG prepares a long-range Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) every four years which provides a vision for integrating land use and transportation for increased mobility and more sustainable development. SCAG's 2024-2050 RTP/SCS, Connect SoCal 2024, or Plan incorporates important updates of fundamental data, enhanced strategies and investments based on and intended to strengthen the last plan adopted for all purposes by SCAG RC in September 2020.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), codified at Public Resource Code (PRC) Section 21000 et seq., and its implementing regulations, CEQA Guidelines, found at California Code Regulations Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15000 et seq., apply to governmental action (CEQA Guidelines Section 15002(b)). As the CEQA Lead Agency for Connect SoCal 2024, SCAG must evaluate the potential environmental impacts from the proposed governmental action and disclose the evaluation in a CEQA document that is appropriate for the proposed governmental action. Program EIR is the appropriate type of EIR for the long-range, regional Plan.

The PEIR serves as a first-tier, programmatic document and provides a region-wide assessment of potential environmental impacts of Connect SoCal 2024, including direct and indirect impacts, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts. Although individual transportation projects are primarily (conceptually) identified in the Plan, the PEIR analyzes potential environmental impacts of both transportation projects and integrated land use patterns from a regional perspective and is programmatic in nature.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4, the 2024 PEIR considers and discusses feasible mitigation measures that are capable of avoiding or reducing the significant adverse environmental impacts of the Plan. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, the PEIR describes a range of reasonable alternatives to the Plan that could feasibly avoid or substantially lessen any significant adverse environmental impacts of the Plan while attaining most of the basic Plan objectives.

CEQA Public Process, Tribal Consultation, and Stakeholder Outreach:

As reported at the October 6, 2022, February 2, 2023, and April 6, 2023 EEC meetings, the 2024 Draft PEIR is compliance with all applicable public scoping and tribal consultation requirements, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15082 and 15083 and Assembly Bill 52 (tribal consultation during the CEQA process). At its October 6, 2022 meeting, EEC authorized the release of a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the 2024 Draft PEIR to formally kick off the CEQA process for the Plan. Subsequently, SCAG released the NOP for 30-day public review and comment period from October 17 through November 16, 2022. On a separate and parallel track, SCAG staff initiated the AB 52-required tribal consultation process in October 2022 by sending Tribal Consultation Initiation letters to 64 tribal contacts and 54 tribes within the SCAG region. The tribal consultation process was

completed in January 2023 after receiving no requests for consultation. For more information on the NOP, including an overview and a summary of NOP comments received, and AB 52 tribal consultation process, please see the October 2022 and February and April 2023 EEC staff reports at: <https://scag.ca.gov/energy-and-environment-committee-past-agendas>

In addition to the CEQA and AB 52-required public scoping and tribal consultation, SCAG CEQA staff conducted ongoing outreach and engagement with stakeholders throughout the development of the 2024 Draft PEIR. As previously discussed in the April 6, 2023 and July 7, 2023 EEC staff reports, staff leveraged existing stakeholder outreach forums, primarily SCAG’s Technical Advisory Committees and Working Groups, and conducted targeted meetings on specific PEIR topics. A summary of stakeholder outreach activities for the 2024 Draft PEIR, to date, is presented in Table 1, below, and will continue to be updated as appropriate.

Table 1: 2024 Draft PEIR Stakeholder Outreach Activities (as of October 2023)

Date	Forum	Stakeholder Representatives	Topics Covered
March 3, 2022	Energy and Environment Committee	Elected Officials, Interested Stakeholders, General Public	Connect SoCal 2024 PEIR 101
September 1, 2022	Energy and Environment Committee	Elected Officials, Interested Stakeholders, General Public	CEQA Initiation for the Connect SoCal 2024 PEIR
October 6, 2022	Energy and Environment Committee	Elected Officials, Interested Stakeholders, General Public	Request to Release Connect SoCal 2024 PEIR Notice of Preparation
October 10, 2022	Global & Land Use Economic Counsel	Business; General Public	Release of the NOP
October 31, 2022	Aviation Technical Advisory Committee	Aviation and Airports	Status Update on the 2024 PEIR Aviation Technical Report
November 9, 2022	2024 Draft PEIR NOP Scoping Meeting #1	Business; Environmental; Public Agencies; General Public	Connect SoCal 2024 Project and 2024 PEIR Overview
November 10, 2022	2024 Draft PEIR NOP Scoping Meeting #2	Business; Environmental; Public Agencies; General Public	Connect SoCal 2024 Project and 2024 PEIR Overview
January 4, 2023	Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority / Riverside County Transportation Commission	Public Agencies	Conservation
February 2, 2023	Energy and Environment Committee	Elected Officials, Interested Stakeholders, General Public	2024 PEIR Status Update on NOP Comments
February 16, 2023	Joint Sustainable and Resilient Communities/ Natural and Farm Lands	Environmental; General Public	2024 PEIR Overview & Status Update, Recap on NOP Comments, and Preliminary

	Conservation		Approach to Biological Resources Impact Analysis
March 8, 2023	South Coast Air Quality Management District	Air Districts	2024 PEIR Overview, Preliminary Technical Methodology for Air Quality and GHG Impacts Analyses
March 13, 2023	City of Riverside	Public Agencies	Transportation Impacts Analysis
March 14, 2023	Ventura County Air Pollution Control District	Air Districts	2024 PEIR Overview, Preliminary Technical Methodology for Air Quality and GHG Impacts Analyses
March 16, 2023	Technical Working Group	Business; Environmental; Public Agencies; General Public	2024 PEIR Status Update and Major Components
April 3, 2023	Global & Land Use Economic Counsel	Business; General Public	2024 PEIR Status Update
April 6, 2023	Energy and Environment Committee	Elected Officials, Interested Stakeholders, General Public	Status Update on Additional Stakeholder Outreach and Highlights of Preliminary Approaches to Major Components
April 27, 2023	Ventura County Air Pollution Control District	Air Districts	2024 PEIR Overview, Preliminary Technical Methodology for Air Quality and GHG Impacts Analyses
May 24, 2023	South Coast Air Quality Management District	Air Districts	2024 PEIR Overview and Equity
June 23, 2023	South Coast Air Quality Management District	Air Districts	2024 PEIR Overview and Equity
July 6, 2023	Energy and Environment Committee	Elected Officials, Interested Stakeholders, General Public	Status Update on Additional Stakeholder Outreach and Preliminary Outline of Draft Contents
July 18, 2023	Technical Working Group	Business; Environmental; Public Agencies; General Public	Preliminary Outline of Draft Contents
August 24, 2023	Joint Meeting of Sustainable and Resilient Communities / Natural and Farm Lands Conservation Working Groups	Elected Officials, Interested Stakeholders, General Public	Status Update on Major Outreach, Approaches to Major Components, and Outline of Draft Contents
September 7, 2023	Joint Regional Council and Policy Committee ^b	Elected Officials, Interested Stakeholders, General Public	CEQA Requirements and 2024 PEIR Status Update
September 21, 2023	Technical Working Group	Business: Environmental:	Status Update on

		Public Agencies; General Public	Development, Major Components and Outline of Contents of the 2024 Draft PEIR
November 2, 2023 <i>(today's EEC meeting)</i>	Energy and Environment Committee	Elected Officials, Interested Stakeholders, General Public	Recommendation that RC Authorize Release of 2024 Draft PEIR for public review and comments
November 2, 2023 <i>(today's RC meeting)</i>	Regional Council	Elected Officials, Interested Stakeholders, General Public	Consideration of EEC recommendation to Authorize Release of 2024 Draft PEIR for public review and comments

*Notes: (a) updated in late October 2023. (b) The 2024 PEIR was highlighted and included in the staff report and presentation to the Joint Meeting of SCAG Regional Council and Policy Committees on September 7, 2023.

2024 Draft PEIR Contents and Conclusions

Building upon the certified Final PEIR for Connect SoCal 2020, public comments received on the NOP, and stakeholder feedback and discussions at various required and targeted outreach meetings, SCAG staff is now close to finalizing the 2024 Draft PEIR for public release.

The 2024 Draft PEIR analyzes and discloses the environmental impacts expected to occur from Plan implementation. Specifically, the 2024 Draft PEIR evaluates whether implementation of Plan policies and strategies, including transportation and potential land use projects, has the potential to result in significant adverse impacts to each of the 20 environmental areas identified in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The 2024 Draft PEIR also considers and discusses feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to the Plan. These analyses are based on and consistent with the preliminary approaches to major components of the 2024 Draft PEIR that were presented at the April 6, 2023 EEC meeting, including environmental setting, environmental impacts analyses by topics, analytical themes, CEQA mitigation measures, and alternatives analysis. For additional details on the approaches, please see the April 6, 2023 EEC staff report at: <https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/eec040623fullpacket.pdf?1680210073>

Given the long-term temporal nature of the Plan (a minimum of 20 years), the potential magnitude, scale, and distribution of possible changes during the lifetime of the Plan, the unforeseeable nature of specific projects, the 2024 Draft PEIR conservatively and reasonably concludes that even after the incorporation of Regional Planning Policies, Implementation Strategies, and CEQA mitigation measures, the Plan is expected to result in significant and unavoidable adverse impacts to all 20 environmental areas with the exceptions of consistency with federal transportation conformity and SB 375 requirements . A summary of the 2024 Draft PEIR expected conclusions comparing the Plan to the environmental baseline conditions is included in Table 2, below.

Table 2: Summary of 2024 Draft PEIR Expected Conclusions by CEQA Appendix G Environmental Impact Areas

	Environmental Impact Areas	Conclusion (Expected)
1	Aesthetics	Significant
2	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	Significant (except for timberland in Impact AG-3)
3	Air Quality	Significant (except for consistency with federal transportation conformity requirements in Impact AQ-1)
4	Biological Resources	Significant
5	Cultural Resources	Significant
6	Energy	Significant
7	Geology and Soils	Significant
8	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Significant (except for consistency with SB 375 requirements in Impact GHG-2)
9	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Significant
10	Hydrology and Water Quality	Significant
11	Land Use and Planning	Significant
12	Mineral Resources	Significant
13	Noise	Significant
14	Population and Housing	Significant
15	Public Services	Significant
16	Recreation	Significant
17	Transportation	Significant
18	Tribal Cultural Resources	Significant
19	Utilities and Service Systems	Significant
20	Wildfire	Significant

The 2024 Draft PEIR draft contents and structure are based on and consistent with the preliminary outline presented at the July 7, 2023 EEC meeting. Specifically, the 2024 Draft PEIR includes seven chapters, plus an Executive Summary and appendices.

- Executive Summary
- Chapter 1.0 – Introduction
- Chapter 2.0 – Project Description

- Chapter 3.0 – Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures
- Chapter 4.0 – Alternatives
- Chapter 5.0 – Other CEQA Considerations
- Chapter 6.0 – List of Preparers
- Chapter 7.0 – Glossary
- Appendices

For additional details on the 2024 Draft PEIR contents and key information of each chapter, please see the July 6, 2023 EEC staff report at: <https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/eec070623fullpacket.pdf?1688070254>

Next Steps:

Upon RC’s authorization to release the 2024 Draft PEIR at the November 2, 2023 meeting, SCAG staff will work towards finalizing the Draft PEIR document and its public release anticipated on November 9, 2023. The complete 2024 Draft PEIR, including appendices will be available for public review and comments on SCAG’s website at: <https://scag.ca.gov/program-environmental-impact-report-0> starting on November 9, 2023, subject to Regional Council’s authorization at today’s meeting. The 2024 Draft PEIR will have a 65-day CEQA public review and comment period (exceedance of the minimum 45-day comment period under CEQA). The comment periods for the 2024 Draft PEIR and the Plan are scheduled to end on the same day on January 12, 2024. At that time, SCAG staff will respond to all comments on the 2024 Draft PEIR and make relevant clarifications and corrections, if needed, and seek certification of the 2024 Final PEIR in April 2024. Dates of key milestones for EEC and RC Review of and Action on the Connect SoCal 2024 PEIR are shown in Table 3, below.

Table 3: Key Milestones for EEC and RC Reviews of and Actions on the Connect SoCal 2024 PEIR

Milestones	Dates (Expected)
Presentation on the 2024 Draft PEIR. Recommendation by EEC that RC authorize release of the 2024 Draft PEIR for a 65-day CEQA public review and comment period, beginning November 9, 2023 and ending January 12, 2024.	November 2, 2023 (this meeting)
RC authorization to release the 2024 Draft PEIR for a 65-day CEQA public review and comment period, beginning November 9, 2023 and ending January 12, 2024.	November 2, 2023 (this meeting)
Initiate 65-day CEQA public review and comment period of the 2024 Draft PEIR.	November 9, 2023
Close the 65-day CEQA public review and comment period of the 2024 Draft PEIR.	January 12, 2024
Review by EEC or Joint Policy Committee of the Summary Contents of the Proposed 2024 Final PEIR and Recommendation by EEC or Joint Policy Committee to RC for Consideration of Certification of Proposed 2024 Final PEIR for Connect SoCal 2024.	March 2024



Presentation of the proposed 2024 Final PEIR. RC Consideration of Certification of 2024 Final PEIR for Connect SoCal 2024.	April 2024
--	------------

FISCAL IMPACT:

Work associated with this item is included in the current Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Overall Work Program (23-020.0161.04: Environmental Compliance, Coordination & Outreach).

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. PowerPoint Presentation - 2024 PEIR Release Authorization



Connect SoCal 2024 Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)

Energy and Environment Committee
November 2, 2023

WWW.SCAG.CA.GOV



Presentation Agenda

- 1 CEQA Requirements
- 2 2024 Draft PEIR Process
- 3 2024 Draft PEIR Contents
- 4 Next Steps
- 5 Recommended Action


CEQA Requirements

- SCAG is the CEQA Lead Agency for Connect SoCal 2024 (CEQA Project)
- PEIR is the appropriate type of CEQA document for a regional plan
- PEIR includes a region-wide, first-tier, programmatic level assessment
- Evaluates and discloses potential environmental impacts of Plan
- Mitigates or avoids significant adverse environmental impacts of Plan



2024 PEIR Process

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE OR JOINT POLICY COMMITTEES



- Aviation Technical Advisory Committee
- Global & Land Use Economic Counsel
- Joint Policy Committees
- Joint Sustainable and Resilient Communities/ Natural And Farm Lands Conservation
- Regional Council
- City of Riverside
- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- Technical Working Group
- Ventura County Air Pollution Control District
- Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority / Riverside County Transportation Commission

Attachment: PowerPoint Presentation - 2024 PEIR Release Authorization (Recommendation and Authorization to Release the Connect SoCal

2024 Draft PEIR Contents: Major Components (Recap from April 6, 2023 EEC Meeting)

Environmental Setting

- 2019 CEQA baseline year, may vary among CEQA topics
- Variance is allowed by CEQA

Environmental Impact Analyses

- Follows CEQA Guidelines Appendix G
- Reflects regulatory landscape and CEQA case law since the 2020 PEIR

CEQA Mitigation Measures

- Continued bifurcation of SCAG and Project-level mitigation measures
- Incorporated Regional Planning Policies and Implementation Strategies as Plan features
- Removed regulatory requirements from project-level mitigation

Alternatives Analysis Approach

- Reasonable range of alternatives
- No Project and Intensified Land Use alternatives

Staff report link: <https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/eec040623fullpacket.pdf>

2024 Draft PEIR Contents: Outline (Recap from July 7, 2023 EEC Staff Report)

Executive Summary

Chapter 1.0: Introduction

Chapter 2.0: Project Description

Chapter 3.0 – Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

Chapter 4.0 – Alternatives

Chapter 5.0 – Other CEQA Considerations

Chapter 6.0 – List of Preparers

Chapter 7.0 – Glossary

12 Appendices

Staff report link: <https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/eec070623fullpacket.pdf>

Summary of 2024 Draft PEIR Conclusions by CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Environmental Impact Areas


Analyzes and discloses environmental impacts from Plan implementation including policies, strategies, and potential projects

Considers and discusses feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to the Plan

Given the size and long-range nature of the Plan, SCAG's limited authority, and unknown details of specific projects, the Plan is expected to result in significant and unavoidable adverse impacts to all 20 environmental areas

	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT AREAS	CONCLUSION (EXPECTED)
1	Aesthetics	☑ Significant
2	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☑ Significant
3	Air Quality	☑ Significant
4	Biological Resources	☑ Significant
5	Cultural Resources	☑ Significant
6	Energy	☑ Significant
7	Geology and Soils	☑ Significant
8	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☑ Significant
9	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	☑ Significant
10	Hydrology and Water Quality	☑ Significant
11	Land Use and Planning	☑ Significant
12	Mineral Resources	☑ Significant
13	Noise	☑ Significant
14	Population and Housing	☑ Significant
15	Public Services	☑ Significant
16	Recreation	☑ Significant
17	Transportation	☑ Significant
18	Tribal Cultural Resources	☑ Significant
19	Utilities and Service Systems	☑ Significant
20	Wildfire	☑ Significant

Next Steps



Recommended Action – November 2, 2023

Energy & Environment Committee

Recommend that the Regional Council authorize the release of the Connect SoCal 2024 Draft PEIR for a *65-day public review and comment period beginning November 9, 2023, and ending January 12, 2024*, and direct staff to carry out administrative tasks for the 2024 Draft PEIR public release.



THANK YOU!

For more information, please visit: <https://scag.ca.gov/peir>



AGENDA ITEM 4
REPORT

Southern California Association of Governments
November 2, 2023

To: Community Economic & Human Development Committee (CEHD)
Energy & Environment Committee (EEC)
Transportation Committee (TC)
Regional Council (RC)

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S
APPROVAL**

From: Julia Lippe-Klein, Planning Supervisor
(213) 236-1856, Lippe-Klein@scag.ca.gov

Subject: 2020 Sustainable Communities Program – Overview

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR CEHD, TC, EEC AND RC:

Receive and File

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 4: Provide innovative information and value-added services to enhance member agencies' planning and operations and promote regional collaboration.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Since 2005, SCAG's various sustainability planning grant programs (Compass Blueprint, Sustainability Planning Grants, Sustainable Communities Program) have provided resources and direct technical assistance to jurisdictions to complete important local planning efforts and enable implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), which today is called Connect SoCal. Following the adoption of Connect SoCal every four years, SCAG releases Calls for Applications on a rolling basis to provide local technical assistance in support of Connect SoCal implementation.

The SCP allows SCAG to strengthen partnerships with local agencies who are responsible for land use and transportation decisions. Projects selected will allow local agencies to facilitate coordination and integration of transportation planning with active transportation, housing production, safety, smart cities, mobility innovation, transportation demand management, green region and sustainability.

On September 3, 2020, the Regional Council approved the 2020 Sustainable Communities Program (SCP) Guidelines, which consisted of four (4) Calls for Applications. Combined, the Calls for Applications align with the 2020 Connect SoCal Key Connections, which augment the Core Vision of the plan, including new initiatives at the intersection of land use, transportation and technology to close the gap and reach greenhouse gas reduction goals. Those Calls included the

following: Call 1: Active Transportation and Safety; Call 2: Housing and Sustainable Development; Call 3: Smart Cities and Mobility Innovations; and Call 4: Civic Engagement, Equity and Environmental Justice. Across the 2020 SCP, the program has awarded \$11.8 million to 56 projects across the region.

This staff report provides an overview of the focus per Call, in alignment with the 2020 Connect SoCal Key Connections, and highlights project examples per Call, showcasing progress towards implementation of the 2020 Connect SoCal, in anticipation of the development of the 2024 SCP following release of the Draft Connect SoCal 2024, whose goals and policy direction will inform the shape of the 2024 program.

BACKGROUND:

Program Overview

Since 2005, SCAG's Sustainable Communities Program (SCP) - previously known as Compass Blueprint and Sustainability Planning Grants - has provided resources and direct technical assistance to jurisdictions to complete important local planning efforts to support implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), also known as Connect SoCal.

The SCP allows SCAG to strengthen partnerships with local agencies who are responsible for land use and transportation decisions. Projects selected will allow local agencies to facilitate coordination and integration of transportation planning with active transportation, housing production, safety, smart cities, mobility innovation, transportation demand management, green region and sustainability. SCAG has funded 121 projects totaling over \$25.9 million since 2016 through the SCP.

Sustainable Community Program (SCP) Goals:

- Provide needed planning resources to local jurisdictions for active and multimodal transportation, sustainability, land use, and affordable housing;
- Promote, address and ensure health and equity in regional land use and transportation planning and close the gap of racial injustice and better serve communities of color;
- Encourage regional planning strategies to reduce motorized vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions, particularly in environmental justice communities where there is the highest need for air quality improvements;
- Develop local plans that support the implementation of key strategies and goals outlined in Connect SoCal's Sustainable Communities Strategy;
- Develop resources that support the key strategies and policy direction of the adopted Connect SoCal;

- Support a resilient region that looks at climate adaptation and public health preparedness as key strategies to address community prosperity, transportation safety, economic recovery and sustainability; and
- Increase the region's competitiveness for federal and state funds, including, but not limited to the California Active Transportation Program and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Funds.

This staff report highlights the focus of each Call for Applications and highlights the projects supported.

Call 1: Active Transportation and Safety

The first Call for Applications was released on September 8, 2020, with a focus on Active Transportation and Safety (ATS) related projects. SCP ATS funded planning and quick build projects that sought to increase rates of walking and biking, promote traffic safety, expand opportunities for multimodal transportation options, and better position local jurisdictions to be competitive for implementation funds. Eligible projects included Active Transportation Plans, Safety Plans, Network Visioning and Implementation, and Quick Build projects. The SCP Call 1 program represents a \$5 million investment in critical active transportation and safety projects over four fiscal years, across 11 projects.

The Montebello First/Last Mile Master Plan, which was awarded \$149,997 and is expected to be completed by early 2024 is an example of the types of projects funded in this category. The Plan is focused on helping to improve pedestrian and bicycle connections to and from transit stops in the City of Montebello. Examples of planned improvements include new bikeways, increased shade and seating at transit stops, and improved pedestrian crossings. These improvements support the SCAG's regional goal of encouraging more transit ridership and creating safer conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Call 2: Housing and Sustainable Development

The second Call for Applications was released on November 9, 2020, with a focus on Housing and Sustainable Development (HSD) related projects. SCP HSD provided resources for housing production planning to implement the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) and to further implementation of the SCS. HSD prioritized projects that sought to integrate and align Southern California's housing production, preservation and protection opportunities with Connect SoCal. Awards were provided to the following project types: Advancing Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Implementation; Housing Sustainability Districts, Workforce Housing Opportunity Zones, and Housing Supportive Tax Increment Financing Districts; and Objective Development Standards for Streamlined Housing, Prohousing Designation Program and Parking Innovation. The SCP HSD Call 2 program represents a \$5 million investment in innovative housing strategies over three fiscal years, across 26 projects.

For example, the Advanced ADU Bundle, which was awarded \$546,676, provided planning assistance to the cities of Laguna Beach, Pasadena, and Santa Monica to develop ADU implementation policies and programs to accelerate housing production. This project in total resulted in 11 public events and workshops that engaged nearly 700 residents that sought to build public participation into the planning process. The project ultimately produced a suite of technical work products that assessed and modernized each city's ADU permitting processes and policies, built informative best practices, and developed an ADU Handbook that can serve as a model for other jurisdictions to follow in the future.

Call 3: Smart Cities and Mobility Innovations

The third Call for Applications was released on February 8, 2021, with a focus on Smart Cities and Mobility Innovations (SCMI) related projects. SCP SCMI supported the implementation of three Connect SoCal Key Connections: Smart Cities and Job Centers, Go Zones, and Shared Mobility/Mobility as a Service. These Key Connections focused on advancing expanded mobility ecosystems and management strategies using innovative policy and/or technology to realize regional planning goals. Resources through this Call for Applications supported local jurisdictions with technology and innovation to improve the efficiency and performance of the transportation system by implementing curb space management measures that encourage shared modes, manage parking effectively, and support commerce and the growth of housing and employment in job centers. Awards were provided in the following project categories: Curb Space Data Collection and Inventory; Technology Assessment or Adoption Plan; Parking Management Plan; and Permitting Process Evaluation. One example project that has recently been completed is the Laguna Woods Technology Mobility Plan which awarded \$150,000 to the City of Laguna Woods to evaluate potential mobility technologies. The Plan engaged with the community and key stakeholders to understand the unique mobility needs of Laguna Woods (average resident age: 75 years old) and included three phases of actions to implement an autonomous vehicle (AV) pilot program in the future, focusing on the physical and digital infrastructure needed for success. The SCP SCMI Call 3 program represents a \$2.5 million investment in innovative mobility strategies over three fiscal years, across eight (8) projects.

Call 4: Civic Engagement, Equity and Environmental Justice

The fourth Call for Applications was released on April 12, 2023, with a focus Civic Engagement, Equity and Environmental Justice (CEEEJ) related projects. SCP CEEEJ was supported by two funding sources including Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) and the State of California (State) Regional Early Action Planning Grant Program of 2021 (REAP 2.0). REAP 2.0 funded Housing and Land Use Strategies and SB 1 funded Multimodal Communities projects. SCP CEEEJ seeks to support local planning efforts by strategically investing in and providing technical assistance for projects in SCAG's Communities of Concern, SB 535 Disadvantaged Communities, and other priority populations. For example, the Farmworker Housing Study and Action Plan, which was awarded nearly \$500,000, is a partnership between the County of Ventura and local community-based organization, House Farm Workers!

This project will use survey data to summarize farmworker needs and identify key policy, financial, and regulatory barriers and solutions to housing development, including identifying optimal housing typologies and gaps in social services. SCP CEEJ represents a \$4.3 million investment in innovative housing and multimodal strategies across 11 projects.

NEXT STEPS

SCAG staff intends to develop the 2024 SCP guidelines following release of the next Plan.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Call 1: Funding for staff time and selected SCP projects is included in the FY2023-24 Overall Work Program (OWP) in project 275-4892.01 and 275-4892.02 Sustainable Communities Program (SCP) – 2020

Call 2: Funding for staff time and selected SCP projects is included in the FY2023-2024 Overall Work Program (OWP) in project 300-4887.01 2020 Sustainable Communities Program (SCP) - Housing and Sustainable Development (HSD).

Call 3: Funding for staff time and selected SCP projects is included in the FY2023-24 Overall Work Program (OWP) in project 275-4895.01 and 275-4895.02 Sustainable Communities Program (SCP) - Smart Cities and Mobility Innovations (SCMI).

Call 4: Funding for staff time and selected SCP projects is included in the FY2023-24 Overall Work Program (OWP) in project 275-4823.08 Connect SoCal Implementation Call for Projects (SCP Call 4) and 305- 4927.01 REAP 2.0 Early Program Initiatives.

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. SCP 2020_Project List

SCP 2020 Call for Applications

Project Type	Agency	County	Project Name	Funding Amount	Project Description
Call 1: Active Transportation & Safety: 11 projects total; 9 contracts					
Pedestrian Plan	LA County Public Health	Los Angeles	Lennox Community Pedestrian Plan	\$ 499,933.00	Develop a pedestrian plan for the unincorporated Lennox community in Los Angeles County. The plan will include 4 PSRE priority projects.
Network Visioning & Implementation	Los Angeles Dept. of Transportation	Los Angeles	Wilshire Center/K-town AT Network Visioning	\$ 1,209,557.00	Develop an active transportation network plan for the mid-Wilshire and Koreatown neighborhood in the City of Los Angeles. The planning effort will then be followed by a quick build implementation project based on the planning effort.
	City of Pomona	Los Angeles	Pomona Citywide Complete Streets Ordinance (CCSO)	\$ 703,510.00	Develop a complete streets network plan for the City of Pomona, followed by a quick build implementation project based on the planning effort.
Quick Build	City of Santa Monica	Los Angeles	East Pico Safety Project	\$ 800,000.00	The project will design and implement a quick build project on East Pico Blvd in the City of Santa Monica that primarily focuses on pedestrian improvements.
Non-Infrastructure	Riverside County Public Health	Riverside	Safe Routes for All - Coachella	\$ 657,000.00	Develop a Safe Routes for All Plan in the City of Coachella. The agency is managing project implementation.
First/Last Mile	Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)	Orange	OCTA Bus Stop Safety and Accessibility Study	\$ 300,000.00	Develop a first/last mile plan for the highest ridership bus stops in Orange County. The final plan will include 12 PSRE priority projects.
	Montebello Bus Lines	Los Angeles	First Mile / Last Mile Master Plan	\$ 150,000.00	Develop a first/last mile plan for the Montebello.
Active Transportation Plan	City of Banning	Riverside	Banning Comprehensive ATP	\$ 250,000.00	Develop a citywide Active Transportation Plan for the City of Banning.
Safe Routes	City of Lynwood	Los Angeles	Lynwood Safe Routes To School (SRTS) Plan	\$ 250,000.00	Develop a Safe Routes to School Plan for the City of Lynwood.
	City of Duarte	Los Angeles	Safe Routes to School Plan	\$ 100,000.00	Develop a Safe Routes to School Plan for the City of Duarte.
Vision Zero	City of Santa Ana	Orange	Safe Mobility Santa Ana (SMSA) Plan Update	\$ 50,000.00	Develop 4 PSRE projects for the City's Vision Zero Plan (a separate effort). The projects will be incorporated into the plan and adopted together.
TOTAL				\$ 4,970,000.00	
Call 2: Housing & Sustainable Development: 25 projects total; 12 contracts					
Advanced ADU Bundle	Pasadena	Los Angeles	Pasadena ADU Implementation	\$ 500,000.00	This project bundle consists of three (3) cities that received planning assistance to develop ADU implementation policies and programs to accelerate housing production. (Project Completed in December 2022)
	Santa Monica	Los Angeles	Santa Monica ADU Implementation		
	Laguna Beach	Orange	Laguna Beach ADU Implementation		
Preliminary ADU Bundle	Buena Park	Orange	Buena Park ADU Implementation	\$ 660,000.00	This project bundle consists of four (4) cities that will receive planning assistance to develop ADU implementation policies and programs to accelerate housing production.
	Compton	Los Angeles	Compton ADU Implementation		
	Garden Grove	Orange	Garden Grove ADU Implementation		
	Paramount	Los Angeles	Paramount ADU Implementation		
	Santa Fe Springs	Los Angeles	Santa Fe Springs ADU Implementation		

Attachment: SCP 2020_Project List [Revision 1] (2020 Sustainable Communities Program – Overview)

SCP 2020 Call for Applications

Project Type	Agency	County	Project Name	Funding Amount	Project Description
EIFD Bundle	Covina	Los Angeles	Covina Downtown EIFD	\$ 375,000.00	This project bundle will collaboratively work to implement Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts (EIFD) in these three jurisdictions.
	LAC/USC Health Village	Los Angeles	LAC/USC Healthy Village Vision		
	Yucaipa	San Bernardino	Yucaipa Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District		
Workforce Housing	Palmdale	Los Angeles	Central Palmdale Workforce Housing Project WHAR12	\$ 300,000.00	The goal of this project is to provide planning and development assistance to the City of Palmdale in order to facilitate development of 13 acres of surplus land owned by the city and the local school district into affordable workforce housing.
EIFD	Heart of Hollywood (City of LA)	Los Angeles	Heart of Hollywood Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District	\$ 125,000.00	This project intends to assess and implement the preferred type of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District in Hollywood.
EIFD	One San Pedro (HACLA)	Los Angeles	One San Pedro Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District	\$ 250,000.00	This project intends to determine the best model or models of infrastructure financing districts necessary to make the One San Pedro plan a reality.
Objective Development Standards Bundle	Coachella	Riverside	Coachella Objective Development Standards	\$ 990,000.00	This project consists of two (2) bundles of (4) four cities that will be receiving planning assistance to revise and adopt Objective Development Standards, and implement HCD prohousing guidelines, policies, and programs.
	Grand Terrace	San Bernardino	Grand Terrace Objective Development Standards		
	Montebello	Los Angeles	Montebello Objective Development Standards		
	Newport Beach	Orange	Newport Beach Objective Development Standards		
	Santa Fe Springs	Los Angeles	Santa Fe Springs Objective Development Standards		
	Santa Monica	Los Angeles	Santa Monica Objective Development Standards		
	South Pasadena	Los Angeles	South Pasadena Objective Development Standards		
	Westminster	Orange	Westminster Objective Development Standards		
Specific Plan	Rialto	San Bernardino	Rialto Foothill-Central Specific Plan Update	\$ 600,000.00	This project will include a merger and update to two existing Specific Plans to ensure consistency and accelerate housing production.
Specific Plan	Burbank	Los Angeles	Burbank Media District Specific Plan Update	\$ 430,000.00	This project will update the Media District Specific Plan to ensure consistency and accelerate housing production.

SCP 2020 Call for Applications

Project Type	Agency	County	Project Name	Funding Amount	Project Description
Objective Zoning Standards	South El Monte	Los Angeles	South El Monte Zoning Code Comprehensive Update for Housing Streamlining	\$ 200,000.00	This project will be a completely updated zoning code for the City that is fully consistent with the latest General Plan, State and Federal Law, streamlined to be more housing-friendly, and consistent with HCD's pro-housing goals.
TOTAL				\$ 4,430,000.00	
Call 3: Smart Cities & Mobility Innovations: 8 projects total; 5 contracts					
Curb Space	Los Angeles Dept. of Transportation	Los Angeles	Curb Zone Data Inventory for Digital Curb Management	\$ 850,000.00	A digital curb zone inventory to optimize commercial loading activities and advance digital stewardship.
	City of Long Beach	Los Angeles	Long Beach Curb Space Management Study		A curb occupancy and usage study with real-time data collection and monitoring, focusing on underserved communities.
	City of Stanton	Orange	Stanton Citywide Curb Management Plan		An inventory to collect data in residential, commercial, and industrial neighborhoods and developing a Citywide Curb Management Plan to improve safety and quality of life.
Technology	San Gabriel Valley Council of Govts	Los Angeles	GoSGV Engagement & Evaluation	\$ 375,000.00	Analysis of the GoSGV Regional E-Bike Share Program to quantify vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reductions and implement innovative outreach solutions with Community Based Organizations (CBOs).
Parking	City of Desert Hot Springs	Riverside	Downtown and Light Industrial Parking Plan	\$ 675,000.00	A parking plan encompassing the commercial and light industrial hubs of the City along with a framework of innovative practices to meet future development and mobility demand needs.
	City of Garden Grove	Orange	Garden Grove Curb Data Study		Policies and actions for curb and parking management in several Environmental Justice areas to mitigate the disproportionate negative environmental impacts from parking.
Technology	City of Laguna Woods	Orange	Laguna Woods Mobility Technology Plan	\$ 200,000.00	A Mobility Technology Plan to establish new mobility service capabilities, particularly for senior and disabled populations, and the prospective future implementation of autonomous vehicle technology.
Technology	City of Rialto	San Bernardino	Smart Cities Plan for Warehousing & Logistics	\$ 300,000.00	A Smart Cities Plan focused on the local impacts of warehousing and logistics and technological and policy solutions that could address those adverse impacts while supporting economic goals.
TOTAL				\$ 2,400,000.00	

SCP 2020 Call for Applications

Project Type	Agency	County	Project Name	Funding Amount	Project Description
Call 4: Civic Engagement, Equity, and Environmental Justice: 11 projects total; 11 contracts					
Multimodal Communities	Los Angeles Dept. of Transportation	Los Angeles	Reconnecting MacArthur Park	\$ 500,000.00	Explore the permanent closure of Wilshire Blvd. between Carondalet St. and Alvarado St. through a traffic study and robust community engagement and planning.
	County of Los Angeles, Dept. of Public Works	Los Angeles	East LA Moves / El Este Se Mueve Mobility Corridor Plans	\$ 454,586.00	Identify community-centered transportation improvements for implementation along key corridors in unincorporated East LA through a participatory planning process.
	Los Angeles Dept. of Public Works, Streets LA	Los Angeles	Warner Center Active Transportation Hub	\$ 499,701.00	Identify barriers to walking and biking, identify the top 20 priority corridors, and develop active transportation design prototypes for typical roadways in the Warner Center (WC) area.
	SBCTA/SBCOG	San Bernardino	Active Transportation Priority Projects Outreach and Engagement	\$ 294,765.00	Leverage engagement to identify priority active transportation projects, inform planning efforts, and better position jurisdictions to secure implementation funding.
	City of Moreno Valley	Riverside	Pedestrian Access Plan	\$ 249,018.00	Develop a citywide Pedestrian Access Plan and identify non-Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant locations throughout the city.
Housing and Land Use Strategies	City of La Puente	Los Angeles	Mixed Use Development for Underutilized Commercial Zones	\$ 427,350.00	Encourage infill development by initiating an amendment to the General Plan and Zoning Code to include a new mixed-use zoning program that can be applied to existing underutilized commercial properties.
	City of Lancaster	Los Angeles	Transit Oriented Development Zones Update	\$ 230,560.00	Realize the City's vision for compact mixed-use development near the Metrolink Commuter Rail Station through a comprehensive update to the underutilized 2015 form-based Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Zones Plan.
	City of Laguna Beach	Orange	Environmental Impact Report - Downtown Specific Plan Update	\$ 200,000.00	Expand opportunities for infill housing, allow nearly unlimited housing density, increase maximum allowable building heights, and allow parcel mergers for affordable housing projects in certain areas.
	City of Santa Ana	Orange	Transformative Engagement for Zoning Code Update	\$ 469,700.00	Develop an inclusive community engagement plan to inform a comprehensive update to the City's Zoning Code, where zoning districts and development standards will be developed for properties.
	City of Jurupa Valley	Riverside	Pedley Town Center Plan - Implementation	\$ 478,894.00	Develop mixed-use zoning in the Pedley Town Center Plan area to accelerate infill, mixed-use, affordable, and commercial development near a Metrolink station.
	County of Ventura	Ventura	Farmworkers Housing Study and Action Plan	\$ 499,991.00	Use survey data to identify farmworker needs as well as key policy, financial, and regulatory barriers and solutions to housing development, including identifying optimal housing typologies and gaps in social services.
Total				\$ 4,304,565.00	



AGENDA ITEM 5
REPORT

Southern California Association of Governments
November 2, 2023

To: Transportation Committee (TC)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S
APPROVAL

From: Roland Ok, Planning Supervisor
(213) 236-1819, ok@scag.ca.gov

Subject: Update on SCAG's Broadband Program

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Receive and File

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians. 2: Advance Southern California’s policy interests and planning priorities through regional, statewide, and national engagement and advocacy. 3: Be the foremost data information hub for the region. 4: Provide innovative information and value-added services to enhance member agencies’ planning and operations and promote regional collaboration. 7: Secure funding to support agency priorities to effectively and efficiently deliver work products.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

After the adoption of SCAG's Digital Action Plan on April 6, 2023, SCAG staff initiated three projects: (1) the Broadband Permit Streamlining Project, (2) the Last Mile Project Assessment for the SCAG Region, and (3) the Affordable Connection Program (ACP) Outreach Program. The objective of this staff report is to provide a status update. Staff is working on advancing these projects and will provide a subsequent update in the first quarter of 2024, offering insights and initial findings thus far.

BACKGROUND:

On February 4, 2021, the Regional Council (RC) adopted Resolution No. 21-629-2, committing the agency to addressing the digital divide within the SCAG region.¹ Building upon the principles of Resolution 21-629-2, SCAG Staff developed the Digital Action Plan,² which was subsequently approved by the RC through Resolution No. 23-654-4 on April 6, 2023.³

¹ Resolution No. 21-629-2. Available at: https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/resolution_no_21-629-2_-_support_to_increase_broadband_access.pdf?1646942018

² SCAG’s Digital Action Plan. Available at: <https://scag.ca.gov/post/scag-digital-action-plan>

³ Resolution 23-654-4. Available at: <https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/rc040623fullpacket.pdf?1680214682> (see page 126).

The Digital Action Plan encompasses a series of proposed actions and deliverables, all aligned with the objectives, strategies, and guiding principles outlined in the Digital Action Plan and in SCAG's Strategic Plan. Within the Digital Action Plan, SCAG delineates a series of proposed steps aimed at strengthening the Broadband Program. These include seeking grant funding from federal and state agencies, conducting technical studies, and analyzing data.

In line with the plan's goals and proposed actions, SCAG has launched three projects designed to bridge the digital divide:

- Broadband Permit Streamlining Project
- Last Mile Project Assessment for the SCAG Region
- ACP Outreach Program

BROADBAND PERMIT STREAMLINING PROJECT:

Over the past three years, SCAG and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) have actively participated in the Southern California (SoCal) Transformation Working Group. This group, comprised of representatives from various sectors, including government, non-profits, education, health, Internet Service Providers (ISPs), and the private sector, meets monthly to discuss critical topics such as broadband status, legislative updates, funding opportunities, and ongoing initiatives. These discussions aim to bridge the digital divide, with permitting issues identified as a significant barrier to broadband infrastructure development.

With funding and support from the California Emerging Technology Fund (CETF), both agencies have collaborated to develop permit streamlining solutions. SANDAG established the Regional Digital Infrastructure Taskforce (ReDIT), which brought together staff from local agencies, ISPs, and Regional Broadband Consortia (RBCs) to identify obstacles to broadband deployment, create regional permitting standards, align local initiatives with state efforts, and more.

Building on the insights from ReDIT, SCAG has engaged Tectonic Engineering Consultants to contribute to the Broadband Permit Streamlining Project. This project encompasses two distinct deliverables:

- **Permit Streamlining Report:** This report will identify potential policies or legislation at regional or local levels that may impede broadband deployment. It will summarize findings derived from consultations with both public and private sectors and offer recommendations to establish regional permitting standards and practices.
- **Model Policy and Ordinance:** The Model Policy and Ordinance will serve as a practical template for local jurisdictions to adopt and incorporate into their permitting procedures, aiming to streamline the process for broadband infrastructure development.

The Permit Streamlining Project is in progress, and staff anticipates its completion by April 2024.

LAST MILE PROJECT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SCAG REGION:

On June 29, 2023, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) granted approval and awarded SCAG's application for the Local Agency Technical Assistance (LATA) grant funding, dedicated to conducting a Last Mile Project Assessment within the SCAG Region. The total amount of the award stood at \$996,058. Subsequently, the RC approved the acceptance of this award on July 6, 2023, through Resolution 23-657-1.⁴

The primary objective of the LATA grant is to enable SCAG to provide support to local jurisdictions that lack the necessary technical expertise, staffing resources, and financial capabilities to identify and analyze opportunities and develop conceptual engineering designs for last-mile services. Unfortunately, it is these very local jurisdictions that are in critical need of improved connectivity. They predominantly comprise low-income households, often from communities of color, many of whom face challenges related to affordability and accessibility.

The Last Mile Project Assessment will ultimately aid local jurisdictions in identifying and designing three (3) shovel-ready projects located within the SCAG region. This initiative will result in the development of conceptual designs and high-level engineering plans, forming the groundwork for three (3) shovel-ready projects that aim to provide internet speeds meeting or surpassing the 100/100 or 100/20 Mbps benchmarks for unserved and underserved communities. Core work efforts for the Project are as follows:

- Broadband Infrastructure Existing Conditions Analysis
- Needs and Market Assessment, Priority Area Identification, and Route Determination
- Last Mile Design for Local Jurisdictions

As of the time of preparing this report, staff is actively engaged in developing the Request for Proposal (RFP) package to procure a consultant. Staff anticipates releasing the RFP towards the end of October or in early November. The RFP will undergo a 30-day review period, during which SCAG will assess and choose a consultant, subject to approval from the RC. Based on current estimates, staff anticipates commencing work efforts in January 2024, with the project expected to span approximately 18 months.

ACP OUTREACH PROGRAM:

On November 15, 2021, Congress allocated \$14.2 billion for the Affordable Connectivity Program (ACP) as part of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA).⁵ The ACP offers a monthly discount of up to \$30 for eligible households for internet services, with up to \$75 per month for

⁴ Resolution No. 23-657-1. Available at: <https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/rc070623fullpacket.pdf?1688070462> (see page 93).

⁵ Affordable Connectivity Program. Available at: <https://www.affordableconnectivity.gov>

households residing on qualifying Tribal lands. Additionally, eligible households can receive a one-time discount of up to \$100 when purchasing a laptop, desktop, computer, or tablet from participating providers, provided they contribute between \$10 and \$50 towards the purchase price. It's important to note that the ACP limits eligibility to one monthly service discount and one device discount per household.

On September 1, 2022, the RC adopted Resolution No. 22-646-6, assigning the staff the task of promoting the ACP under SCAG's Go Human Program.⁶ In alignment with this resolution, the staff submitted a grant application to the FCC on January 9, 2023, and subsequently received approval on March 15, 2023, for a grant totaling \$500,000. The formal acceptance of the grant funding was made in accordance with SCAG's RC Resolution 23-654-1, adopted in April 6, 2023.⁷

Building upon the foundation of the existing Go Human Program, SCAG aims to collaborate with local jurisdictions, community-based organizations, local businesses, community leaders, and other stakeholders to advance the ACP at a regional level. **Table 1, ACP Program Work Efforts**, provides a high-level overview of the agencies' work efforts.

Table 1, ACP Program Work Efforts

Work Efforts/Deliverables	Status
ACP Toolkit for Local Jurisdictions	Completed
Regional Coordination	
State Working Group	In Progress
County Taskforce	In Progress
Digital Ambassadors	
Methodology to identify priority areas	In Progress
Hiring and Training Digital Navigators/Ambassadors	To be initiated Q4 of 2023 or Q1 2024
Countywide pop-up events	To be initiated in Q1 2024
Media Purchase	
Traditional media and social media ad-buys	To be initiated in Q1 2024
Direct mailing to communities of concern	To be initiated in Q1 2024

⁶ Resolution 22-646-6. Available at: <https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/rc090122fullpacket.pdf?1661474396> (see page 26).

⁷ Resolution 23-654-1. Available at: <https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/rc040623fullpacket.pdf?1680214682> (see page 92).



NEXT STEPS:

Staff is actively progressing with these projects and will provide a subsequent update in the first quarter of 2024, presenting the progress and initial findings of the three projects.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Work on this project is funded in SCAG's Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Overall Work Program (OWP) under 100.4901.01 (Broadband Planning).



**AGENDA ITEM 6
REPORT**

Southern California Association of Governments
November 2, 2023

To: Transportation Committee (TC)
From: Jeremy Marks, Assistant Regional Planner
(213) 630-1456, marks@scag.ca.gov

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S
APPROVAL

Subject: Sustainable Communities Program - Smart Cities & Mobility Innovations
Call for Projects: Parking Bundle Project Outcomes

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Receive and File

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians. 4: Provide innovative information and value-added services to enhance member agencies' planning and operations and promote regional collaboration.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this staff report and the accompanying slide deck attachment is to provide information regarding the goals, methodology, and findings/outcomes from the City of Desert Hot Springs and The City of Garden Grove Parking Bundle projects that were funded by SCAG grants through its Sustainable Communities Program (SCP) "Call 3" for Smart Cities & Mobility Innovations (SCMI). The SCMI was developed to support projects that provide practical, relevant strategies for meeting Senate Bill (SB) 375 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emission reduction targets and queue jurisdictions for future funding opportunities. The Parking Bundle projects tested new curb management technologies, assessed baseline and future conditions related to parking inventory, management, and policy in each of the two cities, and recommended approaches for managing local parking needs into the future. The City of Desert Hot Springs sought to develop parking management plans for two different commercial districts to enhance economic development, proactively address parking issues and new development, and improve commute options for employees. Recommendations included that the City of Desert Hot Springs explore shared parking arrangements that make the most efficient use of existing parking inventory, repeal minimum parking requirements to prevent future oversupply of parking inventory, and encourage the use of existing programs to facilitate uptake of non-driving modes that can reduce local parking demand, emissions, and commute times. In contrast, the City of Garden Grove focused on on-street parking issues in six residential study areas, and sought to explore changes that might ameliorate frustration expressed by the public regarding a broad lack of parking availability and

perceptions of reduced safety across the discrete residential study areas. Parking management policy recommendations in the City of Garden Grove included – among other things – that the City continue efforts to increase enforcement of existing parking policies, pursue shared parking arrangements to increase supply, and consider adopting residential parking permit programs. In general, the consultant team concludes that any parking management solution is likely to rely heavily on increased enforcement efforts on the part of the implementing jurisdiction, and that the recent trend towards parking de-regulation (e.g., eliminating parking minimums) will increase need for enforcement.

BACKGROUND:

On July 1, 2022, the Regional Council approved the 2020 Sustainable Communities Program (SCP) “Call 3” award recommendations and authorized staff to initiate the projects. Call 3 is centered on Smart Cities & Mobility Innovations (SCMI), emphasizing curb use, parking management, and the integration of technology. These projects serve a crucial role in the SCAG region, as they align and implement innovative strategies from the region’s Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), also known as Connect SoCal, including concepts for smart cities, go zones, and shared mobility/mobility as a service. SCAG awarded two of these projects – grouped together, for administrative reasons, as the SCP Call 3 Parking Bundle – to the City of Desert Hot Springs and the City of Garden Grove.

These two projects, led by Walker Consultants (joined by Arcadis-IBI), featured a shared approach framework, consisting of: the testing of new curb inventory and management technologies (e.g., Arcadis-IBI’s Curb IQ platform); existing/baseline conditions analyses involving curb mapping, inventory, and in-person parking utilization surveys; future conditions analyses that considered current parking policy and zoning landscapes and expected future development patterns; public-facing and stakeholder engagement; and the provision of parking management recommendations in each of the two participating jurisdictions.

The two cities had slightly different goals for the project, with each city’s approach being informed by unique local contexts. The City of Desert Hot Springs focused on two different commercial districts (i.e., the Downtown District and the Cannabis Industrial District), and the City of Garden Grove focused on six residential study areas that City staff selected as being representative of city-wide residential parking issues. The Garden Grove study areas reflected a mix of single- and multi-family dwellings, amidst an increasing supply of accessory dwelling units (ADUs), that often played host to related on-street parking impacts.

An overview of findings and policy recommendations from each of the two cities is presented below.

City of Desert Hot Springs

Key findings from the Downtown study area in Desert Hot Springs included the following:

- Existing parking supply far exceeds current parking demand (82 percent of spaces empty at peak demand periods), and as Downtown is further developed in the future, current parking regulations will require new developments to further increase the supply of parking despite that there is currently a lack of demand for it.
- Currently, more than 1,000 public and private parking spaces sit empty nearly all the time. These spaces represent at least six acres of land in the downtown, and significant land and capital costs (e.g., the costs incurred to support operation and maintenance of these off-street parking lots).
- Development and parking patterns discourage a critical mass of attractive destinations, walking and biking between destinations, and economic development.

Key consultant findings in the Cannabis Industrial study area in Desert Hot Springs included the following:

- The Cannabis Industrial study area was identified as a focus area for growth in employment featuring mostly light-industrial land uses and with access challenges for current area employees.
- Incomplete sidewalks/curbs, a lack of current parking restrictions and widespread practice of informal curb parking in this study area suggest the need for more flexible parking requirements.
- The City has a goal of maximizing productive square footage for businesses, and the addition of new, large surface parking lots to accommodate off-street parking by area employees would not achieve this goal since surface parking lots are not considered “productive square footage” by the City.

Key consultant recommendations for parking management in Desert Hot Springs included the following:

- Manage and reduce the citywide parking footprint and address redundant, excess parking spaces.
- Facilitate shared parking to make the most efficient use of existing parking spaces. Public parking can be made available through shared, consolidated parking lots to minimize the “parking footprint” and maximize the area for businesses and civic space.
- Repeal minimum parking requirements. Businesses should not be required to build more parking, especially where abundant parking exists.
- Discourage unshared parking, in part by concentrating parking in public lots throughout the downtown district to maximize the land use efficiency of businesses and civic spaces, including by utilizing appropriate massing to encourage active transportation access.
- Encourage, or at least allow, for mixed-use and infill development.

-
- Encourage the use of existing programs to facilitate travel by non-driving modes, particularly for employees in the Cannabis District. These programs can reduce parking demand, emissions, and commute costs.
 - Implement policies and capital improvements to enhance connectivity and encourage walking, bicycling, and regulated shared mobility (e.g., scooters, bike share, other). Improved walkability allows for more efficient parking (and a more enjoyable downtown experience).
 - Anticipate parking needs in the future; if new development requires parking management, consider adopting new technologies and staff to promote efficient use of existing parking spaces, implementing a parking benefit district and encouraging new shared public parking arrangements.

City of Garden Grove

Key consultant findings from the six residential study areas in Garden Grove included the following:

- All study areas experienced a lack of parking availability on *some* blocks. However, one study area was effectively full – with 99 percent parking utilization (217 spots filled, of 220 total) observed on the date of consultant’s survey.
- Significant frustration expressed by the public regarding lack of parking availability, but also reflecting other concerns including perceptions of reduced safety.
- Increased number of ADUs, increased number of people (including drivers) per household resulting from high rents, increasing number of multifamily units, home-based businesses, and houses of worship in residential neighborhoods identified as source of increased parking demand.
- City had begun a concerted effort to increase enforcement of basic regulations, in parallel with the SCAG Parking Bundle Study.

Key consultant recommendations for parking management in Garden Grove included the following:

- Solutions are likely to rely heavily on, at least some amount of increased enforcement effort. Consensus regarding level and policies for enforcement and associated resources needed are key.
- Some public support for parking permit programs was expressed, but, at present, implementation is likely premature.
- Shared parking opportunities with public institutions or private commercial property may serve to increase parking availability.
- Approach the idea of residential parking permits with “eyes wide open” and ensure the foundation of basic enforcement in place first is a possible solution but with tradeoffs of cost and availability.
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) requirements for new, large multifamily and fees for funding multimodal improvements.

- Unbundling of residential parking to encourage sharing of parking spaces when demand warrants.

Overall Study Conclusions

The consultant shared the following overarching conclusions that emerged from its work with both cities:

- Some technologies can help address parking issues, but technology will not be *the* solution to parking problems. Policies and operational measures are most effective and should be the priority.
- Curb mapping in locations with homogenous land uses and homogeneous curb regulations is of limited use.
- Solutions are likely to rely heavily on, at least some amount of increased enforcement effort. Consensus regarding level and policies for enforcement and associated resources needed are key.
- Recent trends in deregulating off-street parking (i.e., eliminating minimum parking requirements) are productive on the whole, but will require more careful regulation and enforcement of the curb.
- Encouraging multimodal transportation can help with meeting sustainability and equity goals, and improving parking conditions, but these efforts will take time and will not pay dividends overnight.
- Efforts to increase housing production will require increased regulatory and enforcement efforts relating to local parking-related policies and practices.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Staff work for the SCP SCMI is included in the OWP under 275-4882.02 and 275-4892.01.

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. PowerPoint Presentation - SCAG Parking Bundle



Credit: <https://www.realtor.com>



SCAG Parking Bundle Parking Management Study

Findings
City of Desert Hot Springs
City of Garden Grove

November 2023

WALKER CONSULTANTS

PRESENTATION AGENDA

- 1. Parking Study and Plan Background - SCAG
- 2. Desert Hot Springs
 - Background and Goals
 - Study Areas (Downtown and Cannabis Industrial District)
 - Findings
 - Recommendations
- 3. Garden Grove
 - Background and Goals
 - Study Areas (Six Residential Districts)
 - Findings
 - Recommendations
- 4. Conclusion

WALKER CONSULTANTS

OVERVIEW - PARKING STUDY AND PLAN BACKGROUND SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

- Project supported by Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)
 - Sustainable Communities Program
 - Smart Cities & Mobility Innovations Projects
 - Focus on best practices in curb space management
 - Parking management can ensure parking availability and encourage shared mobility use
 - Help Address Sustainability Issues
 - Help Address Equity Issues

WALKER CONSULTANTS

FOCUS AND APPROACH - SCAG

- Test new curb management technologies (Arcadis-IBI's Curb IQ)
- Existing/Baseline Parking Conditions Assessment
 - Curb Mapping
 - Inventory
 - Utilization
- Future Conditions Analysis
- Address Sustainable Communities Initiative (SCI) goals including:
 - Sustainability
 - Active transportation and other policies for improved connectivity
 - Equity
- Parking Management Recommendations



WALKER CONSULTANTS

PARKING STUDY AND PLAN BACKGROUND CITY OF DESERT HOT SPRINGS

City Goals and Objectives

- Develop parking management plans for two different commercial districts
 - Downtown District, to enhance economic development of the district and the shared civic space of the downtown
 - Proactively address parking issues and new development
 - Cannabis Industrial District, to enhance economic development and improve commute options for employees
- Provide consistent parking framework
- Deploy innovative practices

WALKER CONSULTANTS


Project Overview – Study Areas

Desert Hot Springs Study Area #1 |Downtown District

- Pierson Blvd
 - Commercial and civic land uses
 - Priority area for redevelopment, community events
- First St and Acoma Ave
 - Single family residential land uses
 - Potentially impacted, but also opportunity for, street closures/detours during events
- No current parking restrictions



Study Area Zoning Map – Downtown Desert Hot Springs




DESERT HOT SPRINGS KEY PARKING FINDINGS- DOWNTOWN

- Existing parking exceeds current parking needs (82% of spaces empty at peak), yet many new land uses may be required to provide additional parking under current policies.
- Currently, more than 1,000 public and private parking spaces sit empty nearly all the time. These spaces represent at least six acres of land in the downtown, and significant land and capital costs.
- Development and parking patterns discourage a critical mass of attractive destinations, walking and biking between destinations, and economic development.

Desert Hot Springs Study Area #2 | Cannabis District

- Focus area for growth in employment
- Light industrial land uses
- Current access challenges
- Incomplete sidewalks/curbs
- No current parking restrictions
- Informal curb parking
- Need for flexible parking requirements
- Goal of maximizing productive square footage for businesses



Study Area Zoning Map - Industrial Cannabis District

DESERT HOT SPRINGS - KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

- Manage and reduce the parking footprint and redundant, excess parking spaces.
- Facilitate shared parking to make the most efficient use of existing parking spaces. Public parking can be made available through shared, consolidated parking lots to minimize the “parking footprint” and maximize the area for businesses and civic space.
- Repeal minimum parking requirements. Businesses should not be required to build more parking, especially where abundant parking exists.
- Discourage unshared parking, in part by concentrating parking in public lots throughout the downtown district so that parcels can utilize their land for businesses and a critical mass of business and civic spaces.
- Encourage, or at least allow, for mixed-use and infill development.

WALKER CONSULTANTS

DESERT HOT SPRINGS - KEY RECOMMENDATIONS (CONTINUED)

- Encourage the use of existing programs to facilitate non-driving modes, particularly for employees in the Cannabis District. Use of these programs can reduce parking demand, emissions, and commute costs.
- Implement policies and capital improvements to enhance connectivity and encourage walking, bicycling, and regulated shared mobility (scooters, bike share, other). Improved walkability allows for more efficient parking (and a more enjoyable downtown experience). A
- Anticipate parking in the future, if new development requires parking management: new technologies, staff, a parking district, shared public parking rather than reserved parking parcel-by-parcel.

WALKER CONSULTANTS

CITY OF GARDEN GROVE – RESIDENTIAL FOCUS


- On-street parking issues in residential areas, an increasing problem and source of tension in cities across the SCAG region, particularly those without a parking enforcement department.
- Six study areas selected as representative of parking issues throughout the City.
- Parking violations historically, lightly enforced by Code enforcement.
- City was exploring a software that can identify issues or quantify issues in the future.



WALKER CONSULTANTS

STUDY AREAS THROUGHOUT THE CITY OF GARDEN GROVE

- Study areas often reflected a mix of single-family, multifamily dwellings, increasingly ADUs, and the associated effects on on-street parking.
- Proximity to dense residential, from multifamily to mobile home parks was considered and observed.
- Unlike many studies, proximity to commercial areas was not one of the issues in need of study.




WALKER CONSULTANTS

GARDEN GROVE – STUDY AREA OCCUPANCY FINDINGS

	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Area 4	Area 5	Area 6
Percent of Block Faces with Parking Utilization Above 85%	0%	19%	16%	11%	80%*	29%

- All study areas experienced a lack of parking availability on *some* blocks.
- *However, one study area was effectively full.
- Significant frustration expressed by the public regarding lack of parking availability, but also reflecting other concerns including perceptions of reduced safety.
- Increased number of ADUs, increased number of people (including drivers) per household resulting from high rents, increasing number of multifamily units, home-based businesses, houses of worship in residential neighborhoods all identified as source of increased parking demand.



SAMPLE FINDINGS – CITY OF GARDEN GROVE

- Only Study Area 5 experienced complete parking congestion.
- Areas 1 – 4 and 6 saw block faces experiencing high and low impacts.
- Some households already pay (\$30 - \$100+) monthly for spaces informally.
- 65% percent of all Garden Grove households own two or fewer vehicles; 75% of renter households own two or fewer vehicles.
- 2.3% to 19.0% of households in each study area do not own cars.
- Parking complaints sometimes were not about lack of available spaces. Other concerns included:
 - Crime
 - Cleanliness, trash
 - Desire to park in front of own house
 - Lack of enforcement
 - People from outside the neighborhood parking in the neighborhood
 - Parking impacts from houses of worship
- City had begun a concerted effort to increase enforcement of basic regulations, parallel with the SCAG Parking Bundle Study.
- Implementation of State RHNA requirements will exacerbate the demand for on-street parking.



POLICIES FOR CONSIDERATION –CITY OF GARDEN GROVE

1. Continue efforts at increased enforcement including for:

- Street cleaning
- Calls for service
- 72-hour rule
- Planned non-owner (PNO) vehicles on the street

Will be the foundation of any improvement.

2. Shared parking opportunities with public institutions or private commercial property to increase parking availability.

3. Residential parking permits: Approach with “eyes wide open” and foundation of basic enforcement in place first. A possible solution but with tradeoffs of cost and availability

4. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) requirements for new, large multifamily and fees for funding multimodal improvements.

5. Unbundling of residential parking to encourage sharing of parking spaces for those who need them.



CONCLUSIONS – CITY OF GARDEN GROVE

- The public’s parking concerns about on-street parking are not always strictly about parking availability or, by extension, transportation.
- Some technologies can help (for example, with enforcement) but technology will not be *the* solution to parking problems.
- Curb mapping in locations with homogenous land uses and homogeneous curb regulations will provide limited solutions.
- Solutions are likely to rely heavily on, at least some, increasing enforcement effort. Consensus regarding level and policies for enforcement and associated resources needed are key.
- Some public support for parking permit programs was expressed, but implementation currently is likely premature.



OVERALL STUDY CONCLUSIONS

- Some technologies can help address parking issues but technology will not be *the* solution to parking problems. Policies and operational measures are most effective and should be the priority.
- Curb mapping in locations with homogenous land uses and homogeneous curb regulations is of limited use. Curb mapping should likely focus on curbs fronting
- Solutions are likely to rely heavily on, at least some, increasing enforcement effort. Consensus regarding level and policies for enforcement and associated resources needed are key.
- Recent trends in deregulating off-street parking (i.e. eliminating minimum parking requirements) are, overall, productive but will result in more careful regulation and enforcement of the curb.
- Encouraging multimodal transportation modes can help with meeting sustainability and equity goals, and improving parking conditions, but these efforts will take time.
- Efforts to increase housing production will require greater curb management measures.





**AGENDA ITEM 7
REPORT**

Southern California Association of Governments
November 2, 2023

To: Transportation Committee (TC)
From: Warren Whiteaker, Department Manager
(213) 236-1810, whiteakerw@scag.ca.gov

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S
APPROVAL

Subject: FY2023-FY2026 Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) Guidelines

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Recommend that the Regional Council: 1) approve CRP Program Guidelines; and 2) authorize Executive Director to initiate call for projects consistent with approved guidelines.

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians. 7: Secure funding to support agency priorities to effectively and efficiently deliver work products.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) is a new program established by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) and provides funding for transportation projects that reduce carbon dioxide emissions from on-road transportation sources. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is responsible for the selection of CRP-funded projects in the SCAG region. In April 2023, the RC approved expediated project selection of Fiscal Year 2021-22 (FY2022) CRP funds. SCAG staff, in consultation with the region's county transportation commissions (CTCs), developed program guidelines for the selection of CRP-funded projects for FY2023 through FY2026. SCAG staff will subsequently initiate a call for project nominations consistent with the approved guidelines and return to the RC for approval of projects recommended for funding.

BACKGROUND:

CRP is a new program established by IIJA that provides over \$6.4 billion nationally over a five-year period (FY2022 through FY2026) for projects designed to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from on-road transportation sources. Under the program, each state is required to develop a Carbon Reduction Strategy by November 15, 2023, which identifies projects and strategies to reduce transportation emissions. The Carbon Reduction Strategy for California was developed by Caltrans and establishes a framework for eligible priority project categories that can use CRP funds in California:

- Zero-emission vehicles and supporting infrastructure,

- Active transportation,
- Rail and transit, and
- Conversion of existing highway lanes to priced managed lanes.

For each fiscal year, 65 percent of CRP funding apportioned to each state is required to be obligated in proportion to the relative share of population in urban areas within the state. The remaining 35 percent of funds apportioned to each state for each fiscal year may be obligated in any area of the state.

Expedited Selection of Projects Funded with FY2022 CRP Funds

Due to limited time to obligate FY2022 CRP funds, SCAG staff sought and received RC approval for expedited project selection for FY2022 only in April 2023.

Selection of Projects to be Funded with FY2023 through FY2026 CRP Funds

As noted in the April 2023 RC staff report, SCAG received concurrence from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on a framework for the selection of the CRP projects within the SCAG region, which is modeled after the federal apportionment approach. Specifically, SCAG will use 65 percent of regional CRP funds (approximately \$92 million for FY2023 through FY2026) for a solicitation for project nominations in partnership with the region's CTCs as outlined in the attached program guidelines. County nomination targets¹ will guide the CTCs in the amount of funding requests that they submit to SCAG for project selection. SCAG will select projects based on the initial screening and prioritization by the CTCs and additional regional project evaluations. SCAG will select projects that advance regional and federal performance measures. SCAG will direct 35 percent of regional CRP funds (approximately \$49 million for FY2023 through FY2026) to identify, evaluate, and award funding for regional and/or local pilots and partnership projects that achieve regional transportation goals and further the objectives of Connect SoCal.

The attached CRP Program Guidelines build off of the Surface Transportation Block Grant/Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (STBG/CMAQ) Program Guidelines and continue the extensive engagement and collaborations that has been ongoing for more than a year with the six regional CTCs, Caltrans, and our federal partners. The CRP Program Guidelines outline a process in which:

- SCAG determines the availability of CRP funding;
- SCAG initiates a regional solicitation for project nominations;

¹ The CRP nomination targets mirror the nomination targets established for the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) program approved by the RC on February 2, 2023, as part of the STBG/CMAQ Compliance Action Plan. While nomination targets guide CTC submittals, the targets are not guaranteed funding levels, nor do the targets establish a nomination floor or a nomination ceiling.

-
- The CTCs assist in the process by outreaching to eligible project sponsors, conducting an initial screening against the selection criteria, and identifying county-level project priorities; and
 - SCAG evaluates project nominations against program criteria and recommends a list of projects for RC approval.

Projects approved by the RC for funding will be programmed in the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP).

FISCAL IMPACT:

Work associated with this item is included in the Fiscal Year 2024 Overall Work Program (WBS No. 24-030.0146.03: Federal Project Selection, Monitoring, and Management).

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. PowerPoint Presentation - FY2023-FY2026 CRP Program Guidelines
2. FY23-FY26 CRP Program Guidelines



SCAG Region CRP Program Guidelines

November 2, 2023

WWW.SCAG.CA.GOV

CRP Program Guidelines

Key Compliance Issues

- CRP funds cannot be suballocated through a percentage or formula
- CRP project selection cannot be delegated
- Projects funded with federal funds must be approved by the MPO
- Caltrans' Carbon Reduction Strategy sets a framework for eligible priority project categories that use CRP funds in California:
 - Transit and passenger rail
 - Active transportation
 - ZEVs and EV infrastructure
 - Conversion of existing highway lanes to price managed lanes

CRP: Carbon Reduction Program | MPO: Metropolitan Planning Organization | ZEV: Zero-Emission Vehicle | EV: Electric Vehicle

Selection Approach


SCAG and County Transportation Commission (CTC) Roles

- SCAG initiates regionwide solicitation for project nominations
- CTCs assist with local outreach and initial nomination screening process, using processes reviewed by SCAG for consistency with regional program guidelines
- County nomination targets guide CTCs in amount of funding requests that they submit to SCAG for project selection
 - Performance-based nomination targets do not represent a guaranteed funding level, a nomination floor, or a nomination ceiling
- SCAG selects projects based on initial screening & prioritization by CTCs and additional regional project evaluations

Program Guidelines

- Caltrans framework for priority project categories
 - Transit and passenger rail; active transportation, ZEVs and EV infrastructure, and conversion of existing highway lanes to price managed lanes
- CTC prioritization
 - CTCs to submit project nominations from respective counties and classify projects as Highly Recommended, Recommended, Contingency List or Not Recommended
- Scoring criteria
 - CTC Prioritization; Regional Priorities; Performance Measures; Equity; Carbon Reduction
- Recommendation to RC
 - Scores converted to Highly Recommended, Recommended, Contingency List or Not Recommended for RC approval

Key Milestones and Next Steps



THANK YOU!



SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

FY23-FY26 CARBON REDUCTION PROGRAM GUIDELINES

CONTENTS

CARBON REDUCTION PROGRAM OVERVIEW	2
BACKGROUND	2
FUNDING AVAILABILITY	2
ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS	3
PUBLIC OUTREACH AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT	3
ELIGIBLE PROJECT USES	3
PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS	4
CALL FOR PROJECTS SCHEDULE	4
REGIONAL PROJECT EVALUATION	4
APPROVED PROJECTS AND MONITORING	6
CONTACT INFORMATION	7

CARBON REDUCTION PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The federal Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) Guidelines, establishes the policy framework for project selection and investment of federal funds in accordance with the State of California’s Carbon Reduction Strategy. CRP funding is made available by the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL), enacted as the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), which provides funds for projects designed to reduce transportation emissions.

SCAG is in a unique position to utilize this resource and build upon the REAP 2.0 funded County Transportation Commission Partnership Program efforts, allowing for broader planning and implementation investments, including those which focus on reducing transportation emissions. As part of its implementation of CRP, SCAG will use 65 percent of the regional CRP share to issue a Call for Project Nominations to support transformative projects as described below.

BACKGROUND

The United States is committed to a whole-of government approach to reducing economy-wide net greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 2030. The BIL provides resources to help funding recipients advance this goal in the transportation sector. In addition, the BIL makes historic investments to improve the resilience of transportation infrastructure, helping communities prepare for hazards such as wildfires, floods, storms, and droughts exacerbated by climate change.

The CRP encourages the advancement of projects that address climate change and sustainability. In particular, SCAG encourages projects that implement the region’s Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainability Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS, known as Connect SoCal). In alignment with SCAG’s Racial Equity Early Action Plan, projects that facilitate the consistent integration of equity are strongly encouraged.

FUNDING AVAILABILITY

The CRP program is authorized from FY22 through FY26. For the FY22 apportionments totaling \$33.6 million, SCAG coordinated with the CTCs to expedite and select a program of projects approved by the Regional Council on April 6, 2023. The SCAG region’s allocation of CRP funds is estimated to be approximately \$141 million from FY23 through FY26. For FY23-FY26, SCAG will solicit project nominations from the CTCs using a Call for Project Nominations process to program up to an estimated approximately \$92 million. This represents 65 percent of the SCAG region’s apportionments. SCAG will direct the remaining estimated up to approximately \$49 million to SCAG’s regional initiatives, to identify, evaluate, and award funding for regional and/or local pilots and partnership projects that achieve regional transportation goals and further the objectives of Connect SoCal. Actual programming may be lower to reflect the latest apportionments as reported by Caltrans.

CRP funds are contract authority, reimbursed from the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund. CRP funds are available for obligation for a period of 3 years after the last day of the fiscal year for which the funds are authorized. Thus, CRP funds are available for obligation for up to 4 years.

FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR	2023	2024	2025	2026
OBLIGATION DEADLINE	9/30/2026	9/30/2027	9/30/2028	9/30/2029
EXPENDITURE DEADLINE	9/30/2031	9/30/2032	9/30/2033	9/30/2034

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

In general, SCAG cities, counties, transit agencies, federally recognized Tribal governments, and CTCs are eligible to apply for CRP funds. Each CTC is responsible for coordination and submission of project nominations to SCAG from eligible entities from their respective counties. SCAG encourages CTCs to coordinate with SCAG and other affected CTCs on project nominations for multi-county projects and to support multi-county agency projects such as the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor Agency (LOSSAN), and the Southern California Regional Rail Authority (Metrolink).

PUBLIC OUTREACH AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Stakeholder engagement is essential in all SCAG programs. SCAG requires each CTC to engage relevant stakeholders to maximize project impact and further collaborative policy goals.

CTCs are required to demonstrate countywide outreach and engagement with stakeholders and the public to solicit project ideas. CTCs should follow current best practices related to virtual and in-person public participation, outreach, and engagement. SCAG encourages each CTC to outreach and engage with historically disadvantaged communities (Priority Equity Communities) within their respective counties. CTCs must document their public outreach and stakeholder engagement process and demonstrate how it meets the program guidelines. This can include a CTC conducting a call for project nominations.

ELIGIBLE PROJECT USES

SCAG’s CRP guidelines prioritize projects that aspire to transform Southern California’s mobility opportunities, especially with respect to Connect SoCal, the region’s adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS). Applicants are encouraged to review strategies included within [Connect SoCal](#) to align project applications with regional planning priorities and concepts. Funds shall be used for implementation efforts that can demonstrate a reduction in transportation emissions over the project’s lifecycle. Of critical importance to SCAG is to demonstrate GHG emission reduction to meet our climate commitments, particularly in ways that advance equity and improve underlying social and public health vulnerabilities.

Funds may be spent on projects at any phase, helping to close a critical transportation funding gap for pre-construction needs. As with most federal funds, CRP requires a non-federal match. While the non-federal share requirement depends on the type of project, most projects must have a minimum 11.47 percent non-federal funding match. Due to the limited balance of toll credits statewide, toll credits may not be used as funding match for CRP.

CRP funding may be used on a wide range of projects that support the reduction of transportation emissions. In accordance with California’s Carbon Reduction Strategy, applicants should nominate projects that support the state’s three [Carbon Reduction Program pillars](#): 1) transit and passenger rail 2) active transportation, 3) zero emission vehicles and infrastructure, and conversion of existing highway

lanes to price managed lanes. For more information, please refer to the [Federal CRP Implementation Guidance](#).

All proposed uses will be required to meet the state and program requirements. Projects must demonstrate a reduction in transportation emissions. Please contact SCAG with any questions regarding funding eligibility.

PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

SCAG will conduct a Call for Project Nominations, provide guidance, perform project evaluations, develop a list of selected projects, and conduct the SCAG board review and approval process.

CTCs will solicit and submit project applications including conducting and documenting their outreach processes, screening applicants and projects for program eligibility, and conducting initial evaluation and prioritization of projects from their respective county. CTCs will develop individual project application materials for submission to SCAG and establish processes for their county's project nominations, consistent with the overall program guidelines and subject to consultation and concurrence by SCAG staff.

One application is required per project and entities may submit multiple project applications. **Applicants must complete and submit their application by March 29, 2024, at 5:00 p.m. Program timelines are subject to change.**

CALL FOR PROJECTS SCHEDULE

The following schedule outlines important dates for the CRP Call for Projects. **Program timelines are subject to change.**

CRP (FY23-FY26) CALL MILESTONES	DATE
CALL FOR APPLICATIONS OPENS	January 4, 2024
APPLICATION WORKSHOP	TBD
CALL FOR APPLICATIONS SUBMISSION DEADLINE	March 29, 2024
REGIONAL COUNCIL APPROVAL	July 11, 2024

REGIONAL PROJECT EVALUATION

SCAG staff will form a review committee composed of a multidisciplinary group of staff members. The review committee will conduct the regional project evaluation process to review the project submittals provided by the CTCs and develop a recommended list of projects for adoption by the SCAG RC. This process will consist of the following steps:

1. **Confirm Eligibility:** SCAG staff will review submitted documentation to ensure compliance with applicable federal, state, and regional policies. Screening will include a review to ensure consistency with adopted RTP/SCS. Any issues identified will be communicated to CTC staff, and projects with unresolved issues will be excluded from further consideration.
2. **Scoring Criteria:** Eligible projects can achieve up to 100 points. The review committee will score projects using the following rubric:

SCORING CRITERIA	POSSIBLE POINTS
CTC Prioritization: Relative CTC project prioritization	Up to 25 Points
Regional Priorities: Project implements SCAG’s adopted RTP/SCS, including future adopted Plan policies and strategies	Up to 20 Points
Performance Measures: Project demonstrates support for Connect SoCal Performance Measures (including but not limited to Federal Transportation Performance Management Goals): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location Efficiency, • Mobility and Accessibility, • Safety and Public Health, • Environmental Quality, • Economic Opportunity, • Investment Effectiveness, • Transportation System Sustainability, and • Environmental Justice 	Up to 15 Points
Equity: Project demonstrates direct and/or indirect benefit that positively impact Priority Equity Communities	Up to 15 Points
Carbon Reduction: Expected carbon reduction and relative cost effectiveness of projects in reducing carbon emissions in the SCAG region	Up to 25 Points

The review committee will score each project using the following criteria:

CTC Prioritization	
• Prioritized in the CTC list as Highly Recommended	25 points
• Prioritized in the CTC list as Recommended	15 points
• Prioritized in the CTC Contingency List	5 points
Regional Priorities	
• Aligns with 3 or more Regional Priorities	20 points
• Aligns with 1 to 2 Regional Priorities	10 points
• Does not align a Regional Priority	0 points
Performance Measures	
• Supports 6 or more Performance Measures	15 points
• Supports 4 or 5 Performance Measures	10 points
• Supports 2 or 3 Performance Measures	5 points
• Supports less than 2 Performance Measures	0 points
Equity	
• Demonstrates direct positive benefit to Priority Equity Communities	15 points
• Demonstrates indirect positive benefit to Priority Equity Communities	10 points
• Does not demonstrate positive benefits to Priority Equity Communities	0 points
Carbon Reduction	
• Demonstrates cost effectiveness in reducing transportation emissions	25 points
• Estimates transportation emission reduction benefits	15 points
• Does not address transportation emission reduction benefits	0 points

3. **Project Ranking Process:** Projects will be ranked according to their average review committee score. SCAG staff will develop a recommended list of eligible projects for CRP funding using the comprehensive rubric rankings. All eligible projects scored with a maximum possible score of 100 points and ranked from highest to lowest score. In developing this list, SCAG will consider if project elements may not be eligible for CRP funds.
4. **Program Balancing:** Candidate projects will be initially prioritized according to their ranking as described above. However, to achieve programmatic investment thresholds, and ensure a balanced program of projects, SCAG staff may adjust project prioritization based on the following factors:
 - Ensuring that at least 40 percent of funding positively benefit Priority Equity Communities and meet Justice 40 requirements, and
 - Overall program balancing for a variety of project types, equitable investments, and regional diversity.

Project scores will be converted into recommendation categories (i.e., Highly Recommended, Recommended, Contingency List, and Not Recommended) prior to publishing the recommended program of projects. To achieve an overall Highly Recommended determination, projects must achieve a score of at least 85 points. To achieve an overall Recommended determination, projects must achieve a score of at least 70 and less than 85 points. To be considered for the Contingency List, projects must achieve a score of at least 65 points. Using this process, SCAG staff will develop a draft program of recommended (Highly Recommended and Recommended) and Contingency List projects for SCAG RC adoption. Projects that achieve a score of less than 65 will be determined to be Not Recommended.

5. **Program Approval:** The SCAG RC will consider the recommended CRP projects.

APPROVED PROJECTS AND MONITORING

To ensure the timely use of federal funds, SCAG will collaborate with Caltrans and CTCs to enhance Guideline policies and procedures to ensure federal funding requirements and deadlines are met and funds are not lost to the region. Once SCAG selects projects, CTCs will be required to submit a Project Alignment Confirmation Form to SCAG for transmittal to Caltrans. Additionally, SCAG will prepare and submit annual obligation plans to Caltrans, monitor federal fund obligations, overall federal funding levels, and apportionment and Obligation Authority (OA) balances. Program completion is based on statutory provisions and SCAG expects all selected projects to be completed in a timely manner and requires that applicants coordinate internal resources to ensure timely completion of the projects.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Questions regarding the Carbon Reduction Program application process should be directed to:

Kate Kigongo
Department Manager, Partnerships for Innovative Deployment
Telephone: (213) 236-1808
Email: kigongo@scag.ca.gov

Questions regarding eligibility, programming, and obligation of CRP funding should be directed to:

Heidi Busslinger
Principal Planner, Federal Transportation Improvement Program
Telephone: (213) 236-1541
Email: busslinger@scag.ca.gov



AGENDA ITEM 8
REPORT

Southern California Association of Governments
November 2, 2023

To: Transportation Committee (TC)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S
APPROVAL

From: Annie Nam, Deputy Director
(213) 236-1827, Nam@scag.ca.gov

Subject: Smart Freeways – An Introduction to the Next Generation of Freeway
Traffic Management Systems

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Information Only – No Action Required

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Darren Henderson, Technical Director of Freeway Operations and Advanced Traffic Management at GHD, will provide a presentation of "Smart Freeways", introducing the next generation of freeway traffic management systems. He will provide an overview of the Victoria Department of Transport and Planning (VicDTP) managed motorways concept that has been adapted as Smart Freeways in the US, highlighting the recently completed Smart 25 Pilot Project in Denver, Colorado. Mr. Henderson will discuss the Advanced Technologies project – Coordinated Adaptive Ramp Metering (CARM) being developed as part of Innovate 680 for the Contra Costa Transportation Authority in Northern California and provide an update on the I-15 Smart Freeways project being developed for the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC).

BACKGROUND:

The VicDTP introduced the managed motorways concept in Melbourne, starting operations with the M1 Motorway in the early 2000's. Managed motorways incorporate intelligent system tools on urban freeways to manage traffic with the aim of reducing congestion. The concept is deployed in jurisdictions in different ways.

While ramp metering and other technologies have been deployed, they are often limited as these techniques may delay the onset of a breakdown but not remove it. By considering the corridor in a holistic way, it can be managed and controlled to mitigate disruptive events and increase system resilience. Managed motorways—through coordinated ramp metering, variable speed limits and

lane-use management systems—can stop flow breakdown, resulting in safety, efficiency, and reliability.

The Melbourne Approach requires a range of physical infrastructure to create space for vehicles on ramps and possible lane allocation around ramps as well as ITS devices and control systems to support pre-emptive control beyond the motorway. The approach also requires a strong understanding of traffic flow, continual optimization, and a robust operational framework to ensure reliable results. Also, the holistic approach, as outlined in the Victoria managed motorways, includes adopting a Safe System approach (also known as Vision Zero) to the design and management of motorways to reduce the incidence of severe crashes.

The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) was interested in the Melbourne managed motorways system to improve the performance of I-25 in Denver, without adding lanes. The I-25 corridor selected for the SMART 25 Pilot Project underwent a major reconstruction in the early 2000's that added lane capacity and an adjacent light-rail line. Fifteen years later, the freeway was more congested than it ever was before, and CDOT began to explore technology-based solutions to reduce travel times, improve travel time reliability and increase traffic flow without the major expense and community impacts of further freeway expansion.

After conducting the initial regional screening and feasibility study, CDOT chose to focus on the coordinated and adaptive ramp metering (CARM) aspects of Australian managed motorways for the SMART 25 pilot. CARM uses sophisticated algorithms and control systems and real-time data from advanced traffic detection systems to adjust the entry of vehicles onto the freeway to minimize the formation of bottlenecks. All the ramps are coordinated to respond to real-time data, minimize flow breakdown and prevent impacts to adjacent arterials.

Similarly, the CCTA's INNOVATE 680 program includes the Advanced Technologies project, including CARM, specifically designed to unify existing systems within the corridor to address corridor-wide congestion on I-680 in Contra Costa County.

In the SCAG region, RCTC is developing the Interstate 15 Smart Freeway Pilot Project. The proposed project will use sensors and other features to continuously monitor real-time traffic conditions on this eight-mile, non-tolled section of I-15. The project will use ramp meters that work as a coordinated system that adapts to allow more or fewer vehicles to enter I-15 at any given time. The project will improve overall traffic flow and reduce collisions by maintaining steady travel speeds within the I-15 corridor, without highway expansion and related construction costs and impacts.

Darren Henderson, Technical Director of Freeway Operations and Advanced Traffic Management at GHD, will provide an overview presentation of Smart Freeways, introducing the next generation of freeway traffic management systems.



FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. PowerPoint Presentation - SmartFreeways



→ Smart Freeways

Darren Henderson

GHD Technical Director – Freeway Operations and Advanced Traffic Management



Attachment: PowerPoint Presentation - SmartFreeways (Smart Freeways – An Introduction to the Next Generation of Freeway Traffic



Acknowledgement

A special thanks to the Colorado Department of Transportation, the Victoria State Government Department of Transport and Planning, and Transmax.

This presentation would not be possible without their commitment to knowledge sharing and their willingness to allow others to learn from their collective experience with SMART 25 and other Smart Freeways projects.

© 2023

Reproduction and/or distribution of the presentation, individual slides and specific information contained within is not permitted without the prior written consent of the presenter.

Smart Freeways

→ Smart Freeways Concept

Smart Freeways provides a new approach to fully control freeway operations

- Refines the way we use familiar highway traffic management technologies
- Provides a **comprehensive package of strategies** to better manage freeway operations and **optimize traffic flows**



Smart Freeways are operating on multiple freeway corridors in Australia

- Initially developed by the Victoria Department of Transport and Planning
- Melbourne's Managed Motorway system now extends over more than 100 miles of freeways
- Additional facilities are in operation in Brisbane and Perth



5

Smart Freeways | GHF

How are Smart Freeways different?

- Uses Transmax STREAMS® to **integrate all ITS devices** on a common platform
 - Ensures **all systems work seamlessly** together
- Features a comprehensive **coordinated adaptive ramp metering** strategy that utilizes the ALINEA/HERO Suite of **multiple control algorithms** to optimize traffic flows
 - Provides the ability to **balance ramp demand and queuing** along the entire corridor




6

Smart Freeways | GHF

Smart Freeways is the only proven strategy to reliably control freeway operations

- Melbourne's throughput on Smart Freeways **increased by up to 25%** during the peak periods
- That's the **equivalent of adding a fifth lane** on a four-lane freeway
- The economic benefits of the initial Smart Freeway made the business case for completing the entire network



Source: VicDTP and Transmax

7

Smart Freeways | GHD



Smart Freeways


→ SMART 25 Pilot Project
Background

SMART 25 Pilot Project Background

- Nine-month pilot demonstrating VicDTP CARM approach on northbound I-25 south of downtown Denver
 - From Ridgeway Parkway to University Boulevard
 - 18 ramps over 14 miles
- STREAMS® Freeway Management System
 - Vehicle detection upgrades for coverage and accuracy



SMART 25 Pilot Project Performance Evaluation Schedule




Smart Freeways

→ SMART 25 Pilot Project Performance Evaluation Findings

SMART 25 Pilot Project Performance Evaluation Findings

- Data observations showed a decrease in the severity and duration of congestion
 - Speed heat plots show reduced congestion “bruising” during peak periods
 - Downstream bottleneck back-ups impacted the northern end of the project
- The most notable reductions were during the PM peak periods
 - Crashes in the corridor affected data both prior to and during the pilot period



Image/data source: CDOT and Transmax STREAMS®

SMART 25 Pilot Project Performance Evaluation Findings

- AM peak period travel times reduced slightly, despite increasing volumes
- PM peak period travel times fell over 14% (2.5 mins) and over 19% (4.1 mins) in the peak hour
 - The PM peak planning travel time (95th percentile) fell over 20% (5.4 mins) demonstrating improved reliability
- Off-peak congestion was effectively eliminated



13

Smart Freeways | GH

SMART 25 Pilot Project Performance Evaluation Findings

- Daily total delay was reduced by over 40%
 - Total delay reduced almost 50% in the PM peak period

Time Period	Baseline Daily Total Delays (Hours)	Arterial Ramps Only (vs Baseline)		Full Operations (vs Baseline)	
All Day	1,958	-495	-25.3%	-827	-42.2%
AM Peak	424	-119	-28.1%	-23	-5.3%
PM Peak	1,374	-262	-19.1%	-661	-48.1%

- Daily vehicle hours of travel decreased by over 5% despite daily VMT increasing only slightly (0.3%) during pilot period

Section	Baseline Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	Baseline Daily Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT)	Full Operations VMT (vs Baseline)		Full Operations VHT (vs Baseline)	
All	1,419,739	23,749	+4,650	+0.3%	-1,245	-5.2%

14

Smart Freeways | GH

SMART 25 Pilot Project Performance Evaluation Findings

- Ramp wait times were expected to increase with CARM
 - Ramp wait times were generally below 2 minutes and seldom exceeded 4 minutes
 - No reports of ramp queues extending onto arterial streets during the pilot period

Ramp Name	AM Peak		PM Peak	
	95 th Pct Travel Time (sec)	Full Operations (vs Baseline)	95 th Pct Travel Time (sec)	Full Operations (vs Baseline)
Ridgegate Direct	49	(+31)	52	(+35)
<i>C-470</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>(+25)</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>(+28)</i>
Dry Creek	38	(+21)	50	(+19)
Arapahoe Direct	77	(+44)	100	(+51)
Belleview	62	(+23)	104	(+16)
<i>I-225</i>	<i>71</i>	<i>(+57)</i>	<i>71</i>	<i>(+49)</i>
Hampden	70	(+47)	61	(+42)

15

Smart Freeways | GHG

SMART 25 Pilot Project Conclusions

- The SMART 25 Pilot Project demonstrated positive outcomes
 - Clear improvements were observed in performance data, especially in terms of travel time and delay during the PM Peak Period
 - The STREAMS[®] system was effective at managing ramp wait times and queues without impacting adjacent arterial streets
 - Additional ramp improvements would likely enhance the system capabilities to manage traffic
 - The benefits of the project were realized on over 300,000 daily trips in the corridor



16

Smart Freeways | GHG



Smart Freeways


➔ Additional U.S. Projects

RCTC I-15 Smart Freeways Pilot Project

- Riverside County Transportation Commission (southern California) plan to implement a Smart Freeways pilot along NB I-15 to address chronic recurrent afternoon and evening traffic congestion
 - Features Coordinated Adaptive Ramp Metering at three service interchanges:
 - Temecula Parkway
 - Combines loop and straight ramps
 - Rancho California Road
 - Winchester Road
 - Integrated with French Valley Parkway Phase II construction



Image source: Press Enterprise (2017)



RCTC I-15 Smart Freeways Pilot Project

- The I-15 Smart Freeway Pilot Project will feature:
 - Enhanced mainline vehicle detection devices (TIRTTLs)
 - Part-time ramp shoulder use and associated lane-use management signage on the Rancho California Road direct ramp
 - Advisory variable speed limit and variable message warning signage
 - Three locations on Rainbow Grade Descent
 - Integration of ITS using STREAMS®



RCTC I-15 Smart Freeways Pilot Project

- Systems engineering, project approvals and final design recently completed
 - Civil and ITS construction contracts are expected to be out for bid by the end of 2023
- Operations expected to start in early 2025
 - Two-year pilot period allows time to achieve and evaluate benefits
 - Evaluation criteria to include:
 - Travel time savings
 - Average Speeds
 - Accident rates
 - Ramp meter queue length & time
 - Emissions reduction



CCTA Innovate 680 Advanced Technology CARM

- Contra Costa Transportation Authority in the (San Francisco Bay Area) plans to implement CARM as part of it's multifaceted Innovate 680 Program
 - In addition to AT-CARM, Innovate 680 incorporates:
 - Express Lanes Completion
 - Express Bus Service
 - Part-time Transit Lane/Bus on Shoulder
 - Shared Mobility Hubs
 - Mobility on Demand Services
 - Automated Driving Systems
 - Coordinated Adaptive Traffic Signals




21

Smart Freeways | GHF

CCTA Innovate 680 Advanced Technology CARM

- The Innovate 680 Advanced Technology Coordinated Adaptive Ramp Metering (AT-CARM) is a multi-phase project covering a 25-mile study corridor with over 50 on-ramps to I-680
 - Segment 1 covers northbound I-680 from Alcosta Blvd to Olympic Blvd extending 14 miles and encompassing 14 on-ramps



22

Smart Freeways | GHF



Questions and Thank You

→ **Darren Henderson**

Technical Director - Freeway Operations
and Advanced Traffic Management

GHD, Phoenix, AZ

951-833-7763

darren.henderson@ghd.com



AGENDA ITEM 9
REPORT

Southern California Association of Governments
November 2, 2023

To: Energy & Environment Committee (EEC)
Transportation Committee (TC)
From: Roland Ok, Planning Supervisor
(213) 236-1819, ok@scag.ca.gov
Subject: SCAG's Clean Transportation Technology Compendium

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S
APPROVAL

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR TC:
Information Only – No Action Required

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR EEC:
Receive and File

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians. 3: Be the foremost data information hub for the region. 4: Provide innovative information and value-added services to enhance member agencies' planning and operations and promote regional collaboration.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
On April 6, 2023, SCAG's Regional Council adopted Resolution No. 23-654-5, formalizing SCAG's Clean Transportation Technology Policy. This policy provides SCAG with a framework to support the development, commercialization, and deployment of a zero or near zero-emission transportation system. The aim is to enhance air quality, reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, achieve sustainability goals, all while adopting a technology-neutral stance.

Included in Resolution No. 23-654-5 was the directive for the preparation of a Clean Transportation Technology Compendium. This compendium is designed to aid in the development of Connect SoCal 2024 and to offer decision-makers comprehensive information on various clean transportation technologies. With the assistance of ICF, SCAG has since finalized the Clean Transportation Technology Compendium, serving as a reference guide for local jurisdictions (see Attachment 2).

Sam Pournazeri, the Senior Director of Clean Transportation and Energy at ICF, will deliver a presentation outlining the key aspects of the Clean Transportation Technology Compendium.

BACKGROUND:

As of 2022, mobile sources in the South Coast region were responsible for 81% of nitrogen oxides (NOx) emissions and 25% of fine particulate matter (PM2.5) emissions, contributing to substantial public health and climate change issues, especially among vulnerable populations. Statewide, 38% of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions is associated from mobile sources.¹ Currently the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) is designated as an "extreme" ozone nonattainment area by the U.S. EPA's 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), with a deadline to meet the standard by August 3, 2038. Additionally, the SCAB has not met the 1997 and 2008 Ozone NAAQS, with attainment deadlines in 2024 and 2032, respectively. Failure to meet these NAAQS would not only have negative public health impacts but could also trigger various federal sanctions, such as highway sanctions, which will impose adverse economic impacts on the region. Meeting the Federal NAAQS necessitates a reduction of 83% in NOx emissions by 2037.²

In recent years, California has established ambitious zero-emission vehicle (ZEV) targets through Executive Order N-79-20 and adopted several regulations such as Innovative Clean Transit (ICT), Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT), and Advanced Clean Cars (ACC) II to expedite the adoption of ZEVs and their necessary infrastructure across all transportation modes, with stringent targets for achieving 100% ZEV sales in various vehicle categories. The implementation of these strategies involves the collective efforts of numerous stakeholders, all working towards adopting and promoting zero-emission technologies to meet the state's ambitious environmental goals.

To align with state policies and support the strategies recommended in Connect SoCal 2020 and 2024, SCAG's Regional Council adopted Resolution No. 23-654-5 on April 6, 2023, establishing the Clean Transportation Technology Policy.³ This policy equips SCAG with a framework to support the development, commercialization, and deployment of a zero or near zero-emission transportation system. It seeks to enhance air quality, reduce GHG emissions, and meet sustainability goals while maintaining a technology-neutral approach. Included in Resolution No. 23-654-5 was the directive for the preparation of a Clean Transportation Technology Compendium.

PURPOSE OF THE CLEAN TRANSPORTATION TECHNOLOGY COMPENDIUM:

Investments in ZEV and Near Zero-Emission Vehicles (NZEV), along with associated infrastructure and products, require an understanding of clean technology options across diverse sectors. The clean transportation technologies landscape is broad and continuously evolving, differing in aspects such as readiness, cost, impact on air pollution and GHG emissions, infrastructure needs, and scalability. The Clean Transportation Technology Compendium provides a detailed overview of zero and near-zero emission transportation technologies, their charging and fueling infrastructure, and

¹ Greenhouse Gas Inventory Data, CARB. Available at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/ghg-inventory-data>

² 2022 State SIP Strategy, CARB. Available at: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-08/2022_State_SIP_Strategy.pdf

³ Resolution No. 23-654-5. Available at: <https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/eec040623fullpacket.pdf?1680210073> (Page 40)

other supporting products, focusing on passenger, medium and heavy-duty vehicles, transit, and rail sectors. It also identifies key characteristics, knowledge gaps, and strategies for clean technology deployment in Southern California.

The Compendium is intended to serve as a resource for technology users in both the public and private sectors during procurement and investment decision-making processes. Furthermore, it seeks to assist public agencies and local municipalities in creating policies that support the adoption of these technologies. The information within is aimed at enabling stakeholders to make informed decisions in line with sustainability goals. Although the Compendium seeks to be comprehensive, it mainly focuses on the overall technology landscape, not the specifics of individual vendor technologies. Given the variety in the market, stakeholders are encouraged to investigate the unique offerings of each vendor to ensure alignment with operational and logistical needs.

KEY FINDINGS:

Below is a summary of some of the challenges and barriers to adoption, and key recommendations to address them. Please refer to the Clean Transportation Technology Compendium for further details.

Challenges and Barriers to Adoption:

The barriers fall under five categories: cost, technology readiness, infrastructure, consumer knowledge, and regulatory support.

- **Cost:** High upfront costs of ZEV and NZEV impact their adoption, as they are notably more expensive than their conventional ICE counterparts, due to factors like research and development, specialized components, and regulatory compliance.
- **Technology Readiness:** Some clean technologies are in early development stages, lacking the reliability and performance of conventional options, limiting market acceptance.
- **Infrastructure:** Absence of sufficient charging and hydrogen refueling infrastructure forms a major adoption hurdle, demanding significant investment and coordination.
- **Consumer Knowledge:** Inadequate consumer awareness about ZEV and NZEV benefits, reliability, safety, and available supporting policies impedes demand.
- **Regulatory Support:** Inconsistent regulatory support, lack of purchasing incentives, and unclear permitting processes across jurisdictions hamper clean transportation sector growth.

Key Recommendations:

To overcome the barriers to the widespread adoption of zero and near-zero transportation technologies, the compendium presents a suite of recommendations. These include:

- **Targeted Incentive Programs:** Implement incentive mechanisms, such as purchase, infrastructure, access, and research and development (R&D) incentives, to decrease costs and spur clean transportation technology development.
- **Public Education & Outreach:** Execute awareness campaigns and events, providing information about clean technologies, government programs, and their environmental/economic impacts.
- **Building Codes:** Modify local building codes to facilitate ZEV and NZEV infrastructure development, like EV-ready parking and promoting green building codes.
- **Land Use & Zoning:** Update policies to encourage ZEV and NZEV adoption through strategies such as allocating public property for infrastructure development, amending zoning regulation to facilitate infrastructure deployment, and developer incentives for encouraging charging infrastructure buildout.
- **Public-Private-Partnership Models:** Employ public-private partnerships for funding, demonstration projects, joint R&D, and workforce development, combining resources and expertise to advance clean technology adoption.
- **Technical Assistance:** Provide local partners with technical assistance, involving informational resources, implementation strategies, and best practice sharing, to facilitate clean technology integration.
- **Workforce Development:** Collaborate with educational entities to form programs that nurture skills necessary for the ZEV and NZEV industry, involving curriculum development and student research funding.
- **Lead by Example:** Adopt ZEV technologies in government fleets, showcasing their efficacy and supporting the market for emerging technologies, while also setting regional goals and providing assistance to local jurisdictions.

NEXT STEPS

Connect SoCal 2024

The Compendium acts as a foundational document for Draft Connect SoCal 2024, serving as a reference guide to assist with clean technology language formulation.

Distribution

Staff will distribute the compendium to member jurisdictions, continuing coordination and prompting their respective staff to utilize this compendium as a reference guide during evaluations of clean technology potential within their individual jurisdictions.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Funding for staff work on this issue is included in the FY24 Overall Work Program (OWP) Task 115.4912.01 Clean Technology Program.



ATTACHMENT(S):

1. Clean Transportation Technology Compendium
2. PowerPoint Presentation - Clean Transportation Technology Compendium



Clean Technology Compendium

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
I. Imminent Need to Reduce Transportation Emissions	1
II. Purpose of Technology Compendium	2
III. Technology Specification and Assessment Methodologies	2
IV. Light Duty Vehicles	3
V. Commercial Medium & Heavy-Duty Vehicles	5
VI. Buses	6
VII. Rail 7	
VIII. EV Charging Infrastructure	8
IX. Hydrogen Fueling Infrastructure	9
X. Natural Gas Fueling Infrastructure	10
XI. Supporting Products	11
XII. Barriers to Adoption	12
XIII. Recommendations	13
1. The Need for Transition to Clean Transportation Technologies	15
1.1 Clean Technology Definition	15
1.2 Drivers of the Clean Technology Adoption	16
1.3 The Need for Clean Technology Compendium	17
1.4 Overview of the Report	17
2. Policy Drivers: Regulations, Incentives and Regional Efforts	19
2.1 Clean Air	19
2.2 Federal Policies	21
2.3 State Policies	24
2.4 Regional Policies	26
2.5 Local Policies	27
2.6 <i>Zero Emission Infrastructure Readiness Actions</i>	29
2.7 Policy Gaps	32
3. Clean Technology Discussion: Approach and Methodology	33
3.1 Scope of Clean Technologies Considered	34
3.2 Specifications	34
3.3 Technology Identification and Assessment Methods	38
4. Technology Compendium	40
4.1 Vehicles	40
4.1.1 Light Duty Vehicles	41
4.1.2 Commercial Vehicles: Medium & Heavy-Duty (excluding Transit Buses)	46
4.1.3 Buses	55
4.1.4 Rail	62
4.1.5 Other Vehicle Technology Considerations	65
4.2 Infrastructure	69
4.2.1 Electricity	70
4.2.2 Hydrogen Infrastructure	76

4.2.3	Natural Gas	80
4.2.4	Other Infrastructure Technology Considerations:	84
4.3	Other Supporting Products	87
4.4	Knowledge Gaps	91
5.	Challenges and Barriers to Adoption.....	94
5.1	Cost	94
5.2	Technology Readiness	95
5.3	Lack of Charging and Fueling Infrastructure.....	95
5.4	Lack of Consumer Knowledge & Awareness.....	96
5.5	Regulatory support	97
6.	Recommendations	99
6.1	Targeted Incentive Programs	99
6.2	Public Education & Outreach.....	100
6.3	Building Codes	101
6.4	Land Use & Zoning.....	102
6.5	Promoting Public-Private-Partnership (P3) Business Models.....	103
6.6	Technical Assistance.....	104
6.7	Workforce Development.....	105
6.8	Lead by Example.....	106
Appendix A:	Technology Compendium Survey.....	107
Appendix B:	Emissions Quantification Methodology	113
Appendix C:	Total Cost of Ownership Methodology.....	122
Appendix D:	Survey Questionnaire	131
Appendix E:	Other Clean Technology Adoption Considerations.....	137
Appendix F:	Technology Compendium Two-Pagers.....	139
Single Occupant Vehicles	139	
Commercial Medium & Heavy-Duty Vehicles.....	141	
Transit Buses	143	
Passenger Rail.....	145	
EV Charging Infrastructure.....	147	
Hydrogen Fueling Infrastructure.....	149	

List of Tables

Table 1. Ozone Nonattainment Classification for South Coast Air Basin (from 2022 Air Quality Management Plan) ..20

Table 2. Tax credits and incentive programs offered through the IJJA and IRA22

Table 3. California Regulations Supporting ZEV Deployment.....25

Table 4. California Incentive Program for Clean Technology Adoption.....26

Table 5. Technology Specifications - Vehicles.....35

Table 6. Technology Specifications – Charging & Fueling Infrastructure.....36

Table 7. Technology Specifications – Supporting Products36

Table 8. LDV body styles descriptions.41

Table 9. Environmental impacts of LDV body styles and technology types.43

Table 10. Technology characteristics of LDVs by body style and technology type.45

Table 11. MDV & HDV product descriptions by body style.46

Table 12. Environmental impacts of MDVs by body style and technology type.49

Table 13. Environmental impacts of HDVs by body style and technology type.....51

Table 14. Technology characteristics of MDVs by body style and technology type.53

Table 15. Technology characteristics of HDVs by body style and technology type.54

Table 16. Bus product descriptions by body style and technology type.....55

Table 17. Environmental impacts.....59

Table 18. Technology characteristics of buses by body style and technology type61

Table 19. Rail product descriptions by body style.....62

Table 20. Environmental impacts of rail.....64

Table 21. Technology characteristics of rail.....65

Table 22. Electricity infrastructure product descriptions.....70

Table 23. Existing and Upcoming Charging Connector Standards71

Table 24. Technology characteristics of electric charging infrastructure.....74

Table 25. Product descriptions for hydrogen fueling infrastructure.77

Table 26. Cost of H2 Fueling Station - CEC Clean Transportation Program80

Table 27. Technology characteristics of hydrogen fueling infrastructure80

Table 28. Product descriptions for natural gas infrastructure.....82

Table 29. Technology characteristics of natural gas infrastructure.83

Table 30. Product descriptions of supporting products.87

Table 31. Technology characteristics of supporting products89

Table 33. Assumptions for On-Road Vehicles114

Table 34. Assumptions for Locomotives115

Table 35. Carbon Intensity of Base and Alternative Fuels115

Table 36. Annual GHG Emissions Benefits of Alternative Fuel Technology115

Table 37. Assumptions for On-Road Vehicles TCO Analysis122

Table 38. Fuel Price Assumptions Used123

Table 39. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Sedan123

Table 40. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Light- Duty SUV.....124

Table 41. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Minivan124

Table 42. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Light-Duty Pickup Truck124

Table 43. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Utility Van	125
Table 44. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Medium-Duty Pickup Truck	125
Table 45. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Cargo Van	125
Table 46. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Passenger Van.....	126
Table 47. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Step Van.....	126
Table 48. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Box Truck	126
Table 49. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Cab and Chassis	127
Table 50. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Straight Truck	127
Table 51. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Semi-Tractor.....	127
Table 52. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Refuse Vehicles	128
Table 53. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Single Deck Bus	128
Table 54. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Double Deck Bus.....	128
Table 55. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Articulated Bus	129
Table 56. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- School Bus	129
Table 57. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs - Shuttle Bus	129
Table 58. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Cutaway	130
Table 59. TCO Calculation for Rail	130
Table 60. Additional Clean Transportation Technology Adoption Criteria.....	137

List of Figures

Figure 1. 2022 NOx and PM2.5 Emissions Contribution of Mobile Sources in South Coast Air Basin 15

Figure 2. 8-hr ozone design values in South Coast Air Basin and Number of Stage One Smog Alerts..... 19

Figure 3. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Results for the SCAG Region 20

Figure 4. Zero Emission Vehicle Stock and Sales in SCAG Region 42

Figure 5. GHG Emissions (well to wheel) reductions of LDV body styles and technology types. 44

Figure 6. Percentage of NOx emissions reductions, exhaust PM emissions reductions, and brake wear PM emissions reductions by body style and technology type. 44

Figure 7. Number of Medium- and Heavy-Duty ZEVs by Vehicle Type and County 47

Figure 8. Number of CNG Medium- and Heavy-Duty Vehicles in SCAG Region in 2020 49

Figure 9. GHG emissions (well to wheel) reductions (metric tons of CO2 per year) of MDVs by body style and technology type..... 50

Figure 10. Percentage of NOx emissions reductions, and exhaust PM emissions reductions by body style and technology type..... 50

Figure 11. GHG emissions (well to wheel) reductions (metric tons of CO2 per year) of HDVs by body style and technology type..... 51

Figure 12. Percentage of NOx emissions reductions, and exhaust PM emissions reductions by body style and technology type..... 52

Figure 13. Number of Zero Emission Transit and Coach Buses by County 56

Figure 14. ZEV Transit Numbers by Operator..... 57

Figure 15. Number of CEC Funded ZE School Buses by School District 58

Figure 16. GHG emissions (well to wheel) reductions (metric tons of CO2 per year) of buses by body style and technology type..... 60

Figure 17. Percentage of NOx emissions reductions, and exhaust PM emissions reductions by body style and technology type..... 60

Figure 18. GHG emissions (well to wheel) reductions (metric tons of CO2 per year) of locomotives by passenger or freight use and by technology type. 64

Figure 19. The Megawatt Charging System (MCS) Connector 71

Figure 20. Number of Public EVSE by County..... 72

Figure 21. Average Hydrogen Refueling Times 76

Figure 22. Hydrogen Delivery Pathways..... 77

Figure 23. Number and type of Hydrogen Fueling Stations within SCAG Region by County 79

Figure 24. CNG and LNG Stations in the Southern California 80

Figure 25. Number of CNG/LNG Fueling Stations within SCAG Region by County 82

Figure 26. Class 8 Day Cab Tractor New Vehicle Price Forecast..... 95

Figure 27. EVCS Permit Streamlining Map for SCAG. Accessed June 2023 103

Figure 28. GHG Emissions Benefits from Transitioning Conventional LDVs to FCEVs..... 119

Figure 29. GHG Emissions Benefits from Transitioning Conventional MDVs to FCEVs..... 119

Figure 30. GHG Emissions Benefits from Transitioning Conventional HDVs to FCEVs 120

Figure 31. GHG Emissions Benefits from Transitioning Conventional Buses to FCEVs..... 120

Figure 32. GHG Emissions Benefits from Transitioning Conventional Locomotives to FCEVs 121

Figure 33. Number of Medium- and Heavy-Duty ZEVs by Vehicle Type and County 141

Figure 34. Zero Emission Transit Vehicles by Operator..... 143
Figure 35. Number of Public EVSE by County..... 147
Figure 36. Number and type of Hydrogen Fueling Stations within SCAG Region by County 149

Executive Summary

I. Imminent Need to Reduce Transportation Emissions

The transportation sector, which includes cars, trucks, buses, and trains, accounts for a significant portion of air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region and contributes to poor air quality and negative health outcomes. Resulting from these emissions as well as the unique meteorological condition of Southern California, the region is one of only two areas in the country designated as an "extreme" nonattainment area for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The region is also prone to climate change impacts, such as heatwaves, droughts, and wildfires, which can be exacerbated by transportation emissions. Reducing transportation emissions in Southern California is a significant logistical and economic challenge, given the region's high volume of freight and port activity, large metropolitan population, and sprawling, car-dependent urban form. SCAG addresses this through land use and transportation planning, promotion of multiple travel choices including transit and active transportation, promotion of policies that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and a transition to a zero-emission transportation system through use of clean transportation technologies.

In an effort to address air quality and climate change challenges linked to the transportation sector, the SCAG Regional Council adopted the Clean Transportation Technology Policy and Resolution on April 6, 2023, which defines clean transportation technology as zero- and near-zero emission vehicles (ZEV and NZEV, respectively), their supporting infrastructure, and other facilitative products that reduce environmental impact over their life cycle. ZEVs and NZEVs offer a robust technological solution to achieve considerable emissions reductions in the transportation sector. Amongst others, these technologies encompass battery-electric vehicles (BEVs), plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (PHEVs), fuel cell electric vehicles (FCEV) and low NOx natural gas vehicles (NGVs), all of which hold significant potential in reducing both air pollution and GHG emissions. Utilizing electricity, hydrogen or renewable natural gas as a transportation fuel, particularly in California, can significantly reduce overall vehicle emissions and either entirely or substantially eliminate tailpipe emissions. Also critical in the mix of clean technologies are the supporting products for zero and near-zero emissions which include any products or systems that enable the utilization of zero- and near-zero emission technologies. These can include hardware or software solutions, or services targeted at the efficient deployment, maintenance and operation of ZEV and NZEV and their infrastructure. The main objective of these supporting products is to offer a comprehensive solution that aids in the deployment and adoption of clean transportation technologies, with the intention to reduce or eradicate associated environmental impacts, while concurrently enhancing the user experience.

In recent years, federal policies, such as the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) and the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA), provide significant funding for clean transportation, with hundreds of billions of dollars of planned investment in transportation systems and technologies over the next decade. At the state level, California has implemented measures to accelerate the adoption of ZEVs, and the South Coast AQMD in Southern California is implementing regulations to promote zero-emission and clean technologies in warehouses, ports, rail, and intermodal facilities.

Despite these unprecedented policies and investments, considerable disparities persist in clean technology ownership and operation between low-income and high-income communities. Factors such as initial purchase cost and lack of needed investment in charging and fueling infrastructure contribute to the observed income-related disparities in ZEV ownership. Given that ZEVs typically have a higher upfront cost compared to traditional vehicles, affordability becomes a major barrier, particularly for low- and moderate-income households. Current incentives often fail to fully offset these

costs for lower-income households. Similarly, access to necessary infrastructure, such as charging stations, is limited, particularly in lower-income neighborhoods where personal charging stations may not be feasible. Even with significant federal and state investments, more is needed to bridge the gap in zero-emission infrastructure. The growing demand for such infrastructure further underscores the importance for regional agencies like SCAG to increase efforts in infrastructure deployment to support the transition to clean transportation technologies equitably.

II. Purpose of Technology Compendium

Sound investments in ZEV and NZEV vehicles, infrastructure, and related products hinge on a thorough understanding of the available clean technology options across multiple sectors. The landscape of clean transportation technologies is vast and ever-expanding, varying significantly in readiness, cost, impacts on air pollution and GHG emissions, infrastructure needs, and scalability. In response to these needs, SCAG initiated development of the Clean Transportation Technology Compendium to provide an in-depth overview of zero and near-zero emission transportation technologies, including their charging and fueling infrastructure and other supporting products. With its focus on passenger vehicles, medium and heavy-duty vehicles, transit, and rail sectors, the compendium delves into key characteristics, gaps in knowledge, uncertainties, and strategies to fast-track clean technology deployment in Southern California.

The intent of this compendium is to serve as a resource for technology users, both public and private, who are faced with procurement and investment decisions. Additionally, it provides a guiding tool for public agencies and local municipalities in establishing policies that foster the adoption and support of these technologies. The knowledge shared within is designed to empower stakeholders at all levels to make informed choices that align with the goal of a cleaner and more sustainable future. While this technology compendium is intended to be as comprehensive as possible, the discussion is mainly focused on the overarching technology landscape rather than diving into the intricacies of vendor-specific technologies. Today, a multitude of vendors and companies offer clean transportation technologies, each coming with unique characteristics and features. When deciding on technology procurement, it is important for stakeholders to delve deeper into the specific offerings of each vendor. This ensures that the selected technology aligns seamlessly with their operational and logistical requirements.

III. Technology Specification and Assessment Methodologies

In the development of this technology compendium, SCAG compiled a catalog of various clean technologies and described them based on specific technology specifications. For vehicle technologies, the specifications cover aspects such as GHG emissions reduction, indicating the annual metric ton of CO2 emissions reduction per unit of vehicle replacement. Other specifications include NOx and PM emissions reductions, representing the percentage reduction in emissions. The range specification quantifies the number of miles a vehicle can travel with one refueling. Capital cost specification provides information on the initial investment required for purchasing clean technology vehicles, while the total cost of ownership (TCO) saving specification estimates the incremental cost or savings incurred over the vehicle's life (assumed to be 15 years across all categories). Adoption status specifies the number of vehicles employing the technology deployed in the SCAG region, and availability indicates the number of make/models of vehicles commercially available or expected to be available in the next

Vehicle Technology Specification

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| • GHG Emissions Reduction | • Total Cost of Ownership |
| • NOx Emissions Reductions | • Adoption Status |
| • PM Emissions Reductions | • Availability |
| • Range | • Longevity |
| • Capital Cost | |

three years. Longevity reveals the average number of years covered by the manufacturer warranty for vehicles using the technology.

For charging and fueling infrastructure, the specifications include capital cost, indicating the initial investment required for EV chargers, natural gas stations, and hydrogen fueling stations. Maintenance cost represents the ongoing cost of

Infrastructure & Supporting Product Technology Specification

- Capital Cost
- Maintenance Cost
- Adoption Status
- Availability
- Longevity

maintaining these infrastructure units. Adoption status specifies the number of charging stations or fueling stations deployed in the SCAG region, while availability assesses the number of vendors or suppliers providing these infrastructure units. Longevity indicates the average number of years covered by the manufacturer’s warranty for charging stations or fueling stations. For supporting products, the specifications include capital cost, indicating the upfront cost associated with the technology, and maintenance cost, representing the ongoing cost or subscription fee. Adoption status specifies the number of units of the supporting product deployed in the SCAG region, while availability assesses the number of vendors or suppliers providing the supporting product. Longevity indicates the average length of the manufacturer warranty for the supporting technology.

To evaluate clean transportation technologies, SCAG utilized a variety of data sources and methodologies. These included pre-developed tools such as the AFLEET tool from the Argonne National Laboratory for calculating the TCO of vehicles, the Alternative Fuels Data Center’s (AFDC) vehicle search tool for availability of clean technology vehicles, and ICF’s EV library for determining vehicle availability and range. California Air Resources Board (CARB) resources, including the Technology Feasibility Assessment for locomotives and the EMFAC2021 model, were also used for information on clean rail technologies and emission quantification.


In cases where existing tools did not provide complete information, internet searches were conducted to gather data on factors like longevity and range. Additionally, a survey was distributed to clean vehicle technology manufacturers and municipalities to gather feedback and fill any knowledge gaps. The survey aimed to gather information on commercial availability, costs, market penetrability, accessibility, and other considerations related to clean transportation technologies. The survey received responses from 20 relevant vendors of which details are provided in Appendix A. These responses played a crucial role in bridging information gaps that could not be addressed through internet searches alone. Furthermore, the project team conducted one-on-one interviews and engaged in discussions with clean technology manufacturers to gain deeper insights into the evolving technology landscape. Participation in conferences and industry gatherings also facilitated face-to-face interactions with these manufacturers.

IV. Light Duty Vehicles

The characterization of light-duty vehicles in the technology compendium includes various body styles such as passenger cars, SUVs, minivans, light-duty pickup trucks, and utility vans. Technologies such as BEV, PHEVs, and FCEVs are described based on predetermined specifications. Currently BEV and PHEVs continue to lead the charge in the clean technology revolution, bolstered by continuous improvements in battery technology. On the other hand, FCEVs, although fewer in model diversity, present an alternative for longer journeys where quick refueling is paramount. Several auto manufacturers are investing in this technology with an aim to expand their offerings. As of December 2022, consumers in California had a broad range of options with 50 passenger BEV models, 51 PHEV models, and 3 FCEV models commercially available for sale. It should also be noted that while PHEVs are considered a ZEV, they are only truly zero emission when operating solely on battery power. Once the battery is depleted, they

operate similarly to a conventional hybrid vehicle, utilizing a gasoline engine. The average electric range of PHEVs has steadily increased from 20.5 miles in 2012 to 38.5 miles as of 2021.

The adoption of passenger ZEVs in the SCAG region has steadily increased over the years. ZEV adoption started gaining momentum around 2010 and was initially concentrated in high populous areas and regions with higher socioeconomic status. In the SCAG region, the majority of ZEVs are found in Los Angeles and Orange counties, with Los Angeles County having more than 50 percent and Orange County having more than 25 percent of the total ZEVs in the region. Prior to 2010, the SCAG region had only 122 ZEVs. Since then, the number has surged to approximately 525,000, representing about 3.9 percent of the total light-duty vehicle fleet in the region by the end of 2022. Sales trends indicate that ZEVs are becoming an increasingly significant portion of the market, composing roughly 25% of light-duty vehicle sales as of the second quarter of 2023. BEVs and PHEVs represent the majority of ZEVs in the region, with FCEVs lagging significantly behind, only representing 0.06 percent of ZEVs in the region. It is worth noting that the majority of the BEVs (88 percent) in the region have battery electric ranges over 200 miles. Given the current adoption rates, the region is making significant progress toward the targets set by the state requiring 100% of light duty vehicle sales in the state being ZEV by 2035.



However, despite the rapid increase in ZEV adoption, the upfront cost of ZEVs is still higher than their counterpart internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles. The latest report from Kelley Blue Book reveals that the average cost for a passenger ZEV is \$18,000 more than that of an average ICE vehicle.¹ At the same time, when evaluating the TCO, zero-emission vehicles, except for FCEVs, demonstrate cost savings over the lifetime of the vehicle, despite their higher upfront costs. The lower operating and maintenance costs of zero-emission vehicles offset the initial investment, making them financially advantageous choices in the long run. However, for FCEVs, due to the currently high cost of the fuel, the TCO ends up being higher than that of their counterpart ICE vehicles.

¹ <https://mediaroom.kbb.com/2022-05-10-Luxury-Share-Increases-in-April,-Pushing-New-Vehicle-Average-Transaction-Prices-Higher,-according-to-Kelley-Blue-Book>

V. Commercial Medium & Heavy-Duty Vehicles

Medium-duty vehicles (MDVs) are Class 2-7 vehicles with a Gross Vehicle Weight Rating (GVWR) between 8,501 and 33,000 lbs. Body styles for MDVs include pickup trucks, cargo vans, passenger vans, step vans, box trucks, and cab & chassis. Technology types evaluated for MDVs include BEV, PHEV, FCEV, and natural gas vehicles (NGVs). Heavy-duty vehicles (HDVs) are Class 8 trucks weighing over 33,000 lbs. and include body styles such as straight trucks, semi-tractors, and refuse trucks. Similar technology types to MDVs are evaluated for HDVs.

The landscape of clean technology in the commercial medium and heavy-duty vehicle (MHDV) sector is undergoing significant transformation. There is a growing shift away from traditional

fossil fuel-based technologies toward cleaner alternatives driven by advancements in battery electric and hydrogen fuel cell technologies. These cleaner options show promising potential for reducing GHG emissions and improving air quality, particularly in terms of nitrogen oxides and diesel particulate matter emissions. Leading manufacturers are now offering electric and hydrogen-powered models for medium and heavy-duty applications, such as delivery trucks and semi-tractors. According to CALSTART's Zero Emission Technology Inventory, there are currently 134 models of zero-emission MHDVs available in the North American market, with 9 of them being FCEVs and the remainder being BEVs. Unlike light-duty vehicles, the offering of PHEVs in the MHDV sector is currently very limited. While PHEVs have gained traction in the light-duty segment, their availability and adoption in the MHDV sector are considerably lower.

However, the adoption of MHDVs powered by zero-emission technology is still in its early stages in the SCAG region. The region currently has only 178 MHDVs, which comprise 58 heavy-duty vehicles and 120 medium-duty vehicles. Compared to the roughly 36,000 Class 2b – 8 vehicles sold in the SCAG region every year; the current adoption rate is significantly below the 100 percent new vehicle sales target set by the state for 2036 as part of the Advanced Clean Fleet (ACF) regulation. This indicates that the use of zero-emission MHDVs is not yet widespread. Furthermore, the distribution of MHDVs in the SCAG region is not evenly spread. The majority of these vehicles are concentrated in Los Angeles and Orange counties, which are densely populated and heavily trafficked areas.

Aside from ZEVs, the use of NGVs, particularly those utilizing compressed or renewable natural gas (CNG/RNG), is growing in the MHDV sector. NGVs are seen as a cost-effective alternative to diesel trucks, as natural gas tends to be less expensive and more price stable. CARB has implemented stringent emissions regulations for on-road heavy-duty vehicles, including CNG trucks. The HD Omnibus Regulation, established in 2020, requires new heavy-duty engines sold in California to meet a low-NOx standard by 2027. Many CNG truck manufacturers are introducing low-NOx engines to comply with these regulations. CNG trucks with low-NOx engines show promise in reducing GHG emissions and decreasing NOx emissions, which contribute to smog and health issues. However, it is important to continue investing in research and development of cleaner technologies, including ZEVs such as BEV and FCEVs. While CNG trucks are not ZEVs and still emit some emissions, they offer significant emissions reductions compared to diesel trucks. As of 2018, there were approximately 2,240 CNG low-NOx trucks in the region, according to data from CARB's EMFAC model. Similar to light-duty vehicles, except for FCEVs, ZEV and NZEV MHDVs demonstrate cost savings




Medium-duty battery electric cargo vans such as this Ford E-Transit vehicle run solely on a rechargeable battery. As of 2022, 48 vehicles like this have been deployed in SCAG region.

over their lifetime when considering the TCO. Despite the higher upfront cost, the long-term savings in fuel and maintenance expenses make these technologies a financially advantageous option for MHDV fleets.

VI. Buses

Buses can be classified as Class 4 or greater vehicles, weighing 14,001 lbs. or more, designed primarily for the transportation of passengers. They are commonly used for public transportation systems, school transportation, and private charter services. Within the buses category, various body styles are considered, including single deck buses, double deck buses, articulated buses, school buses, shuttle buses, and cutaways. Each body style is evaluated for different technology types, such as BEVs, PHEVs, FCEVs, and NGVs. The clean technology landscape for buses has evolved significantly over the past few years, with battery electric buses (BEBs) and fuel cell electric buses (FCEBs) gaining traction. These technologies significantly reduce GHG, and criteria pollutant emissions compared to



Battery Electric Transit Buses such as this BYD Transit Buses are the most common type of medium and heavy-duty transit buses in the SCAG region.

diesel- and natural-gas powered buses, playing a crucial role in decarbonizing public transit, school transportation, and other services. BEBs have become more prevalent due to advancements in battery technology, while FCEBs offer a clean alternative, especially for long-range applications. Currently, there are over 51 models of zero emission buses (transit, coach, and school buses) available in the North American market, including 48 BEBs and 3 FCEBs, according to CALSTART's Zero Emission Technology Inventory. In the SCAG region, zero emission transit buses make up the largest number of heavy-duty zero emission vehicles. According to the Zero Emission Vehicle and Infrastructure Statistics provided by the CEC, SCAG region currently has a total of 476 ZEBs. Among these ZEBs, there are 449 BEBs and 27 FCEBs. Transit buses account for the majority, with 378 ZEBs, while 90 are school buses and 8 are coach buses. LA Metro and the Antelope Valley Transit Authority have the largest fleets, with the latter having the most zero emission transit buses. The Anaheim Transportation Network, City of Los Angeles, and Foothill Transit also have a significant number of zero emission transit buses, while other operators in the region have fewer or none. The current adoption rate of transit ZEBs is approximately 5% of the total transit buses operating in the region. This rate remains significantly below the 100% ZEB target by 2040 established by the state's Innovative Clean Transit regulation.² It is noteworthy that transit agencies in the SCAG region have made commitments and developed detailed plans to achieve the state targets, as illustrated in their ZEB Rollout Plans.³

Despite higher upfront costs, ZEBs including BEBs and FCEBs, offer lifetime cost savings when considering the TCO. BEBs are particularly advantageous in terms of TCO, while FCEBs may require additional investment to achieve cost parity with the counterpart diesel or NGV. However, overall, ZEBs prove to be cost-effective choices for bus fleets due to reduced operating and maintenance expenses over their lifespan.

² <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/innovative-clean-transit>

³ <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/innovative-clean-transit/ict-rollout-plans>

VII. Rail

The rail category evaluates freight and passenger rail locomotives that have historically been running on diesel. Technology types include BEV, FCEV, and NGV. Three types of rail technology are discussed: 1) Passenger locomotives specifically designed for pulling passenger trains, ensuring safe and efficient transportation of passengers over long distances or within urban transit systems; 2) freight locomotives designed for hauling freight or cargo trains, optimized for pulling heavy loads and commonly used in the transportation of goods, materials, or containers over long distances or for industrial purposes; and 3) switchers, which are specialized locomotives used primarily for maneuvering or shunting railcars within a railway yard or industrial facility, handling low-speed operations such as coupling and uncoupling of railcars, sorting, and assembling trains in a rail yard.

Adoption of zero-emission technologies in the rail sector is still in its early stages; however, these technologies are relatively mature and have been deployed elsewhere—particularly outside of North America, such as many European and Asian countries—but not yet in the SCAG region. Due to the predictable nature of passenger locomotive operations in terms of routes and schedules, there is a potential opportunity to employ battery-electric technology for shorter routes that allow for convenient charging. Alternatively, fuel cell technology offers more flexibility for passenger rail agencies, enabling them to operate longer routes with faster and less frequent refueling. Caltrans has identified hydrogen locomotives as the most suitable zero emission technology for Amtrak intercity operations and has devised a strategy to transition its rail fleet to 100 percent zero emission by 2035. As advancements in zero emission switch locomotives have shown promise, it is estimated that commercially available zero emission passenger locomotives will be developed by 2030, building upon these technological successes.

Within the SCAG region, a number of agencies have plans to implement these technologies over the coming decade. For example, Metrolink, which serves five of the six counties (all but Imperial County) outlines in its Climate Action Plan that it plans to develop and implement the necessary steps to achieve widespread electrification across its rail fleet fully by 2028. This process will occur in stages, with the Antelope Valley Line expected to be fully electrified by 2025. The plan notes that this will be accomplished by replacing diesel locomotives with electric locomotives. In San Bernardino County, the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA) has laid out plans to debut its hydrogen locomotives in 2024. The project will be funded by the California Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program and expected to begin testing in late 2023.⁴ Also, in April 2023, CARB adopted the In-Use Locomotive Regulation, which mandates passenger locomotives manufactured in 2030 and onward must operate in a zero-emission configuration within California. While this regulation provides a strong policy framework, the region must proactively prepare for the required infrastructure, whether it be hydrogen or battery charging, and focus on technology demonstrations to expedite the adoption of zero-emission solutions in the passenger rail system within the SCAG region.



⁴ <https://www.gosbcta.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/ZEMU-Technology-Fact-Sheet-ENG-120522.pdf>

In addition to these initiatives, the California High-Speed Rail (CA HSR) project⁵ also aims to connect major urban centers in California, from San Francisco to Los Angeles and eventually extending to Sacramento and San Diego using all-electric trains. Once completed, it will significantly reduce travel times between these cities and serve as a more sustainable transportation alternative to driving or flying. According to CA HSR, this rail will run on electricity supplied entirely from renewable sources.⁶ In addition to CA HSR, Brightline West⁷ is another anticipated high-speed rail service to connect Southern California with Las Vegas, Nevada. This project will offer a much-needed alternative to the heavily trafficked I-15 corridor, providing faster and more efficient travel options for tourists and business travelers alike. Just like the CA HSR, the Brightline West will be operating all-electric, high-speed trains.

Due to the significantly higher upfront cost associated with zero emission locomotives, often 2-4 times higher than their counterpart diesel locomotives, the rail technology sector has not yet achieved cost parity in terms of TCO. The initial investment required for acquiring and maintaining zero emission locomotives, such as BEV, and FCEV, remains a significant barrier. While these clean technologies offer environmental benefits and long-term cost savings through reduced fuel and maintenance expenses, the higher upfront cost poses a challenge for widespread adoption in the rail industry. However, as advancements in technology continue and economies of scale are realized, it is expected that the costs associated with zero emission locomotives will gradually decrease, making them more financially viable and contributing to the overall decarbonization efforts in the rail sector.

VIII. EV Charging Infrastructure

This category describes various types of EV charging infrastructure, including Level 2 Charging, Direct Current Fast Charging (DCFC) stations, and Innovative Charging Solutions. Level 2 charging stations provide medium charging rates and can be either stand-alone or networked. DCFC stations offer faster charging speeds, with different power levels ranging from low power to ultra-high power. Innovative charging solutions include wireless charging systems, pantograph charging systems, and solar charging canopies. Level 2 charging stations are the most widely adopted, while DCFC stations are more suitable for heavy-duty vehicles with higher power requirements. The industry is also developing megawatt charging technology, with the Charging Interface Initiative leading the way. Standardization of charger connectors and interoperability remains a key challenge in EV charging infrastructure. Various connector standards, such as SAE J1772, CCS, CHAdeMO, and Tesla (also known as NACS), are used for different charging applications and power outputs. In 2023 several major auto manufacturers, including Ford, GM, Rivian, Volvo, Polestar, and Mercedes-Benz announced their plan to integrate NACS ports into their vehicles by 2025.⁸



EV charging infrastructure such as this EVgo DC Fast charger are widely available in SCAG region. Around 3,712 DCFC currently are available in SCAG region provided by 20-30 manufacturers.

⁵ <https://hsr.ca.gov/about/>

⁶ <https://hsr.ca.gov/communications-outreach/info-center/get-the-facts/>

⁷ <https://www.brightlinewest.com/>

⁸ <https://drivz.com/glossary/north-american-charging-standard-nacs/#:~:text=Ford%20was%20the%20first%20EV,%2C%20Polestar%20and%20Mercedes%20Benz.>


The shift to clean technologies requires access to charging infrastructure. This can be particularly challenging for people who live in apartments or other multi-unit dwellings, where installing personal charging stations (i.e., home charging) might not be possible. Public charging stations are an alternative, but they require investment in infrastructure that may be lacking in low and moderate-income neighborhoods. Even with the significant investments made at the federal and state levels, those investments alone cannot close the gap. According to CEC AB 2127 report⁹, to meet the ambitious goals set by Executive Order N-79-20, nearly 2 million public and shared-private charging facilities will be needed by 2035 to support light-duty vehicles across the state. Within the SCAG region alone, the report indicates the requirement for 1 million charging points (by 2035). Notably, out of these, 689,000 chargers should be publicly accessible stations, while the remaining chargers are anticipated to meet the needs of workplaces and multi-unit dwellings.

As of now, the region hosts approximately 33,000 Level 2 and 3,700 DCFC chargers. Los Angeles County leads the region in this regard, holding 76 percent of all Level 2 chargers and 50 percent of all DC fast chargers, reflecting the large population and EV adoption rates in the county. San Bernardino and Riverside counties have comparable numbers of chargers, highlighting their efforts in expanding the charging infrastructure as well. Unfortunately, the more rural Imperial County possesses the fewest chargers in the region. This disparity underscores the need for a more equitable distribution of resources to support widespread ZEV adoption.

The capital cost of EV charging infrastructure varies depending on the type of charging system. For Level 2 charging stations, the capital cost ranges from \$2,500 to \$4,500 for stand-alone units. Networked Level 2 charging stations may have additional costs associated with the central management system. DCFC stations have higher capital costs due to their faster charging capabilities. Low-power DCFC stations (50 – 100 kW) range from \$29,500 to \$59,500. Medium-power DCFC stations (>100 – 250 kW) have a capital cost of \$59,500 to \$115,000. High-power DCFC stations (>250 – 350 kW) range from \$115,000 to \$139,000. Ultra-high-power DCFC stations (up to 1 MW) have a higher capital cost, typically in the range of \$400,000 to \$500,000.

IX. Hydrogen Fueling Infrastructure

Hydrogen fueling infrastructure plays a vital role in the transition to clean energy transportation. FCEVs offer zero emission mobility, but their widespread adoption depends on the availability and accessibility of hydrogen fueling stations. Establishing such infrastructure comes with unique challenges, including high capital costs, technical complexities, and safety considerations. Despite these obstacles, investing in hydrogen infrastructure can bring significant environmental benefits and contribute to energy diversity and resilience. Hydrogen is stored onboard vehicles as compressed gas, utilizing high-pressure tanks



⁹ <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/reports/electric-vehicle-charging-infrastructure-assessment-ab-2127>

capable of storing hydrogen at either 5,000 or 10,000 pounds per square inch (psi). Hydrogen delivery systems include gaseous and liquid hydrogen delivery, as well as on-site production. Gaseous hydrogen can be transported by truck or pipeline, while liquid hydrogen is transported in super-insulated, cryogenic tanker trucks. On-site hydrogen production is an option to reduce transportation costs in remote locations. The hydrogen fueling infrastructure discussion in the compendium includes various station types, including slow fill, fast fill, on-site production, off-grid, mobile, and on-the-go stations, considering factors such as capital cost, maintenance cost, adoption status, availability, and longevity.

In terms of hydrogen fueling infrastructure, Southern California is one of the few regions in the world with a significant network of hydrogen fueling stations. The SCAG region is gradually increasing its hydrogen fueling infrastructure with a total of 39 fueling stations available as of January 2023. The majority of these stations are concentrated in Los Angeles and Orange counties, with only five, four, and three stations located in San Bernardino, Riverside, and Ventura counties, respectively. This lack of infrastructure, and particularly the concentration of fueling stations in high populations centers, speaks to the nascent nature of this technology. While there are currently 34 light-duty retail stations open in the region, 20 additional stations are planned to open in the future. For heavy-duty hydrogen fueling stations, there are currently five operating, with one planned to open in the near future.

The deployment of hydrogen fueling stations brings with it a distinctive set of difficulties that set it apart from traditional fuel or EV charging infrastructure. To begin with, the processes involved in the production, transportation, and storage of hydrogen fuel are both technically complex and financially demanding. Hydrogen is generally derived from natural gas through a method called steam methane reforming (SMR) or from water through electrolysis, both procedures needing considerable energy inputs. Additionally, due to hydrogen's low energy density and high flammability, its transportation and storage present significant logistical and safety issues. Secondly, the initial investment required for setting up a hydrogen fueling station is considerably high, often acting as a barrier for private sector involvement without substantial financial incentives or subsidies. The capital cost of hydrogen infrastructure for fueling stations can range from \$400,000 to \$8,000,000, depending on factors such as station size and complexity. These costs include the design, engineering, construction, and equipment required for hydrogen production and dispensing. Additionally, the maintenance cost for these stations is estimated to be around \$142,000 per year. In addition, there are regulatory complexities to navigate, including obtaining necessary permits and compliance with safety regulations, which can be time-consuming and costly. In addition to these barriers, creating a hydrogen infrastructure is a classic 'chicken-and-egg' problem. Consumers are hesitant to buy hydrogen powered vehicles due to the lack of widespread infrastructure, while providers are reluctant to invest heavily in building out infrastructure until there is a large enough fleet of hydrogen vehicles to justify the investment.

X. Natural Gas Fueling Infrastructure

Natural gas is a cleaner fuel option compared to traditional petroleum-based fuels, as it produces fewer GHG emissions, particulate matter, and smog-forming pollutants. Its availability and existing infrastructure, including pipelines and refueling stations, make it easier to integrate NGVs into transportation systems. Many fleet operators, including transit agencies and delivery companies, have embraced natural gas as a fuel choice. Renewable Natural Gas (RNG) is a low carbon alternative to natural gas, produced by capturing and refining biogas emitted from various sources. RNG undergoes a purification process to remove impurities and increase its methane content, making it a renewable fuel derived from organic waste materials. However, while RNG is a lower-emission alternative, it is not completely carbon-neutral as methane emissions can occur during the production and distribution processes.

Natural gas can be used as Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) or Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) to power vehicles. LNG is created by cooling natural gas to a liquid state, reducing its volume for more efficient storage and transportation. It requires specialized storage tanks, vaporizers, and dispensers to handle cryogenic temperatures. CNG, by comparison, involves compressing natural gas to high pressures and storing it in cylinders or tanks at the fueling station. CNG fueling infrastructure requires compressors and dispensers to achieve the necessary pressure levels for refueling.

Two types of CNG refueling methods are time-fill and fast-fill stations. Time-fill stations are designed for overnight or prolonged refueling periods, typically used in fleet operations where vehicles are parked for extended durations. They utilize lower pressure and flow rates to slowly fill the CNG tanks of multiple vehicles simultaneously, optimizing infrastructure use and taking advantage of non-peak electricity rates. Fast-fill stations, by comparison, are similar to conventional gasoline or diesel stations, providing higher pressure and flow rates for quick refueling. They are suitable for applications where vehicles need rapid refueling, enabling efficient operations for vehicles with higher fuel consumption or limited time availability. Fast-fill stations require larger compressors and storage systems compared to time-fill stations.

The SCAG region has a relatively even distribution of natural gas fueling infrastructure across four out of the six counties. Los Angeles has the highest number of stations at 34, followed by Riverside and San Bernardino counties with 19 each, and Orange County with 13 stations. Ventura County currently has two stations, while Imperial County has only one station. The cost of natural gas infrastructure varies depending on the size and capacity of the station. A starter station, with a daily capacity of 20-40 gasoline gallon equivalents (gge), typically ranges from \$45,000 to \$75,000. A small station, serving 100-200 gge per day, has an estimated cost between \$400,000 and \$600,000. For medium stations, which handle 500-800 gge per day, the cost is approximately \$700,000 to \$900,000. Large stations with a capacity of 1,500 or more gge per day have a higher price range, ranging from \$1.2 million to \$1.8 million. These costs cover the necessary equipment, installation, and construction required to establish a functional natural gas fueling station.

XI. Supporting Products

As described earlier, the supporting products outlined in this compendium are key facilitators for the widespread adoption and effective utilization of zero and near-zero emission technologies. Each product category plays a unique and integral role in this ecosystem. These products include:

- *Charge management software* not only manages the charging process for EVs, its advanced features and data analytics also ensure the maximum utilization of charging infrastructure. This software optimizes charging schedules and integrates with renewable energy sources to promote efficient energy use.
- *Smart grid technologies*, such as stationary battery energy storage systems (BESS) and vehicle-to-grid (V2G) technologies, enhance power grid stability and facilitate the integration of renewable energy sources. Vehicle-to-grid technologies, for instance, enable bidirectional energy transfer between EVs and the power grid, thereby allowing EVs to support demand response programs and optimize energy usage.
- *Battery Management Systems (BMS)*, which include centralized, distributed, and modular types, are crucial for maintaining the safe and optimal performance of BESS. By monitoring various parameters like battery health, temperature, and voltage, BMS ensures the longevity and safety of batteries used in EVs.

- *Fleet management software*, encompassing telematics, predictive maintenance, and smart routing, improves vehicle functionality, safety, and convenience, contributing to advancements in smart mobility. They enable functions such as fleet tracking, diagnostics, navigation, and emergency services.
- *Payment systems* like in-vehicle payments, subscription services, and contactless payment options enhance the convenience and accessibility of EV charging services. They offer seamless transactions, simplified payment plans, and touchless interactions, respectively.

Beyond their roles in promoting zero and near-zero emission technologies, these supporting products also contribute significantly to power system stability. BESS and V2G/V2X technologies respond instantly to fluctuations in power demand or supply, acting as buffers during high demand periods or storing energy when supply exceeds demand. Charging management solutions help avoid sudden demand spikes that could potentially destabilize the power grid by intelligently scheduling charging times based on grid conditions.

Despite their evident potential, detailed knowledge about many of these supporting products remains scarce. There is a significant lack of information on crucial factors such as capital costs, adoption rates, and market acceptance. This gap underscores the pressing need for in-depth research and data-gathering initiatives.

XII. Barriers to Adoption

Despite rapid growth of clean transportation technology adoption, there are still significant challenges and concerns around the implementation of these technologies in the SCAG region. The barriers fall under five categories: cost, technology readiness, infrastructure, consumer knowledge, and regulatory support.

- **Cost:** The high upfront costs associated with ZEV and NZEV technologies pose a substantial barrier to their adoption, particularly for those with financial constraints. The latest report from Kelley Blue Book¹⁰, reveals that the average cost for a passenger ZEV is \$18,000 more than that of an average ICE vehicle. The cost disparity becomes much more significant in the heavier application. For instance, a conventional passenger locomotive costs around \$2.5 million, while its BEV counterparts cost between \$10 to \$12 million. The high costs are due to research and development expenses, specialized components, and limited production scales. Also, compliance with various performance standards and regulatory requirements adds to the overall expense, potentially making these technologies less accessible.
- **Technology Readiness:** Technology readiness serves as a significant barrier to the widespread adoption of clean technologies. Many of these emerging technologies are still in early stages of development and lack the level of reliability and performance found in conventional vehicles and equipment. The limited availability of reliable and commercially viable clean technology solutions hampers their market acceptance and slows down the transition toward a cleaner and more sustainable transportation sector.
- **Lack of Charging and Fueling Infrastructure:** The lack of readily available infrastructure for charging and hydrogen refueling stations presents a major adoption barrier. For example, to support the deployment of 1.8 million FCEVs in California, 1,700 fueling stations will be needed.¹¹ Constructing these requires significant

¹⁰ <https://mediaroom.kbb.com/2022-05-10-Luxury-Share-Increases-in-April.-Pushing-New-Vehicle-Average-Transaction-Prices-Higher.-according-to-Kelley-Blue-Book>

¹¹ Hydrogen Station Network Self Sufficiency Analysis per Assembly Bill 8, California Air Resources Board, November 2020. Available at: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-11/ab_8_self_sufficiency_report_draft_ac.pdf

investments and coordination among various stakeholders. For heavy-duty trucks operating interstate, a national network of charging or fueling infrastructure is essential.

- **Lack of Consumer Knowledge & Awareness:** Many consumers are not aware of the benefits of ZEVs and NZEVs, nor the potential cost savings associated with them. Misconceptions about their reliability and safety also exist. Moreover, potential consumers might be unaware of policies and programs designed to support the adoption of these technologies, which further impacts the demand.
- **Regulatory Support:** The absence of robust regulatory support in setting performance targets and standardizing design protocols for clean technology infrastructure is a significant obstacle. Lack of incentives for purchasing ZEVs and NZEVs, as well as inconsistent regulations across jurisdictions, create a complex landscape, discouraging potential adopters and stifling innovation in the clean transportation sector. The lack of clear and unified permitting processes also poses challenges in deploying crucial infrastructure such as charging and fueling stations.

XIII. Recommendations

To overcome the barriers to the widespread adoption of zero and near-zero transportation technologies, the compendium presents a suite of recommendations. These include:

- **Targeted Incentive Programs:** While state and federal funding and grants can be used to encourage the deployment of ZEVs and NZEVs in the region, more equitable and targeted incentive mechanisms with income-caps and tiers are needed to help bridge disparities in clean vehicle adoption. Additional programs, such as purchase incentives, infrastructure incentives, access incentives, and research and development incentives, also need to be introduced to reduce upfront costs, promote infrastructure development, facilitate access, and support technological advancements in clean transportation.
- **Public Education & Outreach:** Raising awareness of the benefits of ZEVs and NZEVs through informational campaigns, test drive events, workshops and seminars, and community events can accelerate the adoption of clean technologies. These efforts should aim to provide information about available technologies, government support programs, and the positive environmental and economic impact of transitioning to cleaner transportation options.
- **Building Codes:** Local jurisdiction building codes can encourage the development of infrastructure for ZEVs and NZEVs. Examples include EV-ready parking, EV-only parking, EV charging infrastructure in existing buildings, and promoting green building codes. These measures can ensure charging accessibility, increase convenience, and promote sustainability in new and existing constructions.
- **Land Use & Zoning:** Local jurisdictions can update land use and zoning policies to promote the adoption of ZEVs and NZEVs. Strategies include leveraging public property for infrastructure development, land banking for future infrastructure needs, amending zoning and land use regulations to permit charging stations in various zones, streamlining permitting processes, and securing incentives for developers to include charging infrastructure in their projects.
- **Public-Private-Partnership (P3) Business Models:** Public-private partnerships can alleviate financial burdens and accelerate clean technology deployment. Strategies include providing public-private funding, conducting demonstration projects, facilitating training and workforce development, and fostering joint


research and development initiatives. Leveraging the resources and expertise of both sectors, these partnerships can drive innovation and advance the adoption of zero and near-zero transportation technologies.

- **Technical Assistance:** Technical assistance can help local partners in evaluating and implementing zero-emission transportation technologies. This includes offering information and resources, developing implementation strategies, conducting feasibility studies, sharing best practices, and advocating for policy and regulatory changes. Such guidance and support can help local jurisdictions navigate the complexities of adopting and integrating clean technologies into their transportation systems.
- **Workforce Development:** Collaboration with educational institutions and training programs to develop educational programs focusing on zero and near-zero transportation technologies can help meet the evolving needs of the clean technology industry. This includes developing curriculum materials, providing funding for student research projects, and nurturing the skills and knowledge required for successful careers in the ZEV and NZEV industry.
- **Lead by Example:** Local governments can lead by example by transitioning their own fleets to zero emission transportation technologies ahead of the state targets. This serves as a demonstration of the effectiveness and practicality of these technologies and provides a market for emerging technology providers. SCAG and its regional partners can consider setting regional clean technology deployment goals and targets, integrating them into future planning efforts, and assisting local jurisdictions with setting and updating their own clean technology adoption targets.

1. The Need for Transition to Clean Transportation Technologies

Nationally, the transportation sector is a major source of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and with the current efforts to decarbonize the electricity grid, it has become the leading cause of total emissions. In California, transportation accounts for approximately 38 percent of total emissions in the state.¹² In the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region, which covers an area of approximately 38,000 square miles and serves a population of over 19 million people, a significant fraction of the region's total GHG emissions comes from the transportation sector¹³. SCAG region faces a particularly significant challenge in reducing transportation emissions due to the high degree of freight and port activity in the region, along with the large number of vehicles and sprawling, car-dependent urban form.¹⁴ For example, the region is home to several major ports and transportation hubs, including the Ports of Los Angeles (POLA) and Long Beach (POLB), which are among the busiest ports in the world. These ports are strategically located near major markets and population centers and have well-developed transportation infrastructure to support the movement of goods and products. As estimated for 2022, mobile sources are projected to account for 81% of nitrogen oxides (NOx) emissions and 25% of fine particulate matter (PM2.5) emissions in the South Coast Air Basin.¹⁵ The presence of criteria pollutants, such as NOx and PM2.5, pose a threat to public health, while GHGs lead to climate change, which worsens extreme heat days, droughts, and wildfires in Southern California. This exacerbates the vulnerability of already susceptible populations, furthering inequities, and posing a threat to economic resilience. Figure 1 below shows the contribution of mobile sources to NOx and PM2.5 emissions in the South Coast air basin.

Figure 1. 2022 NOx and PM2.5 Emissions Contribution of Mobile Sources in South Coast Air Basin¹⁶



1.1 Clean Technology Definition

To address the air quality and climate change challenges associated with the transportation sector, several initiatives are currently being implemented to encourage the adoption of clean transportation technologies. From the Clean Transportation Policy and Resolution adopted by SCAG Regional Council on April 6, 2023, SCAG defines clean

¹² <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/ghg-inventory-data>

¹³ According to SCAG's GHG emissions inventory published in 2012, more than 50 percent of the region's GHG emissions were associated with transportation

¹⁴ https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/05-30-12_scag_revised_if_report_final.pdf

¹⁵ <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/applications/cepam2019v103-standard-emission-tool>

¹⁶ Emissions from Ocean Going Vessels is only out to 3 nm

transportation technology as zero- and near-zero emission vehicles (ZEV and NZEV), their supporting infrastructure, and other facilitating products that reduce environmental impact over their life cycle. Here life cycle refers to refers to the cumulative effect on the environment resulting from all stages in a product or process's life cycle, from raw material extraction, through production and usage, to disposal or recycling. In this report NZEVs refers to vehicles that emit extremely low levels of pollutants and may be used as bridging technologies where fully zero emission technologies are not feasible or commercially available; near zero implies a significant reduction compared to commonly used technologies.¹⁷

SCAG's Technology-Neutral Approach towards Advancing Clean Transportation Technologies

As part of its commitment to promote clean transportation technology, SCAG is adopting a technology-neutral approach in its study, advancement, and investment in these technologies. SCAG defines technology neutrality as a stance that does not favor any particular technology, as long as it advances the goal of a zero-emission transportation system that meets or surpasses federal and state targets.

ZEVs and NZEVs are a strong technological solution to achieving significant emissions reductions in the transportation sector. These technologies include battery-electric vehicles (BEVs), plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (PHEVs), fuel cell electric vehicles (FCEV), and low NOx natural gas which offer significant potential in reducing both air pollution as well as GHG emissions. Using electricity, hydrogen, or renewable natural gas as a transportation fuel, especially in California, can significantly reduce overall vehicle emissions and completely eliminate, or significantly reduce tailpipe emissions. Moreover, the state has set ambitious targets for electricity grid renewable energy adoption and has implemented policies, such as the Renewable Portfolio Standard, cap-and-trade program, and the low carbon fuel standard (LCFS), to achieve these goals. As a result, over 34 percent of California's electricity power mix came from renewable energy in 2021, and following the signage of SB100, the grid is expected to be 100 percent carbon free by 2045.¹⁸

Zero and near-zero emissions supporting products include any products or systems that enable the utilization of zero- and near-zero emission technologies. This can incorporate hardware or software solutions, or services aimed at deploying, maintaining, or operating ZEV and NZEV and their infrastructure efficiently. Examples include solutions for managing charging operations that enable the sustainable, equitable, and efficient use of these technologies. The primary goal of these supporting products is to provide a holistic solution that assists in the deployment and adoption of clean transportation technologies. In doing so, they aim to reduce or eliminate associated environmental impacts, while simultaneously enhancing the user experience.

1.2 Drivers of the Clean Technology Adoption

The shift toward a zero-emission transportation system in the SCAG region is catalyzed by a blend of various elements. Predominantly, the transition is spurred by federal, state, and local policies intended to curb GHG emissions and bolster air quality through an assortment of incentive schemes and regulatory measures. With the United States setting ambitious climate targets, California stands at the forefront, implementing some of the most rigorous environmental

¹⁷ Under the California Advanced Clean Fleet (ACF) regulation, "Near-zero-emissions vehicle" or "NZEV" means a vehicle that is capable of operating like a ZEV using electricity stored on-board the vehicle for a minimum number of miles, or "all-electric range", as specified and tested in accordance with section 1037.150p(2)(ii) of "California Greenhouse Gas Exhaust Emission Standards and Test Procedures for 2014 and Subsequent Model Heavy Duty Vehicles," as last amended September 9, 2021. Note that under this definition a low NOx natural gas truck cannot be counted as an NZEV, while under SCAG's definition, a low NOx natural gas truck is considered as a near-zero emission technology

¹⁸ <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/california-electricity-data/2021-total-system-electric-generation>

laws nationwide. These policies have triggered stricter emission standards for vehicles, stimulated the adoption of clean transportation technologies and led to an increase in investments for infrastructure to back zero-emission transport. A more comprehensive discussion of these policies is provided in Chapter 2.

Beyond the realm of policy, the quest for cleaner air has emerged as a considerable propellant for the switch to a zero-emission transportation system in the SCAG region. Elevated levels of particulate matter and ozone render air pollution a serious public health concern, with the transportation sector largely contributing to the predicament. The integration of clean technology vehicles holds the potential to significantly diminish emissions, thereby improving air quality, which in turn results in a healthier, more habitable environment for residents. This holds particular significance for vulnerable populations who are often most affected by the adverse impacts of poor air quality. Chapter 2 provides more detailed insight on the air quality issues and the imminent needs for reducing transportation emissions in the SCAG region.

1.3 The Need for Clean Technology Compendium

To make informed investments in ZEV and NZEV vehicles, infrastructure, and products, it is critical to have a comprehensive understanding of the available clean technology options across various sectors. While many clean transportation technologies have been developed recently, and more are expected in the future, they can differ significantly in terms of readiness, cost, impact on air pollution and GHG emissions, infrastructure requirements, and scalability. SCAG and the region should prioritize continuous innovation while also meeting standardization and interoperability goals. Additionally, flexibility is crucial to allow different technologies to be applied to different use cases as determined by the investing entity. To address this challenge, SCAG has developed a Clean Transportation Technology Compendium to offer a detailed overview of zero and near-zero emission transportation technologies, their supporting infrastructure, and other supporting products. This compendium is focused on passenger vehicles, medium and heavy-duty vehicles, transit, and rail sectors, addressing essential characteristics, knowledge gaps, uncertainties, and strategies to accelerate clean technology deployment in Southern California. The Compendium will provide an overview of the available zero- and near-zero emissions technologies and assess each technology based on emissions benefits, technology readiness level, implementation status, cost considerations, market conditions, scalability, and other criteria.

The intended audience for this Clean Technology Compendium includes decision makers about technology purchases as well as public agencies that set policy to facilitate clean technology deployment. This may include private investors such as business owners or fleet managers as well as cities, public transit operators, other public fleet managers, planners as well as other regional partners in SCAG region. By equipping these stakeholders with a comprehensive and objective understanding of clean transportation technologies, the Compendium will serve as a valuable resource to support their efforts in advancing sustainable and decarbonized transportation systems. Through this Compendium, SCAG aims to empower decision-makers with the knowledge and tools needed to navigate the evolving landscape of clean transportation technologies. By providing a reliable and accessible source of information, the Clean Technology Compendium will facilitate the transition toward a more sustainable and low-carbon transportation future in SCAG region.

1.4 Overview of the Report

The SCAG's Clean Technology Compendium starts with an Executive Summary that provides a brief overview of the entire content. Following this, Chapter 1 discusses the urgent need for transition to clean transportation technologies, offering definition of clean technology, drivers for adoption, and the need for a clean technology compendium. Chapter 2 dives into various policy drivers including regulations, incentives, and regional efforts with focus on clean air, federal,

state, regional, and local policies, and identifying policy gaps. Chapter 3 presents the methodology for clean technology assessment, the scope of clean technologies considered, their specifications, and the methods used to characterize them. Chapter 4 serves as a technology compendium, covering various types of vehicles including light duty, medium and heavy-duty commercial vehicles, buses, rail. This chapter also covers infrastructure for electricity, hydrogen, natural gas, other supporting products, along with knowledge gaps in these areas. This chapter is the core of the document where all the technology characterization and technology inventory is presented.


In chapter 5, the project team examines the challenges and barriers to adoption such as cost, technology readiness, lack of charging and fueling infrastructure, lack of consumer knowledge and awareness, and regulatory support, and chapter 6 presents recommendations for SCAG and regional partners on the type of strategies that could be explored to accelerate the adoption of clean transportation technologies. Finally, Chapter 7 outlines the next steps and SCAG's commitments toward advancing clean transportation technologies in the region. The report also includes several appendices covering more detailed information such as the survey methodology, emissions quantification, total cost of ownership, and two-pagers on various clean technology options.

2. Policy Drivers: Regulations, Incentives and Regional Efforts

2.1 Clean Air

Despite ongoing progress, the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) is still working toward complying with the NAAQS. Despite significant population and economic growth, air quality in the SCAB region has managed to improve significantly over the years. As shown in Figure 2, the 8-hr average ozone design value in the basin has been continuously decreasing from 0.273 parts per million (ppm) in 1980 to approximately 0.114 ppm in 2020. Notably, the number of Stage One smog alerts went down from more than 100 events in 1980 to almost no events since 1999.

Figure 2. 8-hr ozone design values in South Coast Air Basin and Number of Stage One Smog Alerts¹⁹



Even with substantial progress, many communities in SCAB suffer from high levels of ozone air pollution. Despite significant reductions in NOx and volatile organic compounds (VOC) emissions, ozone concentrations in the SCAB have not been reduced in recent years.

According to the latest Ozone NAAQS established by U.S. EPA in 2015²⁰, the SCAB is one of only two areas in the country that is designated as an “extreme” ozone nonattainment area. As an “extreme” ozone nonattainment area, South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) has until August 3, 2038, to attain the 2015 Ozone NAAQS for the Basin (dotted line in Figure 2), which is 20 years from the designation as an “extreme” nonattainment area. Aside from the 2015 Ozone NAAQS, the SCAB is still in non-attainment with both 1997 and 2008 Ozone NAAQS of 80 and 75 ppb, respectively. The attainment date for the 1997 80 ppb Ozone NAAQS is June 15, 2024, and for the 2008 75 ppb Ozone NAAQS is July 20, 2032. Table 1 shows the ozone non-attainment classification for the SCAB and their respective attainment deadline.

¹⁹ <https://www.aqmd.gov/home/air-quality/historical-air-quality-data/historic-ozone-air-quality-trends>

²⁰ In 2015, the U.S. EPA established a new ozone standard of 70 ppb. The design value of an air basin for the 2015 8-hour ozone standard is determined by the highest ozone value of all stations, based on a 3-year average.


Table 1. Ozone Nonattainment Classification for South Coast Air Basin (from 2022 Air Quality Management Plan²¹)

Standard	Level	South Coast Classification	Attainment Date
2015 8-hour Ozone	70 ppb	Extreme	August 3, 2038
2008 8-hour Ozone	75 ppb	Extreme	July 20, 2032
1997 8-hour Ozone	80 ppb	Extreme	June 15, 2024
1979 1-hour Ozone	120 ppb	Extreme	December 31, 2022

Failure to meet these NAAQS would not only have negative public health impacts but could also trigger various federal sanctions, such as highway sanctions, which will impose adverse economic impacts on the region. According to the Clean Air Act (CAA), where a region fails to attain the NAAQS or does not make necessary revisions to its state implementation plan (SIP), no transportation project or grant can be approved other than for safety, mass transit, or transportation improvement projects related to air quality improvement or maintenance. Such federal sanctions will impede the South Coast region’s ability to continue moving goods to serve the regional and national demand and impose adverse economic impacts on the region.

As part of the 2022 State SIP Strategy²² as well as the 2022 South Coast Air Quality Management Plan²³ (AQMP) development, California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the AQMD worked together to determine the necessary reductions for achieving the 70-ppb ozone standard. According to agencies’ assessment, meeting this standard remains a priority for reducing overall emissions in the South Coast, and significant reductions beyond those achieved by the current control program will be required by 2037. Although reductions in VOC emissions will bring some short-term benefits in some parts of the South Coast, meeting the 70-ppb ozone standard can only be accomplished through significant reductions in NOx emissions. Air quality models predict that NOx emissions will need to be reduced to 60 tpd, a decrease of approximately 124 tpd from baseline 2037 levels, to achieve compliance in the remaining parts of the region that are not yet meeting the standard. Achieving a reduction of 83 percent in NOx emissions by 2037 will necessitate comprehensive and coordinated efforts to tackle emissions from both stationary and mobile sources, involving both the implementation of existing measures and the development of new ones.

Figure 3. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Results for the SCAG Region



Source: OEHHHA

Air quality is a critical environmental issue that affects everyone, but it is low-income and disadvantaged communities that often bear the greatest burden of its negative impacts. The CalEnviroScreen 4.0²⁴ is a tool developed by the California Environmental Protection Agency to identify communities in the state that are most impacted by pollution and other environmental and public health stressors. By using this tool, it becomes even more apparent the need for

²¹ <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/air-quality/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan>

²² https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-08/2022_State_SIP_Strategy.pdf

²³ South Coast AQMD. 2022. Retrieved from: <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/clean-air-plans/air-quality-management-plans/2022-air-quality-management-plan/final-2022-aqmp/final-2022-aqmp.pdf?sfvrsn=10>

²⁴ <https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/report/calenviroscreen-40>

emissions reduction within SCAG region. Figure 3 shows that SCAG region scores in the 59th percentile across the 20 indicators that are used in the tool. As it relates specifically to air pollution, the region scores slightly better, but remains below acceptable levels.²⁵ The AQMD's MATES V Study is also another important study that utilizes various tools, including fixed site monitoring, advanced monitoring technologies, and low-cost sensor networks, to measure air toxics levels in residential and commercial areas and identify high risk areas. The study has shown that toxic air pollution in the SCAB has decreased by over 54% between 2012 and 2018. Despite this progress, toxic air contaminants still pose significant health risks such as cancer and chronic diseases. In 2018, residents of the South Coast Air Basin had a 455 in one million chance of developing cancer due to exposure to toxic air contaminants.²⁶

Aside from air quality issues, mitigating climate change is also another key driver for clean technology adoption. The impacts of climate change are already being felt in California and around the world, with growing intensity that adversely affects communities and the environment. The science that predicted these impacts is now even stronger and leaves no doubt that urgent action is needed to prevent irreversible damage. The impacts of climate change are felt most heavily by low-income and communities of color, which are also disproportionately impacted by air pollution as described earlier. California has established itself as a global leader in science-based, public health-focused climate change mitigation and air quality control and has established ambitious climate goals. At the state level, these goals include emission reduction goals of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030, 85 percent by 2045, and carbon neutrality no later than 2045. Having an electricity grid that is low to zero carbon is crucial to meet climate goals as the state's vehicle fleet transitions to ZEVs, including battery electric vehicles (BEVs) to charge from grid electricity. CARB's 2022 Scoping Plan²⁷ provides a set of policy recommendations to help California achieve its climate and air quality goals. These recommendations include enhancing existing programs and regulations, such as the Advanced Clean Trucks and Clean Fleets regulations, expanding incentives for ZEVs and infrastructure, and investing in transit and active transportation. The report also suggests developing new regulations, such as those for medium- and heavy-duty vehicle efficiency, as well as adopting a more holistic approach to address the intersectionality of climate change and equity.

2.2 Federal Policies

The transportation sector accounts for one-third of domestic GHG emissions in the U.S. and affects the health and well-being of millions of Americans, particularly those in disadvantaged communities. In response to this, ambitious GHG emissions reduction goals have been set at the federal level for on-road transportation and rail. The targets include a 50 percent goal for new vehicle sales to be ZEVs for light-duty vehicles by 2030.²⁸ To support this, a complementary target for EV chargers was included, calling for 500,000 stations by 2030.²⁹ The White House has also created a goal that 100 percent of federal fleet procurement be light-duty ZEVs by 2027. For MHDVs, the goal is to have 30 percent of new vehicle sales be ZEV by 2030 and reach 100 percent by 2040, and also have the federal fleet procurement be 100 percent ZEVs by 2035.³⁰ As for the rail sector, the focus is on reducing emissions by prioritizing resources toward developing technology pathways to achieve emission reduction targets. To achieve these ambitious goals, in January 2023, the US Departments of Energy, Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and the

²⁵ OEHHA. 2022. Retrieved from: <https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/report/calenviroscreen-40>

²⁶ South Coast AQMD. 2021. Retrieved from: <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/air-quality/air-quality-studies/health-studies/mates-v>

²⁷ CARB. 2022. 2022 Scoping Plan For Achieving Carbon Neutrality. Retrieved from: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-12/2022-sp.pdf>

²⁸ <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/08/05/executive-order-on-strengthening-american-leadership-in-clean-cars-and-trucks/>

²⁹ <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/nevi/>

³⁰ <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/12/08/fact-sheet-president-biden-signs-executive-order-catalyzing-americas-clean-energy-economy-through-federal-sustainability/>

Environmental Protection Agency released the *Blueprint to Decarbonize America’s Transportation Sector*³¹ which outlines a federal strategy for partnerships to decarbonize the entire US transportation sector, building on the momentum of recent historic investments in transportation infrastructure.

In support of the ambitious GHG emissions reduction goals for the transportation sector, the federal government has also secured historic investments in clean transportation. The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) was signed into law by President Biden on November 15, 2021. It is the first infrastructure law in U.S. history to address the climate crisis and invests \$660 billion into transportation systems and technologies over five years. The Inflation Reduction Act (IRA), signed on August 16, 2022, is the most aggressive action on tackling the climate crisis in U.S. history. Combined, these laws are projected to lower economy-wide emissions by over 40% by 2030 and position the U.S. to achieve a 50-52% emissions reduction by the end of the decade. The transportation sector will receive historic levels of funding for transit, rail, and active transportation, as well as buildouts of EV charging and sustainable fuel infrastructure, tax credits, rebates, clean ports, and investments along the EV and battery supply chains. For example, the IIJA includes \$7.5 billion for the nationwide deployment of EV charging stations, with \$5 billion allocated to the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) Formula Program and \$2.5 billion available for a competitive grant program to support communities and corridors. California's share of NEVI funding is estimated to include \$384 million over the five-year period, and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and CEC are leading NEVI development in California. The NEVI guidelines require the development of the State Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Deployment Plan, and NEVI funds can only be used on designated Alternative Fuel Corridors initially.³² The IRA has also introduced a number of tax credits and incentive programs to support the growth of ZEVs and related infrastructure at the federal level. One of the main incentives is the alternative fuel infrastructure tax credit, which provides a tax credit for 30% of the cost of alternative fuel vehicle refueling infrastructure, including EV charging stations. Another incentive is the commercial EV and FCEV tax credit, which provides a tax credit of up to \$40,000 for the purchase of new all-electric or fuel cell vehicles. Additionally, the clean heavy-duty vehicle program provides funding for the replacement or retrofit of old heavy-duty vehicles with newer, cleaner models. These incentives are intended to encourage the growth of ZEV and NZEV market, making it easier for individuals and businesses to transition to cleaner transportation options. Table 2 below provides more detailed descriptions of programs being offered under the IRA.

Table 2. Tax credits and incentive programs offered through the IIJA and IRA

Incentive Program	Description
National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program (NEVI)	The National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program (NEVI) is a \$5 billion federal program aimed at reducing GHG emissions by funding clean transportation and energy programs across the US. California's Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the California Energy Commission (CEC) created a deployment plan for NEVI, which will allocate \$384 million in federal funds to build a network of modern, high-powered DC fast chargers along Interstates and National Highways throughout California. The deployment plan was submitted in August 2022. NEVI-funded charging stations will have a minimum of four 150 kW combined Charging System (CCS) connectors and total station power of 600 kW, located no more than 50 miles apart and no more than 1 mile from a freeway exit or highway roadway. At least 40 percent of NEVI benefits will go to disadvantaged, low-income, rural, and Tribal communities, and the CEC will manage funding solicitations on behalf of the state.

³¹ <https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2023-01/the-us-national-blueprint-for-transportation-decarbonization.pdf>

³² <https://highways.dot.gov/newsroom/president-biden-usdot-and-usdoe-announce-5-billion-over-five-years-national-ev-charging>

Incentive Program	Description
Electric Vehicle (EV) and Fuel Cell Electric Vehicle (FCEV) Tax Credit	The Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 has updated the Clean Vehicle Credit, formerly known as the Qualified Plug-in Electric Drive Motor Vehicle Credit, effective August 17, 2022, with additional requirements starting January 1, 2023. The Clean Vehicle Credit now includes both EVs and FCEVs, requires a traction battery with at least 7 kWh, and establishes sourcing requirements for critical mineral extraction, processing and recycling and battery component manufacturing and assembly. Vehicles meeting these requirements are eligible for a tax credit of up to \$7,500. The percentage of the battery's critical minerals and components that are extracted, processed, recycled, manufactured, or assembled in North America must increase annually to qualify for the tax credit. Eligibility is also subject to a final MSRP limit and modified adjusted gross income threshold.
Alternative Fuel Infrastructure Tax Credit	Alternative Fueling equipment for various fuels can receive a tax credit of 30% of the cost up to \$30,000 until December 31, 2022, and after that date, the credit is 30% or 6% for depreciable property up to \$100,000, with specific requirements. Additionally, residential fueling equipment purchased between January 1, 2023, and December 31, 2032, can receive up to a \$1,000 tax credit.
Commercial Electric Vehicle (EV) and Fuel Cell Electric Vehicle (FCEV) Tax Credit	Starting January 1, 2023, businesses can receive a tax credit for purchasing new electric or fuel cell vehicles, with amounts based on the vehicle's battery capacity and purchase price, not exceeding \$7,500 for vehicles under 14,000 lbs. and \$40,000 for vehicles over 14,000 lbs. The tax credit cannot be combined with the Clean Vehicle Tax Credit.
Clean Heavy-Duty Vehicle Program	The Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) allocated \$1 billion toward replacing polluting heavy-duty vehicles with clean, zero-emission vehicles, supporting zero-emission vehicle infrastructure, and providing workforce development and training. Additionally, funds will be provided for planning and technical activities to promote the adoption and deployment of zero-emission vehicles. The EPA will distribute the funding between now and 2031, with \$400 million going to communities in nonattainment areas.
Clean Ports Program	The EPA has launched a \$3 billion program to fund grants and rebates for the purchase or installation of zero-emission port equipment or technology, planning and permitting for such equipment, and the development of qualified climate action plans that reduce emissions of GHGs, criteria air pollutants, and hazardous air pollutants at one or more ports. \$750M of total funding will be spent in nonattainment areas, and eligible funding recipients include port authorities, state, regional, local or tribal agencies, air pollution control agencies, and private entities that own or operate port-related facilities. The funding expires on September 30, 2027.

Aside from incentive programs being offered through IIJA and IRA, the federal government has also recently adopted several key regulations that promote the adoption of clean technologies. In December 2021, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) finalized federal GHG emissions standards for passenger cars and light trucks for model years 2023 through 2026³³. The standards are ambitious but achievable, and are expected to achieve significant GHG emissions reductions, along with reductions in other air pollutants. The standards are the most stringent ever set for the light-duty vehicle sector. The stringency of the GHG emissions standards established under this regulation increases between 5 and 10 percent each year from 2023 through 2026. The final standards are expected to result in average fuel economy label values of 40 mpg. In a separate effort, the Clean Truck Plan³⁴, announced in November 2021, aims to reduce GHG and criteria pollutant emissions from medium- and heavy-duty trucks by increasing fuel efficiency standards for these vehicles. The plan proposes new emissions standards for diesel and gasoline-powered trucks for model years 2027-2030, as well as the introduction of new efficiency standards for electric and fuel cell-

³³ <https://www.epa.gov/regulations-emissions-vehicles-and-engines/regulations-greenhouse-gas-emissions-passenger-cars-and>


³⁴ <https://www.epa.gov/regulations-emissions-vehicles-and-engines/clean-trucks-plan>

powered vehicles. As part of the Plan, the EPA passed the Heavy-Duty NOx rule in December 2022, which aims to set more stringent emission standards for heavy-duty trucks and engines, reducing NOx emissions and contributing to cleaner air and improved public health.³⁵

Aside from the federal policies and incentive, the U.S. EPA also plays an important role in granting waivers to California for establishing its own standards. Despite the usual prohibition against states implementing their own emission standards for new engines and vehicles, the Clean Air Act provides a provision for California to request an authorization to enforce its unique standards. Under the Clean Air Act, California is allowed to request waivers or authorizations from the EPA to enforce its own emission standards for new motor vehicles and nonroad engines and vehicles, if they supersede federal standards. The EPA approve the waiver or authorization unless it finds that California's standards are not as protective of public health and welfare as federal standards, unnecessary due to a lack of compelling and extraordinary conditions, or inconsistent with the Clean Air Act. The Act also enables other states to adopt California's standards without needing EPA approval, provided those standards are identical to the ones for which California received a waiver or authorization.

2.3 State Policies

In an effort to combat climate change and improve air quality, the state has implemented a number of measures to accelerate the adoption of ZEVs and NZEVs. These include mandates requiring automakers to produce a certain percentage of ZEVs, financial incentives for consumers who purchase such vehicles, and investments in charging and fueling infrastructure. In September 2020, Governor Newsom signed Executive Order No. N-79-20 which set a goal of 100% zero-emission passenger vehicles by 2035 and directs state agencies to develop strategies to transition all medium- and heavy-duty vehicles to ZEVs by 2045. The order also includes directives for accelerating the deployment of charging infrastructure, increasing the number of ZEVs in public fleets, and promoting increased consumer awareness and adoption of EVs.³⁶ This executive order sets the stage for the state to implement policies to accomplish these ambitious targets. A number of regulations have already gone into effect, which were designed to address all vehicle modes, including light-, medium-, heavy-duty, and transit vehicles as well as rail. Table 3 below summarizes the most significant of these regulations.



³⁵ <https://www.epa.gov/regulations-emissions-vehicles-and-engines/final-rule-and-related-materials-control-air-pollution>

³⁶ <https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/9.23.20-EO-N-79-20-Climate.pdf>

Table 3. California Regulations Supporting ZEV Deployment

Regulation	Description
Advanced Clean Cars II	The Advanced Clean Cars II regulations will reduce light-duty passenger car, pickup truck, and SUV emissions from the 2026 model year through 2035. The regulations amend the Zero-emission Vehicle Regulation to require an increasing number of ZEV, including battery-electric, hydrogen fuel cell electric, and plug-in hybrid electric-vehicles. By 2035, the regulation requires 100% of new passenger vehicles sold in the state to be ZEV. These amendments support California Governor Newsom’s executive order that all new passenger vehicles sold in California must be zero emissions by 2035. The Low-Emission Vehicle Regulations were also amended to include increasingly stringent standards for gasoline cars and heavier passenger trucks.
Advanced Clean Trucks Regulation	The ACT regulation requires manufacturers of medium- and heavy-duty vehicles to sell increasing percentages of ZEVs in California, culminating in a requirement for 100% ZEV sales by 2045.
Advanced Clean Fleets Regulation	The regulation requires fleets operating in California to transition to zero emission technology with the goal of transitioning all drayage trucks to zero emission by 2035 and the rest of the MD-HD vehicles to zero emission by 2045. Starting in 2036, manufacturers can only sell zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles. From January 1, 2024, trucks participating in drayage activities in California must be registered with the CARB Online System, with only zero-emission trucks allowed to register from 2024 onwards. All drayage trucks must be zero-emission by 2035. High priority and federal fleets must either follow the Model Year Schedule, buying only ZEVs from 2024 and phasing out internal combustion vehicles that have passed their useful life starting in 2025, or the optional ZEV Milestones Option, meeting phased-in ZEV targets. State and local government fleets must have 50% ZEV purchases from 2024 and 100% by 2027, although small government fleets and certain counties can start their ZEV purchases in 2027.
Low NOx Omnibus Regulation	The HD Omnibus Regulation requires heavy-duty engines of model year 2024-2026 to meet a 0.05 g/bhp-hr NOx standard, with more stringent standards for subsequent model years, aimed at ensuring real-world emissions performance critical for attaining federal health-based air quality standards for ozone in 2031. Despite the regulation being adopted in 2020 and set to be implemented in 2024, as the 2024 model year certification approached, CARB staff became aware through manufacturer product plans that some truck categories in California would not be able to produce Omnibus-compliant diesel engines. To ease the transition, CARB recently proposed amendments offering flexibility, ensuring engine availability while preserving projected emissions reductions. ³⁷
Innovative Clean Transit Regulation	The ICT regulation, adopted in December 2018, requires public transit agencies to transition to a 100% zero-emission bus fleet by 2040. All transit agencies that own, operate, or lease buses with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) greater than 14,000 lbs. must comply with the regulation. The ZEB purchase requirements vary depending on the transit agency’s size.
In-Use Locomotive Regulation	The proposed in-use locomotive regulation would require locomotive operators in California to fund a spending account based on emissions and use the funds to purchase or upgrade to the cleanest locomotives. Starting in 2030, only locomotives less than 23 years old and those with an original engine build date of 2030 or newer would be allowed to operate in California, and by 2035, all Class I line haul locomotives with an original engine build date of 2035 or newer would need to operate in a zero-emission configuration.
Zero Emission Truck Measure	This measure, as proposed in 2022 State SIP Strategy, would seek to accelerate the number of zero-emissions (ZE) trucks beyond existing measures (including the proposed Advanced Clean Fleets regulation). The measure seeks to upgrade the remaining heavy-duty combustion trucks to new or used ZE trucks rather than cleaner combustion engines. CARB has committed to implementing regulatory strategies to achieve this goal, such as differentiated registration fees, restrictions and fees for combustion trucks entering low and ZE zones, or indirect source rules (ISR). Alternatively, the measure could require combustion truck fleets to be scrapped and replaced with ZE trucks at the end of their useful lives. The measure would potentially be heard by the Board in 2028 as part of the comprehensive strategy to achieve zero-emissions medium- and heavy-duty vehicles by 2045.

³⁷ <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/barcu/regact/2023/hdomnibus2023/notice.pdf>

To facilitate the transition of state’s on-road and rail transportation to zero and near-zero emission, the state has also implemented a number of incentive programs. These include rebate programs, vehicle replacement programs, point-of-sale incentives, and infrastructure incentives. Table 4 below lists incentive programs that are currently in effect and are directly supporting the expansion of ZEVs and infrastructure in SCAG region.

Table 4. California Incentive Program for Clean Technology Adoption

Regulation	Description
Clean Vehicle Rebate Project (CVRP)	The CVRP provides rebates to California residents who purchase or lease eligible clean vehicles. The amount of the rebates offered by CVRP varies depending on the type of vehicle and its all-electric range, but they generally range from \$1,500 to \$7,000 for most eligible vehicles. The CVRP rebate can be combined with federal, state, or local agency incentives as well as Administrator match funding, if available, to help further buy-down an eligible vehicle’s cost
Clean Cars 4 All	Clean Cars 4 All provides incentives to low-income individuals to retire their older, high-emitting vehicles and replace them with clean, electric or hybrid vehicles. The funding amount that applicants receive varies depending on the individual’s income, the type of vehicle being purchased or leased, and other factors, but it generally ranges from \$2,500 to \$9,500 per participant.
California HVIP	HVIP is a point-of-sale incentive program that provides a voucher up to \$120,000 for zero-emission trucks. At the time of writing this report, the program has supported the purchase of 2,400 natural gas and 1,800 battery-electric trucks since 2010 (redeemed vouchers), and over half of all voucher requests have come from disadvantaged communities seeking DPM reductions.
CEC Clean Transportation Program	The program provides funding for a range of projects, including research and development, pilot projects, and infrastructure deployment. The amount of funding each applicant receives from the program varies depending on the specific project and the type of funding requested. Generally, applicants can receive funding for up to 100% of their project costs, although some funding programs require a cost share or matching funds from the applicant. The maximum award amount for some programs can be up to several million dollars, while others may provide smaller grants or loans. The specific funding amount for each project is determined through a competitive application process, with awards granted based on project feasibility, environmental benefits, and other factors.
Low Carbon Fuel Standard LCFS	The LCFS is a California regulation that creates a market mechanism that incentivizes low carbon fuels. The regulation requires the carbon intensity of California’s transportation fuels to decrease by 20 percent through the 2030 timeframe and maintain the standard afterwards. The number of credits that a fleet generates is based on the amount of electricity used to charge and the carbon intensity of that electricity. Fleets that strategically use renewable electricity for charging, or purchase renewable energy certificates (RECs), can further increase their LCFS revenue streams. In addition to generating LCFS credit for dispensed fuel, the eligible hydrogen station, or DC fast charger can generate infrastructure credits based on the capacity of the station or charger minus the quantity of dispensed fuel. Currently stations intended for light duty vehicles (<1,200 kg/day for hydrogen stations and <350 kW per charger for charging stations) are eligible for the capacity credits. As more ZEVs use the station and the station utilization increases, the site will generate more LCFS fuel credits and fewer infrastructure credits.

2.4 Regional Policies

SCAG region has also been a leader in pushing for local regulations to promote zero-emission and clean technologies. These include regulation pertaining to warehouses, ports, rail and intermodal facilities. South Coast AQMD’s Warehouse Actions and Investments to Reduce Emissions (WAIRE) program, also known as Rule 2305, requires large warehouses to reduce their emissions by either implementing specific measures to reduce emissions on site or by investing in off-site projects that achieve equivalent emissions reductions. The program aims to reduce the amount of air pollution generated by the warehousing industry, particularly in communities disproportionately impacted by air

pollution.³⁸ The proposed Indirect Source Rule (ISR) for Commercial Marine Ports is also another potential regulatory actions that intends to reduce emissions from equipment, vehicles and vessels operating at marine ports in Southern California. This program requires that ports develop and implement emission reduction plans that include measures such as equipment turnover and electrification, incentives for the use of cleaner vehicles and equipment, and traffic management strategies.³⁹ South Coast AQMD is also considering another ISR, designed to prioritize new and current rail yards and intermodal facilities. This particular ISR mandates owners and operators to come up with plans to decrease emissions from locomotives, cargo handling machinery, and trucks used in and around these facilities. The ISR offers various choices for compliance, which includes using zero-emission technology, alternative fuels, and operational improvements to minimize idling and other practices that contribute to emissions.⁴⁰

SCAG has also been working toward a long-term vision of a zero-emission transportation system to mitigate the impacts of transportation on regional air quality. The Connect SoCal 2020⁴¹ plan identified a coordinated approach to electrifying passenger vehicles, transit, and goods movement vehicles. As it relates to ZEVs, the plan includes a number of strategies aimed at promoting the adoption and use of ZEVs in Southern California. These strategies include expanding the availability of charging infrastructure, promoting EV car-sharing programs, incentivizing the purchase of EVs, and encouraging the adoption of clean truck technology. The plan recognizes the role that EVs can play in reducing GHG emissions and improving air quality and seeks to promote their adoption as part of a larger effort to promote sustainable transportation options in the region.

To accomplish Connect SoCal 2020's objectives, SCAG has implemented various projects and funding programs to advance clean transportation. One such example is the grant awards totaling \$6.75 million given to six projects in 2022 across the region to decrease harmful emissions during last-mile freight and delivery operations. This is in addition to the 26 clean-energy projects awarded \$10 million under SCAG's Last Mile Freight Program, funded by the state's Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee (MSRC) in 2021. Furthermore, SCAG is collaborating with 18 cities in the area to aid them in promoting the development and implementation of EV charging infrastructure. This includes providing customized policy guidance, region-wide site suitability analyses, EV site evaluations, and a passenger EV Infrastructure Plan to support the development of charging stations and encourage EV adoption throughout Southern California. With this progress, SCAG has refreshed this vision in Connect SoCal 2024, providing resources and strategies to accelerate clean transportation. Resolution No. 23-654-5 formalizes SCAG's Clean Transportation Technology Policy with the aim of supporting the development, commercialization, and deployment of a zero-emission transportation system while maintaining technology neutrality to allow operators to invest in the best fit technology for their needs.

2.5 Local Policies

Transportation planning agencies have also established goals and strategies for reducing GHG emissions and to improve air quality. The 2020 Connect SoCal⁴² strategies aim to reduce per-capita GHG emissions from automobiles and light trucks by reducing per-capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) through the implementation of Sustainable

³⁸ <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/compliance/waire-program>

³⁹ <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/rules/scaqmd-rule-book/proposed-rules/rule-2304>

⁴⁰ <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/clean-air-plans/air-quality-management-plans/2022-air-quality-management-plan/final-2022-aqmp.pdf?sfvrsn=10>

⁴¹ <https://scag.ca.gov/read-plan-adopted-final-connect-socal-2020>

⁴² Connect SoCal 2020 is a long-range transportation and land-use plan for the Southern California region, developed by the SCAG. It covers a period of 25 years, from 2020 to 2045, and aims to guide the growth and development of the region in a way that promotes sustainability, equity, and economic prosperity. The plan includes strategies to reduce GHG emissions from transportation, improve mobility and accessibility, and promote diverse housing choices.

Communities Strategies at a regional level. The strategies are focusing on growth near destinations and mobility options, promoting diverse housing choices, leveraging technology innovations, and supporting the implementation of sustainability policies. Of the various strategies identified in Connect SoCal 2020, the Accelerated Electrification strategy is a comprehensive plan to promote the use of EVs in the transportation sector, including passenger, transit, and goods movement vehicles. The strategy expands upon state mandates by coordinating efforts and increasing collaboration to achieve a zero-emissions system. Connect SoCal calls for increased incentives for sales of EVs and expanded charging infrastructure for the light-duty sector. In the transit sector, the goal is to transition to 100% EVs, and in the goods movement sector, to adopt near-zero-emissions technologies and zero emission technologies where feasible.

In addition to policy drivers at the state and regional level, cities are also taking action to support reducing emissions from the transportation sector. For example, Los Angeles released its Green New Deal Plan,⁴³ which highlights its commitment to reducing GHG emissions and transitioning to a carbon-neutral economy by 2050. The plan outlines strategies to accelerate the adoption of ZEVs, including increasing charging infrastructure and providing incentives for both individual and fleet purchases of EVs. The plan also aims to electrify the city's entire bus fleet by 2028.

As the impacts of climate change become increasingly evident, many local entities in SCAG region are taking action to reduce GHG emissions by implementing a variety of policies and programs. Here is a list of some of the key actions:

The Clean Air Action Plan⁴⁴ (CAAP) is a joint initiative between the ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles to improve air quality in the region by reducing emissions from port-related sources. The CAAP includes a range of strategies aimed at reducing emissions from ships, trucks, cargo handling equipment, locomotives, and harbor craft operating in and around the ports, including the adoption of clean technologies such as zero-emission equipment and vehicles, the expansion of on-dock rail infrastructure, and the development of emissions reduction targets and reporting requirements for port tenants and operators. The goal of the CAAP is to promote sustainable growth and reduce the environmental impact of port operations on nearby communities, while maintaining the economic competitiveness of the ports. As part of the CAAP the Clean Truck Fund was established which provides funding to help trucking companies purchase low-emission or zero-emission trucks, with the amount of funding varying depending on the type of truck being purchased. The program is funded through a tariff on containers moving through the ports and is designed to help trucking companies transition to cleaner technologies while improving air quality in the surrounding communities. The program is scheduled to run through 2023 and has provided over \$78 million in funding to help replace older, high-emitting trucks with cleaner alternatives.⁴⁵

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro) released the I-710 Clean Truck Program⁴⁶ in 2020, with the goal of introducing 4,000 zero- and near-zero emissions trucks to the I-710 freeway and reducing the number of diesel trucks traveling through I-710 communities. This program is part of the larger I-710 Project, which includes various initiatives like the I-710 Early Action Soundwall Program, I-710 Community Health Benefit Program, and I-710 Congestion Relief Program. In 2020, the LA Metro Board authorized \$50 million for the program and directed staff to develop elements of the program and seek additional state and federal discretionary funding to reach a minimum target of \$200 million. In response to this direction, the I-710 Zero Emission Truck Program

⁴³ City of Los Angeles. 2019. Green New Deal Plan. Retrieved from: https://plan.lamayor.org/sites/default/files/pLAn_2019_final.pdf

⁴⁴ <https://cleanairactionplan.org/>

⁴⁵ <https://cleanairactionplan.org/strategies/trucks/>

⁴⁶ <https://la.streetsblog.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2021/05/I-710-Clean-Truck-Program-Long-Description-09.20.20.pdf>

working group was established by LA Metro in November 2021 and includes partner agencies and community advocacy groups.

The Los Angeles Cleantech Incubator (LACI) has established the Transportation Electrification Partnership to accelerate transportation electrification and zero-emissions goods movement in the Greater Los Angeles region, ahead of the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games. This partnership, which involves local, regional, and state stakeholders, aims to achieve a 25% reduction in GHG emissions and air pollution beyond existing commitments by 2028. To achieve this goal, the partnership has set specific targets, such as having 30% of all light-duty passenger vehicles on the road and 80% of passenger vehicle sales be electric by 2028 and having 40% of all drayage and short haul trucks and 60% of medium-duty delivery trucks be electric. Additionally, the partnership aims to have 84,000 public and workplace chargers available for single occupancy vehicles and 95,000 available for medium and heavy-duty trucks by 2028.

Southern California Edison (SCE), the largest electricity provider in the region, has created the Charge Ready Program, which provides funding for the installation of charging stations, as well as ongoing support and maintenance. Participants can choose from a variety of charging station options and customize the program to meet their specific needs. The program is designed to support the growth of EV adoption and increase the availability of charging stations, which in turn can help reduce GHG emissions from transportation. The Charge Ready program is part of SCE's broader efforts to promote clean energy and support the transition to a low-carbon future.⁴⁷

Southern California Gas Company (SoCal Gas) is also involved in various clean transportation applications⁴⁸, including developing near-zero emission heavy-duty truck engines and compressed natural gas (CNG) hybrid heavy-duty drayage trucks to reduce GHG emissions and improve air quality in the Los Angeles area, particularly in the I-710 corridor, the Port of Los Angeles, and the Port of Long Beach. The company has also worked on demonstrating the benefits of in-home refueling for NGVs and supporting the development of advanced storage tank technologies that offer higher capacity and a smaller ecological footprint. These tanks will allow NGVs to have a trunk carrying capacity that is equivalent to gasoline vehicles, while still providing the benefits of using a cheaper and cleaner alternative fuel. This effort is part of SoCalGas's broader commitment to promoting the adoption of NGVs as a means of reducing GHG emissions and improving air quality.

2.6 Zero Emission Infrastructure Readiness Actions

Make ready programs are critical for the adoption of zero-emission technology as they help address the infrastructure gap that currently exists in the market. ZEVs require specialized charging or refueling infrastructure, and make-ready programs provide financial and technical support to install this infrastructure. Without the necessary infrastructure, potential buyers may be deterred from purchasing ZEVs, as they may be concerned about running out of charge or fuel. Make ready programs can also help reduce the upfront cost of installing infrastructure, making it more accessible to businesses and individuals, and streamline the process for utility customers to access the needed capacity for installing EV chargers. This section outlines several state-level actions that will facilitate and expedite the deployment of infrastructure, particularly charging infrastructure, throughout the state.

The California Public Utility Commission is currently working on transportation electrification planning efforts to prepare the investor-owned utilities (IOU) and the grid for the expected growth in EV adoption over the next several years. By leveraging the existing interagency coordination and planning framework, and closely working with staff from California

⁴⁷ <https://crt.sce.com/overview>

⁴⁸ <https://www.socalgas.com/sustainability/technology-and-investments/clean-energy-investments>

Independent System Operator (CAISO), CEC, and CARB, the Commission will ensure that their processes are ready for the massive influx of EVs. This work includes the adoption of the 2021 CEC's Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR) demand forecast, which serves as the starting point for all generation and infrastructure planning within CAISO's territory. The IEPR forecast reflects higher transportation electrification adoption that is consistent with CARB's Advanced Clean Cars II and Advanced Clean Fleets regulations. Following the adoption of several zero-emission freight regulations by CARB in recent years, the CPUC has recently released the Zero-Emissions Freight Infrastructure Planning (FIP) draft proposal.⁴⁹ This proposal aims to proactively address the requirements for extended lead time utility-side electrical infrastructure, specifically distribution and transmission, to bolster the rapid progression of transportation electrification. The proposal focuses on creating a uniform set of inputs and assumptions for transportation electrification and on refining processes to direct long-term planning for medium- and heavy-duty grid infrastructure along key freight corridors.

Additionally, CAISO is using the Integrated Resource Planning (IRP) proceeding's 2021 Preferred System Plan, reflecting the CEC's 2021 IEPR forecast, in its 2022-2023 transmission planning process. The proceeding to modernize the electric grid for a high distributed energy resources future has authorized the IOUs to use a variation of the CEC's 2021 IEPR forecast to study the distribution impact of high transportation electrification in their respective 2023 Grid Needs Assessments. Lastly, the CPUC's new proceeding aims to advance demand flexibility through electric rates by considering developing dynamic rates for EV charging. These dynamic rates may facilitate broader EV load management and grid support, which is crucial for ensuring that the grid can accommodate the expected growth in EV adoption over the next decade. Additionally, the overall need of charging stations was analyzed as part of AB 2127 (2021), which developed multiple scenarios of ZEV adoption across the state. According to the report, it is estimated that between approximately 1.2 million and 2 million public and shared private charging stations will be needed in California by 2030 and 2035, respectively, to accommodate the influx of ZEVs. In the SCAG region specifically, the report indicates that by 2035 there will be a need for approximately 1 million charging stations (313,000 DC fast charging stations and the remainder being Level 2) to support the growing number of ZEVs.⁵⁰ Note that these numbers also include the charging infrastructure needs for multi-unit dwellings as well as workplace charging. The AB 2127 Report is a biennial report by CEC that examines the charging needs to support California's plug-in EVs. The report is required under AB 2127 and was updated in response to Governor Gavin Newsom's Executive Order N-79-20, which set expanded ZEV adoption targets.

Also, in November 2022, the CPUC adopted a five-year, \$1 billion transportation electrification program, which will provide a unified policy-driven funding structure for utility transportation electrification efforts through 2030, with a focus on prioritizing investments in charging infrastructure for low-income, tribal, and underserved utility customers. Under the program, 70% of the funds will go toward charging for medium-and heavy-duty vehicles, while 30% will go to duty charging at or near multi-unit dwellings. The program offers rebates for customer side EV infrastructure investments and provides higher rebates for projects in underserved, disadvantaged, and tribal communities to ensure charging infrastructure reaches these hard-to-reach communities.

Furthermore, in Fall 2021, the CPUC made two resolutions (E-5167 and E-5168) approving new Electric Rules for IOUs to help customers cover costs associated with EV charging. These rules are called the EV Infrastructure Rules and they allow ratepayers to cover the costs of service line extensions and electrical distribution infrastructure for

⁴⁹ <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/industries-and-topics/electrical-energy/infrastructure/transportation-electrification/freight-infrastructure-planning>

⁵⁰ <https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/getdocument.aspx?tn=238851>

separately metered or sub-metered EV charging. The EV Infrastructure Rules are a major policy shift as they incorporate utility-side transportation electrification investments into the IOUs' general rate case proceedings. The IOUs began offering service under these rules in mid-2022 and will report data on their implementation in their EV Cost and Load report submitted in 2023. These resolutions also address the issue of energization timing, which is the time between when a customer submits an application with their utility to energize chargers to when the chargers receive power. The CPUC issued Resolution E-5247 in December 2022, which establishes an interim 125-business day average service energization timeline for projects taking service under the EV Infrastructure Rules. The IOUs will collect one year of data to inform an updated proposal for a permanent service energization timeline.

2.7 Policy Gaps

Despite all federal, state, and local incentives and regulations helping to accelerate the adoption of clean transportation technologies, significant disparities in ZEV ownership and operation exist between lower and higher-income communities. A recent study by International Council on Clean Transportation (ICCT) for the International ZEV Alliance⁵¹ found that, despite accelerated adoption and supporting infrastructure, accessibility gaps in electrified transportation persist. ZEV ownership correlates with income and education levels, with high-income communities reporting up to seven times more ZEV ownership than lower-income areas. Some of the key policy gaps contributing to this gap include:

- **Lack of Affordability for Low- & Moderate-Income Communities:** The initial price tag of clean transportation technologies is usually higher than that of traditional vehicles. For example, electric vehicles (EV) often have a higher upfront cost compared to conventional internal combustion engine cars. The latest report from Kelley Blue Book⁵², reveals that the average cost for a passenger ZEV is \$18,000 more than that of an average ICE vehicle. The cost disparity becomes much more significant in the medium and heavy-duty vehicle. The cost disparity is due to the cost of the battery technology, which represents a significant portion of the EV cost. Higher insurance premiums for EVs also add to the higher upfront cost. Historically, some insurers charged higher rates for EVs due to factors like higher repair costs from specialized components, a greater initial vehicle value, perceived risks from limited historical data, and the potential cost of battery replacement. These elevated premiums can raise the overall cost of owning an EV, deterring potential buyers. While incentives can offset some of this cost, they often still remain out of reach for those with lower income households. These households are already grappling with the high price tags of new vehicles. The situation is further exacerbated when considering the even higher costs that come with acquiring ZEVs. This is why it is critical to develop additional, targeted incentive programs to close the affordability gap in clean transportation technologies. Such programs should be explicitly designed to cater to the needs of low and moderate-income communities, which are often marginalized in the transition to clean energy. This could involve strategies such as up-front rebates or grants to directly reduce purchase costs, subsidized loans, or "scrappage" schemes where older, more polluting vehicles can be traded in for a discount on cleaner ones. It is also important to note that currently the federal incentives are structured as tax credits, which require individuals to wait until the end of the tax year to see financial benefits. This does little to offset the high upfront costs, particularly for low and moderate-income individuals who may not have the financial flexibility to wait. Additionally, those with lower income may not owe as much in taxes, limiting the usefulness of a tax credit.
- **Lack of Investment in Charging & Fueling Infrastructure:** The shift to clean technologies requires access to charging and clean fuel infrastructure. This can be particularly challenging for people who live in apartments or other multi-unit dwellings where installing personal charging stations may not be possible. Public charging stations are an alternative, but they require investment in infrastructure that may be lacking in low and moderate-income neighborhoods. Even with the significant investments made at the federal and state levels, those investments alone cannot close the gap for the zero-emission infrastructure. According to CEC's AB 2127 report, to meet the ambitious goals set by Executive Order N-79-20, which anticipates 8 million ZEVs

⁵¹ https://zevalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/Environmental-Justice-Impacts-of-ZEVs_Final-Report.pdf

⁵² <https://mediaroom.kbb.com/2022-05-10-Luxury-Share-Increases-in-April.-Pushing-New-Vehicle-Average-Transaction-Prices-Higher.-according-to-Kelley-Blue-Book>

by 2030, nearly 1.2 million charging facilities (public and shared private⁵³) will be required for light-duty vehicles. In addition, to accommodate the expected 180,000 medium- and heavy-duty vehicles by 2030, an extra 157,000 charging stations will be needed. Currently California has 87,700 public and shared private chargers. To address the infrastructure deficit, there is a significant need for an increased pace of charger installation from 2023 to 2030. Specifically, each week during this period, around 3,000 chargers for light-duty vehicles and 430 chargers for heavy-duty vehicles should be constructed. This clearly shows why it is important for regional agencies such as SCAG and their regional partners to intensify their efforts in deploying clean fueling and charging infrastructure throughout their jurisdictions.

- **Alternative Revenue Sources To Replace Fuel Taxes:** As the transportation sector shifts toward ZEV, a critical policy gap emerges concerning the funding of transportation projects. Traditionally, gas tax revenue has been a primary source of funding for these initiatives. As the adoption of ZEVs increases, gas consumption decreases, leading to a significant reduction in gas tax revenue. This decline poses a challenge for maintaining, upgrading, and expanding transportation infrastructure, as the traditional funding mechanism diminishes. Policymakers need to address this gap by exploring alternative revenue streams or restructuring the current taxation model to ensure that the transition to cleaner vehicles doesn't inadvertently hinder transportation infrastructure investments. For example, as part of the Senate Bill 1 which passed in 2017, starting in 2020, a one-time upfront registration fee of \$100 is charged for 2020 model year plug-in vehicles in California.

⁵³ A shared private charging station has parking space(s) designated by a property owner or lessee to be available to and accessible by employees, tenants, visitors, and/or residents. Parking spaces are not dedicated to individual drivers or vehicles

•

3. Clean Technology Discussion: Approach and Methodology

3.1 Scope of Clean Technologies Considered

As part of this technology compendium, three categories of technologies were evaluated: 1) ZEV and NZEV technologies, 2) charging and fueling infrastructure, and 3) relevant supporting products. For vehicles, the technologies reviewed include BEVs, FCEVs, PHEVs and natural gas-powered vehicles for on-road applications. For rail, which includes passenger rail, freight rail, switchers, and light rail, technology types reviewed included BEV, and FCEV.

In terms of infrastructure, the project team assessed various charging and clean fueling technologies. These included Level 2 Charging Stations, DC Fast Charging Stations, and Innovative Charging Solutions. Additionally, the assessment encompassed hydrogen fueling infrastructure options such as Slow Fill, Fast Fill, On-Site Production, Off-Grid, Mobile Stations, and On-the-Go hydrogen stations. Furthermore, the team also examined natural gas infrastructure, specifically Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) and Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) options.

In evaluating supporting products, the project team examined a diverse range of technologies to complement and enhance the implementation of zero and near-zero emission technologies. These included:

- **Charge Management Software:** This software enables the efficient management and monitoring of charging stations. It optimizes their use and ensures reliable access to the charging infrastructure.
- **Battery Management Systems (BMS):** These systems play a crucial role in maintaining the performance and lifespan of vehicle batteries. They ensure optimal energy storage and distribution.
- **Smart Grid Technologies:** These include advanced grid management systems that enable effective integration of renewable energy sources, offer demand response capabilities, and allow for intelligent energy distribution. These technologies facilitate the integration of ZEVs and NZEVs into the existing grid infrastructure, supporting their charging and operation.
- **Fleet Management Software:** This software is designed to optimize fleet operations. It offers functionalities such as route planning, vehicle tracking, and maintenance scheduling. This aids in maximizing the efficiency and productivity of ZEV and NZEV fleets.
- **Payment Systems:** Systems that enable convenient and secure transactions for accessing charging infrastructure or utilizing other mobility services. They offer user-friendly payment options, ensuring seamless transactions and enhancing the overall user experience.

3.2 Specifications

Clean technology specifications encompass a range of factors that contribute to the environmental sustainability, acceptance, and efficiency of a technology or product including emissions benefits, total cost of ownership, adoption status, etc. This compendium utilizes technology specifications to offer a comprehensive elucidation of diverse clean technologies. Its purpose is to equip stakeholders with the essential tools and information required for making informed decisions when selecting technologies that align with their specific applications.

Our approach to the specifications list evolved due to the exclusion of certain categories, either from inadequate data quality or the inability to define a meaningful metric for our analysis. We focused on factors that could be justifiably addressed. For instance, we initially considered an 'equity specification', but due to challenges in identifying a quantifiable metric for each technology, it was excluded. These additional considerations are discussed within each of

three types of technologies considered (vehicle, infrastructure, and supporting products) and a comprehensive list is included in Appendix E to this report.

The following tables delineate each specification for the three technology categories under consideration. The specification categories for all categories are consistent, though vehicle technologies include additional unique specifications such as emissions and total cost of ownership. These unique aspects are integral to the broader characterization of vehicle technologies.

Table 5. Technology Specifications - Vehicles

Specification	Metric	Unit of Measurement
Product Description	Brief description of the product (e.g., vehicle body type)	
GHG Emissions Reduction	This metric measures the annual metric ton of life cycle (well-to-wheel) CO2 emissions reduction per unit of vehicle replacement. The unit of measurement is in metric tons per year, providing an assessment of the technology's impact on GHG emissions. Please note that GHG emissions assessed in this study encompass those emitted during all stages of the fuel's life cycle: from extraction and production to distribution and final use. More details can be found in Appendix B. It is also noteworthy to mention that the project has attempted to quantify emission reductions from all technologies, irrespective of their current availability. This is feasible as the project team was able to predict the improvements in efficiency once these technologies are developed and brought to market.	Metric Tons per Year ⁵⁴
NOx Emissions Reductions	This specification indicates the percentage of reduction in NOx emissions from conventional gasoline and diesel fuels that the technology offers. It serves as a measure of the technology's contribution to reducing nitrogen oxide emissions.	Percentage
PM Emissions Reductions	This metric represents the percentage of reduction in particulate matter (PM) emissions achieved by the technology. It provides an insight into the technology's effectiveness in reducing fine particulate pollution, with the unit of measurement also being a percentage.	Percentage
Range	This specification quantifies the number of miles that a vehicle utilizing the technology can travel with one refueling. It serves as an important consideration for assessing the practicality and usability of the technology.	Miles
Capital Cost	This metric represents the capital cost associated with clean technology vehicles. It provides stakeholders with information on the initial investment required for purchasing these vehicles.	U.S. Dollar
Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Saving	This metric represents the total incremental cost or saving (if savings are negative – i.e., TCO of clean technology is higher than baseline technology – the number is shown in parenthesis and red color) incurred over the useful life of the vehicle employing the technology. For simplicity, in this analysis, the project team is using 15 years of lifetime. This metric provides stakeholders with an estimation of the financial implications associated with adopting and maintaining the technology. More details can be found in Appendix C.	U.S. Dollar
Adoption Status	This specification indicates the number of vehicles or units employing the technology that have been deployed in SCAG region. It serves as an indicator of the technology's market penetration and adoption level, providing valuable insights into its current usage.	Number of Vehicle/Units

⁵⁴ For this analysis, the project team calculated the metric tons per year of GHG emissions reduction to quantify the impact on GHG emissions. This selection provides a comprehensive GHG emission reduction metric that not only accounts for the intrinsic performance of the technology, but also its practical use. This dual consideration ensures that the technology's real-world implementation and its effect on emission levels are accurately captured, offering a more holistic view of its potential in reducing overall GHG emissions.

Specification	Metric	Unit of Measurement
Availability	This metric assesses the number of make/models of vehicles utilizing the technology that are currently commercially available or expected to be available in the next three years. It provides information on the diversity and availability of options for stakeholders considering the adoption of the technology.	Number of Make/Models
Longevity	This specification reveals the average number of years covered by the manufacturer warranty for vehicles using the technology. It serves as an indication of the expected lifespan and reliability of the technology, allowing stakeholders to consider the associated warranty coverage.	Years

Table 6. Technology Specifications – Charging & Fueling Infrastructure

Specification	Metric	Unit of Measurement
Product Description	Brief description of the product (e.g., type of chargers)	
Capital Cost	This metric represents the capital cost associated with EV chargers, natural gas stations (per unit capacity), and hydrogen fueling stations (per unit capacity). It provides stakeholders with information on the initial investment required for installing these infrastructure units.	\$/station
Maintenance Cost	This specification indicates the cost of maintaining EV charging equipment, hydrogen stations, and natural gas stations. It helps stakeholders assess the ongoing expenses associated with operating and servicing these infrastructure units	\$/year/station
Adoption Status	This metric reveals the number of charging stations or fueling stations that have been deployed in SCAG region. It offers insights into the level of adoption and availability of these stations within the specified area.	Number of Units
Availability	This specification assesses the number of vendors or suppliers that provide charging stations or fueling stations. It informs stakeholders about the diversity and availability of options when it comes to sourcing these infrastructure units	Number of Vendors
Longevity	This metric indicates the average number of years covered by the manufacturer warranty for charging stations or fueling stations. It provides stakeholders with an understanding of the expected lifespan and reliability of the infrastructure units	Years

Table 7. Technology Specifications – Supporting Products

Specification	Metric	Unit of Measurement
Product Description	Brief description of the product (e.g., detailed information about a product's features, functions, and benefits)	
Capital Cost	This metric represents the capital cost or upfront cost associated with the technology. It provides information on the initial investment required to acquire the supporting product or hardware.	\$/unit
Maintenance Cost	This specification indicates the ongoing maintenance cost or subscription fee associated with the technology. It helps stakeholders assess the recurring expenses needed to keep the supporting product operational.	\$/year/unit
Adoption Status	This metric reveals the number of units of the supporting product that have been deployed in SCAG region. It offers insights into the level of adoption and availability of these products within the specified area	Number of Units

Specification	Metric	Unit of Measurement
Availability	This specification assesses the number of vendors or suppliers that provide the supporting product. It informs stakeholders about the diversity and availability of options when it comes to sourcing these products.	Number of Vendors
Longevity	This metric indicates the average length of the manufacturer warranty for the supporting technology. It provides stakeholders with an understanding of the expected lifespan and reliability of the product	Years

3.3 Technology Identification and Assessment Methods

A variety of pre-developed tools were utilized to complete the technology assessment and characterization:

- **AFLEET**: For calculating the total cost of ownership (TCO), the Argonne National Laboratory's (ANL) Alternative Fuel Life-Cycle Environmental and Economic Transportation (AFLEET) Tool was utilized with some modifications to California fuel prices as well as augmenting the vehicle prices with latest available information. More detailed on the TCO analysis is also provided in Appendix C of this report.
- **U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Alternative Fuels Data Center's (AFDC) Alternative Fuel and Advanced Vehicle Search**⁵⁵ was used for the availability of on-road clean technology vehicles
- **ICF's EV library**⁵⁶ was used to determine the availability and range of each vehicle type.
- **CARB's Technology Feasibility Assessment for the Proposed In-Use Locomotive Regulation**⁵⁷ was used for the availability and cost information associated with various clean rail technologies
- **CARB's EMFAC2021**⁵⁸ model along with other sources such as the **U.S. Energy Information Administration** and **CARB's Low Carbon Fuel Standards** (LCFS) carbon intensity data were leveraged for emission quantification.
- **CEC's Zero Emission Vehicle and Infrastructure Statistics** was used to determine the adoption status of light-, medium- and heavy-duty vehicles as well as buses. The tool was also used to extract the latest number of charging and hydrogen fueling stations deployed in the region.
- **Desk research**: In instances where pre-existing tools were not accessible or did not provide complete information, internet searches were conducted to bridge the knowledge gaps. These searches were utilized to gather data on factors such as longevity and range, supplementing the existing information and ensuring a more comprehensive understanding of the subject matter.
- **Clean Technology Survey**: A survey was distributed to clean vehicle technology manufacturers and municipalities. The vendor list was compiled through web searches, industry relationships of the project team, as well as SCAG's listserv and included more than 90 recipients. The survey was distributed via email. In some cases, the information was used to fill in the gaps where existing tools and internet research was lacking. The purpose of this survey was to solicit feedback from technology vendors, manufacturers, and other stakeholders in the clean transportation industry to ensure that the Clean Transportation Technology Compendium is accurate, comprehensive, and up to date. The survey questionnaire is included as an Appendix to this report (Appendix D). Specifically, the project team sought information on the following aspects of clean transportation technologies:

⁵⁵ <https://afdc.energy.gov/vehicles/search/>

⁵⁶ The ICF EV Library is a proprietary database containing information on over 500 electric vehicle makes and models (light, medium, and heavy-duty). It includes key details about their specifications and estimated years of commercial availability. The library is compiled from industry announcements, web searches, as well as conversations and interviews with various manufacturers.

⁵⁷ <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/barcu/regact/2022/locomotive22/appf.pdf>

⁵⁸ <https://arb.ca.gov/emfac/>

- **Commercial availability:** Is the technology commercially available? If not, what phase of development is technology currently in?
- **Capital, Operation, and Maintenance Costs:** What are the estimated capital, operation, and maintenance costs of these technologies compared to conventional technologies? How do these costs evolve over time, and what factors influence them (e.g., research and development, prototyping, testing and validation, and commercialization)?
- **Market penetrability:** What is the current market share of the proposed technology? What factors are driving or hindering their growth in the market?
- **Accessibility:** How accessible are these technologies to various user groups, including individuals, businesses, and public entities? What barriers might hinder their adoption and how can they be overcome?
- **Additional factors:** Are there any other considerations, challenges, or opportunities related to the deployment of the technology in Southern California?

The vendor survey yielded a total of 23 responses, out of which 20 were relevant and provided valuable insights. These responses were obtained from a diverse range of vendors, including prominent names such as BorgWarner, Sesame Solar, City of Manhattan Beach, Proterra, Forum Mobility, Exprolink, Inc., GoPowerEV, Volvo Group North America, Hyzon Motors USA, Hydrogen Fuel Cell Partnership, The Mobility House, BayoTech, BP Pulse Fleet North America Inc., Xendee Corporation, Energy, Efficiency & Environment, Inc., and Core States Energy. The responses obtained from the vendor survey played a vital role in the project team's pursuit of comprehensive information. These valuable inputs helped bridge significant information gaps that could not be readily fulfilled through internet searches or literature review alone.

- **One-on-One interviews:** The project team also took a hands-on approach to gather information by engaging directly with various clean technology manufacturers. This approach involved conducting interviews and holding discussions with industry representatives to gain a more nuanced understanding of the evolving technology landscape. Participation in conferences and other industry gatherings also provided opportunities to interact face-to-face with these manufacturers.

4. Technology Compendium

Chapter 4 of the compendium delves into specification tables for each category of clean technology, namely Vehicles, Infrastructure, and Supporting Products. Within each category, various subcategories and associated products are characterized with respect to the technology specifications identified earlier. While there may be slight differences in the specifications for each category, the discussion of individual products generally revolves around their existing condition (current adoption, and pilot projects), emissions reduction impacts, total cost of ownership, maintenance costs, and factors related to performance and commercialization (e.g., range, availability, and longevity). It is important to note that not all the necessary information was readily available, and any cells in the technology characterization tables with “NI” indicate a knowledge gap or lack of available information. Blank cells indicate that the product is not currently commercially available.

4.1 Vehicles

Defining the Vehicles Category: Within the Vehicles category, Light-Duty (LDVs), Medium-Duty (MDVs), and Heavy-Duty (HDVs) on-road vehicles, as well as Rail locomotives were included in this assessment. Each vehicle category is broken down into body styles. For examples in the LDV category, body styles include Passenger, SUV, Minivan, Pickup Truck, and Utility Van. Each body style is broken down further into fuel types such as BEV, PHEV, FCEV, and NGV. Each body and fuel type was evaluated based on the pre-determined criteria (e.g., GHG Emissions Reductions, TCO, Adoption Status, Availability, etc.).

Data Sources and Limitations:

Data sources used to evaluate the technology specifications include the following:

- AFLEET⁵⁹: Used to calculate the total cost of ownership for BEVs, PHEVs, NGVs, and FCEVs.
- ICF’s EV Library: Used to calculate the availability and range of BEVs, and PHEVs.
- AFDC Vehicle Search⁶⁰: Used for the availability of on-road clean technology vehicles
- CARB’s Technology Feasibility Assessment for the Proposed In-Use Locomotive Regulation⁶¹: Used for the availability and cost information associated with various clean rail technologies

The project encountered certain limitations with the available data sources. To address the gaps in information, internet searches were conducted as an alternative means to acquire complete data. These searches specifically aimed to determine the availability and range of NGVs and FCEVs. Although the internet searches proved to be helpful in filling some of the knowledge gaps, it is important to note that not all the required information was accessible online. In cases where vendors did not provide the necessary information through the clean technology survey, the corresponding cells in the technology characteristics tables were marked as “NI” meaning that “No information Available.” For instance, there were certain instances where TCO data or range data could not be obtained from AFLEET or other publicly available data sources. Since this information was neither available online nor provided through the survey, the respective cells in the table were left as “NI.” Additionally in certain cases where the technology did not exist (e.g., there does not exist any FCEV minivans in the market) the cells were left blank.

⁵⁹ AFLEET Tool - Argonne National Laboratory. Accessed June 8, 2023. <https://afleet.es.anl.gov/home/>.

⁶⁰ <https://afdc.energy.gov/vehicles/search/>

⁶¹ <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/barcu/regact/2022/locomotive22/appf.pdf>

4.1.1 Light Duty Vehicles

LDVs are class 1 vehicles weighing 6,000 lbs. or less. LDV body styles evaluated included passenger cars, SUVs, minivans, pickup trucks, and utility vans. For each body style, technology types such as BEVs, PHEVs, and FCEVs are evaluated by the pre-determined specifications.

Table 8 displays detailed product descriptions for each body style and technology type.

Table 8. LDV body styles descriptions.

Vehicle Type	Description
Passenger Car	A passenger car, also known as an automobile or sedan, is a four-wheeled vehicle primarily designed for the transportation of passengers. It typically has seating for four to five people, with a separate enclosed area for passengers and a designated trunk space for cargo.
SUV	An SUV is a versatile vehicle that combines elements of both a passenger car and an off-road vehicle. It typically features a higher ground clearance, a more spacious interior, and the ability to accommodate more passengers. SUVs often offer optional four-wheel drive for improved off-road capability.
Minivan	A minivan, also known as a multi-purpose vehicle (MPV), is a spacious vehicle designed to transport multiple passengers, typically with three or more rows of seating. Minivans provide ample interior space, versatile seating configurations, and often have sliding doors for convenient access to the rear passenger area.
Light Duty Pickup Truck	A light duty pickup truck is a type of light duty vehicle characterized by an open cargo bed at the rear, separate from the passenger compartment. Pickup trucks are designed for both passenger transportation and hauling cargo. They often offer towing capabilities and are available in various sizes, from compact to full-size models.
Utility Van	A utility van, also known as a cargo van or commercial van, is a light duty vehicle primarily designed for carrying goods, equipment, or tools. Utility vans typically have a fully enclosed cargo area without rear passenger seating. They offer ample space and security features for efficient transportation and storage of cargo or supplies.

Existing Condition


The adoption of clean light duty vehicle technologies in SCAG region has steadily increased over the years. ZEV adoption started gaining momentum around 2010 and was initially concentrated in high populous areas and regions with higher socioeconomic status. In SCAG region, the majority of ZEVs are found in Los Angeles and Orange counties, with Los Angeles County having 54 percent and Orange County having 26 percent of the total ZEVs in the region. Prior to 2010, SCAG region had only 122 ZEVs, but since then, the number has surged to approximately 525,000, accounting for about 3.9 percent of the total light-duty vehicle fleet in the region. Sales trends indicate that ZEVs are becoming an increasingly significant portion of the market, composing roughly 25% of light-duty vehicle sales as of the second quarter of 2023. BEVs and PHEVs represent the majority of ZEVs in the region, with FCEVs lagging significantly behind, only representing 0.06 percent of ZEVs in the region. It is worth noting that the majority of the BEVs (88 percent) in the region have battery electric ranges over 200 miles.⁶² As of December 2022, consumers in California had a broad range of options with 50 passenger BEV models, 51 PHEV models, and 3 FCEV models commercially available for sale⁶³. Given the current adoption rates, the region is making significant progress toward the targets set by the State to require 100% ZEV sales by 2035.

In 2022, more than 175,000 light duty ZEVs were sold in the SCAG region.

⁶² <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/zero-emission-vehicle-and-infrastructure-statistics/light-duty-vehicle>


⁶³ <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/zero-emission-vehicle-and-infrastructure-statistics>

The future adoption of light-duty FCEVs is uncertain, as the current higher cost of hydrogen relative to gasoline or electricity, along with the limited availability of hydrogen refueling infrastructure, may present barriers to their widespread adoption in the near term. Additional advances in technology would be necessary for them to increase market share. It should also be noted that while PHEVs are considered a ZEV, they are only truly zero emission when operating solely on battery power. Once the battery is depleted, they operate similarly to a conventional hybrid vehicle, utilizing a gasoline engine. The average electric range of PHEVs has steadily increased from 20.5 miles in 2012 to 38.5 miles as of 2021.⁶⁴



The trend toward ZEV adoption in SCAG region, especially for light-duty vehicles, is encouraging. However, the adoption of FCEVs has been slow, and the majority of ZEVs are still BEVs and PHEVs. Despite this, the fact that the majority of BEVs in the region have battery electric ranges over 200 miles is an indication that range anxiety is becoming less of a barrier to BEV adoption. The increasing adoption of ZEVs in SCAG region is a positive step toward GHG emissions and improving air quality in the region. However, there is still much work to be done to ensure that there is sufficient clean fueling infrastructure, especially for FCEVs, to support continued ZEV adoption in the region. Figure 4 shows the adoption trend of zero emission light duty vehicles (both total vehicle stock and sales) in SCAG regions between 2010 and 2022. The first graph on the left represents the total number of ZEVs currently operating in SCAG region, while the second graph shows how many ZEVs were purchased each year. The future of ZEVs in the light duty sector in SCAG region is bright, with roughly 27.5 percent of vehicles being ZEVs as of 2020, with no signs of slowing down.⁶⁵

Figure 4. Zero Emission Vehicle Stock and Sales in SCAG Region



Source: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/zero-emission-vehicle-and-infrastructure-statistics> (Accessed: July 7, 2023)

⁶⁴ <https://www.iea.org/data-and-statistics/charts/evolution-of-average-range-of-electric-vehicles-by-powertrain-2010-2021>

⁶⁵ Data gathered from: <https://arb.ca.gov/emfac/fleet-db/067ac056377580f1eb495a6cf58d0205ba4cf295>

In addition to the adoption statistics, the region has also undertaken numerous demonstration projects pertaining to the adoption of zero-emission passenger vehicles. Demonstration projects play a critical role in the adoption of clean zero emission technology by providing tangible examples of how the technology can be successfully implemented in real-world scenarios. These projects allow stakeholders to observe the technology in action and assess its performance, which helps to build confidence in the technology's viability and effectiveness. An interesting demonstration project in the region was launched by Southern California Edison (SCE) and seeks to test the viability of vehicle-to-grid (V2G). This demonstration project will test whether EV batteries could be a reliable and efficient source of energy for the power grid. The project will use a mix of passenger EVs at workplace charging sites, electric school and transit buses to validate whether V2G could help reduce customers' electric bills in exchange for energy supplied from their EV batteries. SCE believes that to meet its goal to become carbon neutral by 2045, 75% of all vehicles in California need to be electric by then. With more than 200,000 EVs in its service area and 700,000 in the state, SCE believes that EV batteries could become a viable source of power for the energy grid.⁶⁶

Environmental Impacts

With respect to environmental impact, the assessment included GHG, NOx, and Exhaust PM reductions by body style and technology type. Emissions reductions in terms of tons of CO₂ per year are displayed in Table 9 and Figure 5. Notably, BEVs consistently boast greater reductions in CO₂ per year than PHEVs and FCEVs across all body styles. Meanwhile, emissions reductions for NOx, Exhaust PM, and Brake wear PM are consistent across all body styles and technology types (Figure 6). It is noteworthy to mention that the CO₂ emissions also account for the upstream emissions accounting for fuel and electricity production. Note that the project team used 2021 carbon intensity values for California average grid electricity used as a transportation fuel in California as reported by the California Air Resources Board.⁶⁷ With respect to NOx and PM emissions (both exhaust and brake wear), the project team utilized the CARB EMFAC2021 model.

Table 9. Environmental impacts of LDV body styles and technology types.

Light Duty Vehicle by Body Style	Technology Type	GHG Emissions Reduction (Metric Ton per Year) ⁶⁸	NOx Emissions Reductions	Exhaust PM Emissions Reductions	Brake wear PM Emissions Reductions
Passenger Car	BEV	3.99	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	2.40	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	2.61	100%	100%	50%
SUV	BEV	5.71	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	3.43	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	3.74	100%	100%	50%
Minivan	BEV	13.19	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	7.91	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	8.63	100%	100%	50%
Pickup Truck	BEV	6.08	100%	100%	50%

⁶⁶ <https://www.sce.com/business/advantages/electric-transportation-programs/vehicle-grid>

⁶⁷ https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/classic/fuels/lcfs/fuelpathways/comments/tier2/2021_elec_update.pdf?_ga=2.207245524.611557608.1628272571-476568668.1615315573

⁶⁸ For FCEVs, the project team assumes that hydrogen is produced through Steam Methane Reforming (SMR) using fossil natural gas, which is currently the most common method for hydrogen production nationwide. However, the project team also explored other options. For information about GHG emissions reductions from hydrogen produced using other feedstocks, please refer to Appendix B.

Light Duty Vehicle by Body Style	Technology Type	GHG Emissions Reduction (Metric Ton per Year) ⁶⁸	NOx Emissions Reductions	Exhaust PM Emissions Reductions	Brake wear PM Emissions Reductions
	PHEV	3.65	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	3.98	100%	100%	50%
Utility Van	BEV	11.87	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	7.12	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	7.77	100%	100%	50%

Figure 5. GHG Emissions (well to wheel) reductions of LDV body styles and technology types.





Figure 6. Percentage of NOx emissions reductions, exhaust PM emissions reductions, and brake wear PM emissions reductions by body style and technology type.



Performance & Commercialization

LDVs are the most widely available and adopted category of ZEV and NZEVs. PHEVs have the greatest range (up to 640 miles for a passenger car), followed by BEVs (up to 520 miles for a passenger car). In terms of total cost of

ownership, BEVs were less expensive than their combustion engine alternative although the initial purchase cost was greater. It should also be noted that while PHEVs are considered a ZEV, they are only truly zero emission when operating solely on battery power. Once the battery is depleted, they operate similarly to a conventional hybrid vehicle, utilizing a gasoline engine, explaining their longer range. Table 10 displays further details relevant for commercialization and specific technological characteristics. For the availability category, the project team also included vehicles of the same make and model but different trim levels (i.e., sub models). For example, while the Audi e-tron is commonly recognized as a single make and model, the project team distinguished and accounted for four distinct trim levels within this range. These trim levels include the standard e-tron, e-tron S, e-tron S Sportback, and e-tron Sportback. This is why the number of models may not necessarily line up with other sources commonly used in California such as Veloz⁶⁹.

Table 10. Technology characteristics of LDVs by body style and technology type.

Light Duty Vehicle by Body Style	Technology Type	Range	Capital Cost	TCO Savings	Adoption Status ⁷⁰ (Number of Vehicles)	Availability	Longevity
Passenger Car	BEV	520 - 114 miles	\$37,000	\$7,506	212,932	40-50 models	7-10 years
	PHEV	640 - 290 miles	\$27,000	\$8,080	117,629	20-30 models	7-10 years
	FCEV	391 miles	\$50,000	(\$36,984)	7,512	< 5 models	3-8 years
SUV	BEV	350 - 100 miles	\$46,000	\$13,147	139,236	80-90 models	7-10 years
	PHEV	560 - 370 miles	\$38,500	\$12,165	40,662	30-40 models	7-10 years
	FCEV	260 - 380 miles	\$59,000	(\$47,720)	10	< 5 models	3-8 years
Minivan	BEV	250 miles	\$46,000	\$45,198	15	< 5 models	7-10 years
	PHEV	520 miles	\$38,500	\$59,520	4,354	< 5 models	3-5 years
	FCEV						
Pickup Truck	BEV	110 – 400 miles	\$77,000	(\$13,675)	2,492	10-20 models	3-10 years
	PHEV	500 miles	\$58,000	(\$3,614)	0	10-20 models	8-10 years
	FCEV						
Utility Van	BEV	110 - 175 miles	\$55,000	\$51,337	15	10-20 models	3-8 years
	PHEV						
	FCEV						

NI indicates “no information” or a knowledge gap

Blank indicates not commercially available

⁶⁹ <https://www.veloz.org/ev-market-report/>

⁷⁰ <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/zero-emission-vehicle-and-infrastructure-statistics/light-duty-vehicle> (Accessed: July 7, 2023)

4.1.2 Commercial Vehicles: Medium & Heavy-Duty (excluding Transit Buses)

Medium (MDV) and Heavy Duty (HDV) vehicle are considered as Class 2b – 8 vehicles with GVWR greater than 8,500 lbs. MDVs are considered Class 2-7 vehicles with GVWR between 8,501 – 33,000 lbs. Body styles for MDVs include pickup truck, cargo van, passenger van, step van, box truck, cab & chassis, and cutaway were considered. The technology types evaluated for each body style consisted of BEV, PHEV, FCEV, and NGV. HDVs are considered Class 8 trucks that weigh over 33,000 lbs. Body styles that were considered for HDVs include straight truck, semi-tractor, and refuse vehicles, with technology types including BEVs, PHEVs, FCEVs, and NGVs. Although many buses are also HDVs, these were evaluated in the bus category. Product descriptions are listed below in Table 11

Table 11. MDV & HDV product descriptions by body style.

Vehicle Type	Body Type	Description
Medium Duty Vehicles	Medium Duty Pickup Truck	A medium duty pickup truck is a type of medium-duty truck with an open cargo bed at the rear designed to carry both passengers and cargo. It typically has a separate cabin for passengers and a rear bed for hauling goods or materials.
	Cargo Van	A cargo van is a commercial vehicle primarily designed for transporting goods or cargo. It typically features a closed cargo area without rear passenger seating, offering ample space for loading and transporting goods securely.
	Passenger Van	A passenger van, also known as a passenger minivan, is a vehicle designed to transport multiple passengers. It typically has several rows of seating, accommodating a higher number of passengers compared to standard cars, and may include additional features for passenger comfort.
	Step Van	A step van, also referred to as a walk-in delivery van, is a vehicle primarily used for delivery or mobile service purposes. It usually has a tall and boxy body design, allowing drivers to easily step in and out of the vehicle, often without the need to climb up or down.
	Box Truck	A box truck, also known as a cube truck or box van, is a medium-duty commercial truck characterized by a fully enclosed cargo area. It typically has a separate cabin for the driver and a rectangular-shaped cargo area with a rigid and enclosed box structure, providing secure storage and transportation for various goods or materials.
	Cab & Chassis	Cab & Chassis refers to a vehicle configuration where the manufacturer provides only the cab and the chassis frame, without any additional cargo area or specialized body. This configuration allows for customization by adding different types of bodies or equipment according to specific needs, such as a flatbed, dump bed, or utility body.
Heavy Duty Vehicles	Straight Truck	A straight truck, also known as a box truck or straight-bodied truck, is a class 8 vehicle consisting of a single rigid frame. It typically has a cab for the driver and a cargo area directly behind it. The cargo area is usually enclosed and designed to transport goods or materials securely. Straight trucks are commonly used for local deliveries or as moving trucks.
	Semi-Tractor	A semi-tractor, also known as a semi-truck or tractor-trailer, is a class 8 truck designed to tow semi-trailers. It consists of a powerful engine, a large cab for the driver, and a fifth wheel coupling at the rear to attach and tow trailers. Semi-tractors are commonly used for long-haul transportation of goods over significant distances.
	Refuse Trucks	Refuse vehicles, also known as garbage trucks or waste collection vehicles, are class 8 vehicles specifically designed for collecting and transporting solid waste or refuse. They are equipped with mechanisms for loading and compacting garbage, such as front loaders, rear loaders, or side loaders. Refuse vehicles play a crucial role in waste management systems, ensuring the efficient collection and disposal of waste materials.

Existing Conditions


Zero-Emission Vehicles. According to the CALSTART’s Zero Emission Technology Inventory⁷¹, there are currently 134 models of zero emission MHDVs available in North American market of which 9 of them are FCEVs and the rest are BEVs. The adoption of MHDVs in SCAG region is still in its early stages. Currently, there are only 178 MHDVs (58 heavy duty and 120 medium duty vehicles) in the region, indicating that the use of MHDVs powered by zero-emission technology is not yet widespread. Moreover, the concentration of MHDVs is not evenly distributed across SCAG region. The majority of these vehicles are concentrated in Los Angeles and Orange counties, which are two of the most densely populated and heavily trafficked areas in the region. This concentration of MHD ZEVs in certain areas may be due to the availability of charging infrastructure as well as operational and logistical considerations that make it more financially viable for businesses to adopt MHD ZEVs. San Bernardino and Riverside counties have a few MHD ZEVs, and Imperial County currently does not have any, many commercial vehicles travel throughout the region, so it is possible that some of the existing trucks are operating in these areas.



Ford E-Transit Medium-duty battery electric cargo vans such as this vehicle run solely on a rechargeable battery. MDVs are class 2b vehicles weighing between 8,501- and 10,000 lbs.

The types of MHD ZEVs currently being used in SCAG region are mainly tractor trucks, terminal tractor, and step vans. Tractor trucks, also known as semi-trucks, are primarily used for hauling large quantities of goods by attaching various types of trailers. Terminal tractors, also known as yard trucks, are primarily used in ports, warehouses, and freight terminals for the purpose of quickly moving trailers and containers short distances within these confined areas. Step vans are also typically used for deliveries in urban areas due to their ease of entry and exit, ample cargo space, and maneuverability in tight spaces.

Figure 7. Number of Medium- and Heavy-Duty ZEVs by Vehicle Type and County⁷²



⁷¹ <https://globaldrivetozero.org/tools/zeti-data-explorer/>

⁷² <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/zero-emission-vehicle-and-infrastructure-statistics/medium-and-heavy> (Accessed: July 7, 2023)

Two influential pilots project in the region were the Joint Electric Truck Scaling Initiative (JETSI) and Volvo Lights (Low Impact Green Heavy Transport Solutions) demonstration project. The Volvo Lights demonstration project was launched in 2019 to demonstrate the viability of battery-electric heavy-duty trucks for goods movement. The project was a collaboration between Volvo Trucks North America, the South Coast AQMD, and industry partners to showcase zero-emission freight transportation in the greater Los Angeles region. The demonstration project involved the deployment of 30 Class 8 trucks to several operators in the region for a one-year trial period. The trucks were used to transport a variety of goods, including groceries, clothing, and other consumer products. The goal of the project was to collect data on the performance of battery electric trucks (BETs) in real-world conditions and to evaluate their potential to reduce emissions, noise pollution, and operating costs compared to traditional diesel-powered trucks. The results of the demonstration project will help to inform future efforts to transition the goods movement sector to ZEVs.⁷³ Another demonstration project showcasing the viability heavy-duty ZEVs was the demonstration of a heavy-duty fuel cell electric trucks (FCET). This project, with funding through the California Climate Investments fund, showed that users tended to prefer the ZEV options, stating that they tended to make less noise and commented on the impressive performance. The next demonstration program, JETSI is a collaboration between CARB, the CEC, and several private companies to accelerate the deployment of BETs for goods movement in California. JETSI aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality by evaluating the performance of battery-electric Class 8 trucks in real-world conditions. The project involves the deployment of 100 BETs and 50 175/350 kW charges to two operators (NFI & Schneider) in the region for a one-year trial period.

There has been a fair amount of movement, especially in the parcel delivery sector, on the medium-duty side. UPS is set to begin adopting electric delivery vans through a partnership with Arrival. Production near UPS's headquarters in Charlotte, North Carolina, is slated to begin in 2023.⁷⁴ Amazon, in partnership with Rivian, has already deployed 1,000 electric vans across more than a dozen U.S. cities as of 2022, with plans to further increase the percent of electric vans across their fleet.⁷⁵

Natural Gas Vehicles. The use of NGVs, which tend to use compressed or renewable natural gas (CNG/RNG), continue to increase in the MHDV sector as these vehicles tend to be a cost-effective alternative to diesel trucks, as natural gas is typically less expensive and more stable in price compared to diesel. Also, as described earlier, in 2020 CARB has established strict emissions regulations for on-road HDVs, including CNG trucks. CARB's latest regulation, known as the HD Omnibus Regulation, requires all new heavy-duty engines sold in California to meet the low-NOx standard of 0.02 grams per brake horsepower-hour (g/bhp-hr) by 2027.⁷⁶ This standard is 90% lower than the current NOx standards for heavy-duty engines and is among the most stringent in the country. As a result of these regulations, many CNG truck manufacturers are introducing low-NOx engines to meet the new standards.

CNG trucks with low-NOx engines are a promising technology for reducing emissions from HDVs. By using RNG instead of diesel fuel, these trucks emit significantly less GHGs compared to diesel trucks. Moreover, when combined with low-NOx engine technology, CNG trucks can further reduce NOx emissions, which is a major contributor to smog and local health problems. It is important to note that CNG trucks are not ZEVs and still produce some emissions during operation. For this reason, it is important to continue to invest in research and development of cleaner technologies,

⁷³ <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/cti-volvo-low-impact-green-heavy-transport-solutions-lights-project>


⁷⁴ <https://www.autoweek.com/news/green-cars/a40880333/arrival-ups-ev-van-production/>

⁷⁵ <https://insideevs.com/news/620418/amazon-now-has-1000-rivian-electric-vans-making-deliveries-in-us/>

⁷⁶ <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/heavy-duty-low-nox-rule>

including ZEV such as battery-electric and fuel cell vehicles. As of 2018, all new model year CNG trucks are equipped with low-NOx engines. According to recent data from CARB’s EMFAC model, there are a total of 2,240 CNG low-NOx trucks in the region as shown in Figure 8.

Figure 8. Number of CNG Medium- and Heavy-Duty Vehicles in SCAG Region in 2020



Source: <https://arb.ca.gov/emfac/emissions-inventory/ea6d4c86fa75e3fe97260461ffb31426088f5210>

Environmental Impacts

MDVs. Table 12, Figure 9, and Figure 10 show GHG and criteria emissions reductions for all MDV body styles and technology types. Consistently, BEVs reduce more GHG emissions than any of the other technology types relative to combustion engines. NOx and PM exhaust emissions are reduced by 100% with a BEV and a FCEV, while PHEVs and NGVs don’t eliminate these emissions, but rather reduce them by 40-90%.

Table 12. Environmental impacts of MDVs by body style and technology type.

Medium Duty Vehicle by Body Style	Technology Type	GHG Emissions Reduction (Metric Ton per Year) ⁷⁷	NOx Emissions Reductions	Exhaust PM Emissions Reductions	Brakewear PM Emissions Reductions
Medium Duty Pickup Truck	BEV	18.38	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	11.03	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	12.03	100%	100%	50%
Cargo Van	BEV	26.88	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	16.13	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	17.60	100%	100%	50%
Passenger Van	BEV	20.60	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	12.36	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	13.49	100%	100%	50%
Step Van	BEV	32.51	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	19.50	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	13.50	100%	100%	50%
	NGV	29.79	90%	84%	0%
Box Truck	BEV	51.08	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	30.65	40%	40%	50%

⁷⁷ For FCEVs, the project team assumes that hydrogen is produced through Steam Methane Reforming (SMR) using fossil natural gas, which is currently the most common method for hydrogen production nationwide. However, the project team also explored other options. For information about GHG emissions reductions from hydrogen produced using other feedstocks, please refer to Appendix B.

Medium Duty Vehicle by Body Style	Technology Type	GHG Emissions Reduction (Metric Ton per Year) ⁷⁷	NOx Emissions Reductions	Exhaust PM Emissions Reductions	Brakewear PM Emissions Reductions
	FCEV	21.21	100%	100%	50%
	NGV	46.82	90%	84%	0%
Cab & Chassis	BEV	58.62	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	35.17	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	24.34	100%	100%	50%
	NGV	53.73	90%	84%	0%

Figure 9. GHG emissions (well to wheel) reductions (metric tons of CO2 per year) of MDVs by body style and technology type.





Figure 10. Percentage of NOx emissions reductions, and exhaust PM emissions reductions by body style and technology type.




HDVs. Table 13, Figure 11, and Figure 12 illustrate the emissions reductions of both GHG (well to wheel) as well as the criteria pollutants for HDVs of various body types and technologies. Keeping consistent with other vehicle categories, BEVs tended to reduce more GHG emissions than the other technology types relative to the combustion engine alternative. NOx and PM exhaust emissions are reduced by 100% with a BEV and a FCEV, while PHEVs and NGVs don't eliminate these emissions, but rather reduce them by 40-90%.

Table 13. Environmental impacts of HDVs by body style and technology type.


Heavy Duty Vehicle by Body Style (excluding transit)	Technology Type	GHG Emissions Reduction (Metric Ton per Year) ⁷⁸	NOx Emissions Reductions	Exhaust PM Emissions Reductions	Brakewear PM Emissions Reductions
Straight Truck	BEV	51.08	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	30.65	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	21.21	100%	100%	50%
	NGV	46.82	90%	84%	0%
Semi-Tractor	BEV	148.34	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	89.00	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	61.60	100%	100%	50%
	NGV	135.96	90%	84%	0%
Refuse Vehicles	BEV	192.79	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	115.68	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	80.06	100%	100%	50%
	NGV	176.71	90%	84%	0%

Figure 11. GHG emissions (well to wheel) reductions (metric tons of CO2 per year) of HDVs by body style and technology type.



⁷⁸ For FCEVs, the project team assumes that hydrogen is produced through Steam Methane Reforming (SMR) using fossil natural gas, which is currently the most common method for hydrogen production nationwide. However, the project team also explored other options. For information about GHG emissions reductions from hydrogen produced using other feedstocks, please refer to Appendix B.

Figure 12. Percentage of NOx emissions reductions, and exhaust PM emissions reductions by body style and technology type.



Performance & Commercialization

MDVs. Table 14 presents the technology characteristics for MDVs, highlighting various specifications including the range, TCO, adoption status, availability, and longevity. Similar to light-duty vehicles, the number of models presented Table 14 encompasses a variety of options with different battery capacities and trims. For example, Class 6 Peterbilt 220EV comes in two different battery capacities of 141 and 282 kWh and therefore, this specific model is counted twice for the purpose of demonstrating the availability of box trucks.

- With respect to medium duty vehicles, BEVs are the only technology type adopted in California thus far and offer a diverse range of models across various body styles.
- PHEVs, when available for a specific body style, provide the highest range on a single fill-up.
- Despite higher initial costs, BEVs demonstrate greater cost-effectiveness over 15-year time compared to combustion engine vehicles when total cost of ownership (TCO) is considered.

Table 14. Technology characteristics of MDVs by body style and technology type.

Medium Duty Vehicle by Body Style	Technology Type	Range	Capital Cost	TCO Savings	Adoption Status	Availability	Longevity
Medium Duty Pickup Truck	BEV	110 - 500 miles	\$93,000	\$42,832	0	5-10 models	3-10 years
	PHEV	500 miles	\$67,000	\$42,105	0	10-20 models	8-10 years
	FCEV	250 miles	\$93,000	(\$103,434)	0	< 5 models	3-10 years
	NGV	650 miles	\$50,000	\$63,853	NI	< 5 models	1-5 years
Cargo Van	BEV	110 - 200 miles	\$68,000	\$94,675	52	5 - 10 models	3-15 years
	PHEV						
	FCEV	125 - 400 miles	\$58,000 ⁷⁹	(\$35,498)	0	< 5 models	NI
	NGV	250 - 400 miles	\$49,000	\$88,089	NI	< 5 models	1-5 years
Passenger Van	BEV	110 - 200 miles	\$55,000	\$74,943	0	< 5 models	3-15 years
	PHEV						
	FCEV	125 - 250 miles	\$58,000 ⁸⁰	(\$88,976)	0	< 5 models	NI
	NGV						
Step Van	BEV	250 - 80 miles	\$150,000	\$12,928	33	10-20 models	8-10 years
	PHEV						
	FCEV	250 miles	\$150,000	(\$201,769)	0	< 5 models	5-10 years
	NGV	NI	\$110,000	\$19,357	NI	< 5 models	1-5 years
Box Truck	BEV	66 - 230 miles	\$185,000	\$36,221	10	10 - 20 models	8 years
	PHEV						
	FCEV						
	NGV	NI	\$115,000	\$73,630	NI	< 5 models	1-6 years
Cab & Chassis	BEV	130 miles	\$100,000	\$212,751	13	< 5 models	8-10 years
	PHEV	NI	\$72,000	\$185,416	0	< 5 models	5-10 years
	FCEV	NI	\$100,000	(\$238,236)	0	< 5 models	1-10 years
	NGV	NI	\$69,000	\$214,893	NI	< 5 models	3-6 years

NI indicates "no information" or a knowledge gap

Blank indicates not commercially available

H DVs. Table 15 provides detailed information pertaining to the commercialization and characteristics of Zero- and Near-Zero Emission HDVs. Notably, PHEVs are currently not available in the market for any of the body styles. With significant advancements in battery electric technology, it is increasingly plausible that manufacturers are prioritizing the development and production of BEVs over PHEVs. One possible reason behind this shift is to avoid the complexity and additional components associated with integrating two separate powertrains, namely an electric motor and an internal combustion engine, within the same vehicle. By focusing on BEVs, manufacturers can streamline the design and engineering process, optimizing the vehicle for electric propulsion and maximizing the benefits of a single powertrain solution. With respect to vehicle ranges, FCEVs offer significantly higher mileage range than those of BEVs, with FCEVs capable of reaching up to 800 miles, compared to BEVs with a range of up to 500 miles. In terms of TCO, NGVs consistently exhibited the lowest costs across each body style, followed by BEVs and FCEVs mainly due to the much lower capital cost of the vehicle. Among the technology types, BEVs and NGVs are the only ones currently adopted in California, with BEVs showcasing the highest variety of available models. Similar to the other two vehicle categories, it is important to note that the number of models presented in Table 15 encompasses a variety of options

⁷⁹ Price assumed the same as BEV Cargo Van.

⁸⁰ Price assumed the same as BEV Passenger Van.

with different battery capacities and trims. For example, Volvo VNR Electric comes in two different trims and therefore, this specific model is counted three times for the purpose of demonstrating the availability of Semi-Tractors.

Table 15. Technology characteristics of HDVs by body style and technology type.

Heavy Duty Vehicle by Body Style (excluding transit)	Technology Type	Range	Capital Cost	TCO Savings	Adoption Status	Availability	Longevity
Straight Truck	BEV	230 - 100 miles	\$185,000	\$36,221	16	5 - 10 models	2-8 years
	PHEV						
	FCEV	150 - 800 miles	\$185,000	(\$301,144)	0	< 5 models	1 year
	NGV	NI	\$115,000	\$73,630	2,531	< 5 models	5-10 years
Semi-Tractor	BEV	500 - 150 miles	\$480,000	(\$453,162)	68	5 - 10 models	5-8 years
	PHEV						
	FCEV	150 - 800 miles	\$360,000	(\$2,361,345)	0	< 5 models	1-3 years
	NGV	NI	\$170,000	\$340,705	696	< 5 models	1-5 years
Refuse Vehicles	BEV	170 - 56 miles	\$500,000	\$844,039	0	5 - 10 models	5-8 years
	PHEV						
	FCEV						
	NGV	NI	\$335,000	\$321,411	5,159	< 5 models	1-8 years

NI indicates "no information" or a knowledge gap

Blank indicates not commercially available

4.1.3 Buses

Buses can be Class 4 or greater vehicles, weighing 14,001 lbs. or more. Body styles within the bus category include single deck bus, double deck bus, articulated bus, school bus, shuttle bus, and cutaway. Technology types for each body style include BEVs, PHEVs, FCEVs, and NGVs. More detailed product of each body style and associated technology type is displayed in Table 16.

Table 16. Bus product descriptions by body style and technology type.


Vehicle Type	Description
Single Deck Bus	A single deck bus is a type of bus with only one level or floor for passenger seating. It typically has a single entrance and exit, with a uniform seating arrangement on the same level throughout the bus.
Double Decker Bus	A double-decker bus is a bus with two levels or floors for passenger seating. The upper level is accessed via stairs located at the rear or front of the bus. Double-decker buses provide increased seating capacity and are often used in urban areas or for tourist transportation.
Articulated Bus	An articulated bus, also known as a bendy bus or articulated coach, is a bus with a joint or flexible section that allows the vehicle to bend in the middle. This design enables better maneuverability and increased passenger capacity. Articulated buses are commonly used in urban transit systems.
School Bus	A school bus is a bus specifically designed to transport students to and from educational institutions. It usually has specific safety features such as high seat backs, flashing lights, and a distinctive yellow color. School buses adhere to specific regulations and guidelines to ensure the safety of students during transportation.
Shuttle Buses	Shuttle buses are small to mid-sized buses used for short-distance transportation, typically within a specific area or between designated locations. They are often used for airport transfers, hotel shuttles, or corporate transportation services.
Cutaway	A cutaway, also known as a cutaway van chassis, refers to a vehicle configuration where the manufacturer provides a cab and chassis with the rear portion of the vehicle left unfinished. It allows for customization by adding different types of bodies or structures, such as shuttle bus bodies, motorhomes, or delivery vans, according to specific needs.

Existing Condition

Buses make up the largest number of heavy-duty ZEVs in SCAG region. The three types of zero emission buses (ZEB) in the region are transit, school, and coach buses, with transit buses having the greatest number, followed by school buses and then coach buses. According to the CALSTART’s Zero Emission Technology Inventory⁸¹, there are currently more than 25 models of zero emission transit buses (of which 23 are BEBs and 2 are FCEBs), 17 models of zero emission school buses (all being BEB), and 10 models of coach buses (9 being BEB and 1 being FCEB) available in the North American market. Within SCAG region, Los Angeles County has the highest number of ZEBs, followed by Orange County. San Bernardino and Riverside counties each have a similar number of ZEBs. Imperial County, which is the least populous county in the region, currently only has three school buses that are ZEB. The growing number of ZEBs in SCAG region reflects the increasing focus on transitioning to a low-carbon transit/school bus system.

⁸¹ <https://globaldrivetozero.org/tools/zeti-data-explorer/>


Figure 13. Number of Zero Emission Transit and Coach Buses by County⁸²



When looking at the number of ZE transit vehicles by operator in SCAG region, LA Metro and the Antelope Valley Transit Authority have the largest fleets, with the latter having the most ZE transit vehicles in the region. The Anaheim Transportation Network, City of Los Angeles, and Foothill Transit also have a considerable number of ZE transit vehicles, although to a lesser extent. Other operators in the region have a much smaller number of ZEBs or none at all (Figure 14).

⁸² <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/zero-emission-vehicle-and-infrastructure-statistics/medium-and-heavy> (Last accessed: July 7, 2023)


Figure 14. ZEV Transit Numbers by Operator⁸³



When considering the number of ZE school buses in SCAG region by school district, there are a variety of districts that have taken steps to adopt this low-carbon transportation option. Some districts have embraced ZEBs more than others, with a handful having a relatively large number of buses in their fleets. Figure 15 shows the progress by school district, with the maximum number of ZEBs per school district being 10.

⁸³ <https://www.transit.dot.gov/ntd/data-product/2021-data-tables> (Accessed February 2023)

Figure 15. Number of CEC Funded ZE School Buses by School District⁸⁴



As described earlier, the California ICT regulation is a statewide initiative aimed at reducing emissions from public transit buses. The regulation requires all transit agencies to transition to 100% zero-emission bus fleets by 2040, with interim targets along the way. The ICT regulation has had a significant impact on the adoption of ZEBs in Southern California. Many transit agencies in the region, including the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) and the Orange County Transportation Authority, have already begun transitioning to ZEBs with the goal of meeting the ICT targets ahead of schedule. For example, in 2021, Metro has completed its transition to an all-electric bus fleet on the Metro G (Orange) Line⁸⁵, replacing its CNG buses with 40 new ZEBs manufactured by New Flyer. The electric buses have a 150-mile range on a single charge and are equipped with rapid en-route chargers installed at stations along the 18-mile corridor. Metro plans to transition to a 100% ZEB fleet by 2030. Also in 2020, OCTA approved the purchase of 10 plug-in battery-electric buses from New Flyer of America for \$10.4 million.⁸⁶ The move was part of OCTA's plan to convert its fleet to 100% zero-emission technology by 2040, with the pilot program designed to test the buses' performance on Orange County streets. OCTA is also testing hydrogen fuel-cell electric buses to determine which technology, or mix of technologies, works best for its needs. Five of the test buses will run on a new route, with the other five operating throughout Orange County. Additionally, in 2021, the OCTA board has approved a contract with One Source Distributors for 10 battery chargers, which will be used to support testing plug-in battery-electric buses on Orange County streets⁸⁷. The contract, which costs approximately \$863,000, includes training for those who will operate and maintain the equipment. The cost of the chargers will be covered by the state's Low Carbon Transit Operations Program. In partnership with Southern California Edison, OCTA will provide necessary electrical

⁸⁴ <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/zero-emission-vehicle-and-infrastructure-statistics/cec-funded-school> (Accessed July 7, 2023)

⁸⁵ <https://www.metro.net/about/i-a-metro-now-running-all-zero-emission-electric-buses-on-the-g-orange-line-in-the-san-fernando-valley/>

⁸⁶ <https://www.octabonds.com/orange-county-transportation-authority-ca/about/news/i4719?newsId=21266>

⁸⁷ <https://www.octabonds.com/orange-county-transportation-authority-ca/about/news/i4719?newsId=24108>

infrastructure at the bus operations base in Garden Grove to support charging of the plug-in battery-electric buses. OCTA plans to move to 100 percent zero-emission technology by 2040, and both pilot programs testing plug-in electric and hydrogen fuel-cell electric buses will help determine which technology will work best for Orange County moving forward.

Environmental Impact

Table 17, Figure 16, and Figure 17 illustrate the emissions reductions of both GHG (well to wheel) as well as the criteria pollutants for buses of various body type and technologies. BEVs (closely followed up by NGVs) tended to lead other technology types in terms of GHG emissions reductions relative to the combustion engine alternative. NOx and PM exhaust emissions are reduced by 100% with a BEV and a FCEV, while PHEVs and NGVs don't eliminate these emissions, but rather reduce them by 40-90%. Brakewear emissions reductions are around 50% across all body styles and technology types. Table 17 provides detailed assessment of GHG (well to wheel) and criteria pollutant impacts of various bus body types and technologies.

Table 17. Environmental impacts

Bus by Body Style	Technology Type	GHG Emissions Reduction (Metric Ton per Year) ⁸⁸	NOx Emissions Reductions	Exhaust PM Emissions Reductions	Brakewear PM Emissions Reductions
Single Deck Bus	BEV	145.88	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	87.53	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	60.58	100%	100%	50%
	NGV	133.71	90%	84%	0%
Double Decker Bus	BEV	145.88	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	87.53	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	60.58	100%	100%	50%
	NGV	133.71	90%	84%	0%
Articulated Bus	BEV	145.88	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	87.53	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	60.58	100%	100%	50%
	NGV	133.71	90%	84%	0%
School Bus	BEV	26.09	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	15.66	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	10.84	100%	100%	50%
	NGV	23.91	90%	84%	0%
Shuttle Buses	BEV	46.34	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	27.81	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	19.25	100%	100%	50%
	NGV	42.48	90%	84%	0%
Cutaway	BEV	46.34	100%	100%	50%
	PHEV	27.81	40%	40%	50%
	FCEV	19.25	100%	100%	50%
	NGV	42.48	90%	84%	0%

⁸⁸ For FCEVs, the project team assumes that hydrogen is produced through Steam Methane Reforming (SMR) using fossil natural gas, which is currently the most common method for hydrogen production nationwide. However, the project team also explored other options. For information about GHG emissions reductions from hydrogen produced using other feedstocks, please refer to Appendix B.

Figure 16. GHG emissions (well to wheel) reductions (metric tons of CO2 per year) of buses by body style and technology type.





Figure 17. Percentage of NOx emissions reductions, and exhaust PM emissions reductions by body style and technology type.



Performance & Commercialization

BEV and NGV buses are the most consistently available models across all body styles, while PHEVs were unavailable, and the availability of FCEVs are limited to certain types of buses. Currently, BEV and NGV buses are the most widely adopted technology types. They also have a TCO that is lower than FCEVs. FCEV and NGV buses tend to have a longer range than BEVs. Table 18 displays detailed data relevant to commercialization and specific technology characteristics for buses.

Table 18. Technology characteristics of buses by body style and technology type

Bus by Body Style	Technology Type	Range	Capital Cost	TCO Savings	Adoption Status ⁸⁹	Availability	Longevity
Single Deck Bus	BEV	120 - 330 miles	\$900,000	\$273,256	315 ⁹⁰	10 - 20 models	1-5 years
	PHEV						
	FCEV	250 - 350 miles	\$1,125,000	(\$2,022,397)	677 ³	< 5 models	1-5 years
	NGV	350 miles	\$540,000	\$308,790	5,756	10-20 models	1-5 years
Double Decker Bus	BEV	200 miles	\$1,050,000	\$90,884	NI	< 5 models	8-12 years
	PHEV						
	FCEV						
	NGV						
Articulated Bus	BEV	150 - 220 miles	\$1,050,000	\$90,884	NI	< 5 models	12 years
	PHEV						
	FCEV	350 miles	\$1,050,000	(\$2,022,397)	NI	< 5 models	NI
	NGV	400 miles	\$540,000	\$308,790	NI	< 5 models	1-3 years
School Bus	BEV	70 - 180 miles	\$300,000	(\$45,852)	152	10-20 models	1-5 years
	PHEV						
	FCEV						
	NGV	140 miles	\$649,822	\$29,048	2,786	< 5 models	2-8 years
Shuttle Buses	BEV	70 - 160 miles	\$265,000	\$143,126	76	< 5 models	1-5 years
	PHEV						
	FCEV	120 - 200 miles	\$265,000	(\$401,421)	0	< 5 models	5-8 years
	NGV	NI	\$90,000	\$84,483	0	< 5 models	1-5 years
Cutaway	BEV	NI	\$265,000	\$143,126	12	< 5 models	5-10 years
	PHEV						
	FCEV						
	NGV	NI	\$90,000	\$84,483	NI	< 5 models	5-10 years

NI indicates "no information" or a knowledge gap

Blank indicates not commercially available

⁸⁹ <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/zero-emission-vehicle-and-infrastructure-statistics/medium-and-heavy> (Last accessed: July 7, 2023)

⁹⁰ Since adoption data (i.e., vehicle stock) for transit buses was not available for single deck versus articulated or double deck, the project team lumped all transit buses into single deck. The coach buses are also included in the single deck buses.

4.1.4 Rail

The rail category evaluates freight and passenger rail locomotives that have historically been running on diesel. Product descriptions for this category are provided in Table 19. Technology types include BEV, FCEV, and NGV. Please note that emissions reductions data and market data were not as readily available as for the other vehicle categories.

Table 19. Rail product descriptions by body style.

Vehicle Type	Description
Passenger Locomotive	A passenger locomotive, also known as a passenger train engine or passenger train locomotive, is a powerful rail vehicle specifically designed for pulling passenger trains. It provides the necessary traction and power to haul passenger cars, ensuring safe and efficient transportation of passengers over long distances or within urban transit systems.
Freight Locomotive	A freight locomotive, also known as a freight train engine or freight train locomotive, is a type of locomotive designed for hauling freight or cargo trains. It is typically optimized for pulling heavy loads and is commonly used in the transportation of goods, materials, or containers over long distances or for industrial purposes.
Switchers	Switchers, also referred to as shunting locomotives or switcher locomotives, are specialized locomotives used primarily for maneuvering or shunting railcars within a railway yard or industrial facility. They are designed to handle low-speed operations, including coupling and uncoupling of railcars, sorting, and assembling trains in a rail yard.

Existing Condition

Adoption of zero-emission technologies in the rail sector is still in its early stages; however, these technologies are relatively mature and have been deployed elsewhere—particularly outside of North America, such as many European and Asian countries—but not yet in SCAG region. Due to the predictable nature of passenger locomotive operations in terms of routes and schedules, there is a potential opportunity to employ battery-electric technology for shorter routes that allow for convenient charging. Alternatively, fuel cell technology offers more flexibility for passenger rail agencies, enabling them to operate longer routes with faster and less frequent refueling. As advancements in zero-emission switch locomotives have shown promise, it is estimated that commercially available zero-emission passenger locomotives will be developed by 2030, building upon these technological successes. Currently, a number of agencies have plans to implement these technologies over the coming decade. For example, Metrolink, which serves five of the six counties (all but Imperial County) outlines in its Climate Action Plan that it plans to develop and implement the necessary steps to achieve widespread electrification across its rail fleet fully by 2028. This process will occur in stages, with the Antelope Valley Line expected to be fully electrified by 2025. The plan notes that this will be accomplished by replacing diesel locomotives with electric locomotives. Additional steps described in the plan include the expansion of on-board energy storage systems that can capture and reuse regenerative braking energy. For lines where electrification is not feasible in the short term the plan lays out a program to replace or retrofit



older locomotives with more energy efficient models that meet the latest emissions standards.⁹¹ In San Bernardino County, the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA) has laid out plans to debut its first battery electric and hydrogen locomotives in 2024. The project will be funded by the California Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program and expected to begin testing in late 2023.⁹² In another project, BNSF Railway will repower a diesel line-haul locomotive with a zero-emission battery-powered locomotive through funding provided by the SCAQMD and the U.S. EPA. The battery-electric locomotive will feature six axles, 8 MWh battery storage capacity, and will operate on a 240-mile route between Los Angeles and Barstow, reducing diesel emissions in disadvantaged communities along the route.⁹³ At the state level, the California Department of Transportation has set a statewide goal of achieving a fully zero-emission intercity rail by 2035.⁹⁴

In addition to these initiatives, the California High-Speed Rail (CA HSR) project⁹⁵ will connect major urban centers in California, from San Francisco to Los Angeles and eventually extending to Sacramento and San Diego, using all-electric trains. Once completed, it will significantly reduce travel times between these cities and serve as a more sustainable transportation alternative to driving or flying. According to CA HSR, this rail will run on electricity supplied entirely from renewable sources.⁹⁶ In addition to CA HSR, Brightline West⁹⁷ is another anticipated high-speed rail service to connect Southern California with Las Vegas, Nevada. This project will offer a much-needed alternative to the heavily trafficked I-15 corridor, providing faster and more efficient travel options for tourists and business travelers alike. Just like the CA HSR, the Brightline West will be operating all-electric, high-speed trains.

Furthermore, the CARB adopted the In-Use Locomotive Regulation in April 2023, mandating that passenger locomotives manufactured in 2030 and onwards must operate in a zero-emission configuration within California. While this regulation sets a strong policy framework, adequate infrastructure and technology demonstrations are essential to expedite the adoption of zero-emission solutions in the passenger rail system within the Southern California region covered by SCAG.

Environmental Impacts

Three types of technologies are evaluated for the rail: BEV, Diesel Electric, FCEV, and NGVs. Table 20 demonstrates the GHG (well to wheel) as well as criteria pollutant reduction associated with these technologies. Due to the high annual activity of passenger rails per unit in California, they typically offer significantly higher GHG emissions benefits as compared to freight locomotive and switcher. For example, according to CARB⁹⁸, an average passenger locomotive in California has an annual activity of approximately 1,828 MWhr, whereas a Class I line haul locomotive only has an annual activity of 351 MWhr within the state. This disparity does not imply that passenger locomotives consume more energy in California; rather, it indicates that passenger locomotives primarily operate within the state. In contrast, line haul locomotives are utilized for long-distance transportation, traversing across the country and therefore their fraction of their activity in California is much less than passenger locomotives.

⁹¹ <https://metrolinktrains.com/globalassets/about/agency/sustainability/climate-action-plan.pdf>

⁹² <https://www.gosbcta.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/ZEMU-Technology-Fact-Sheet-ENG-120522.pdf>

⁹³ <https://www.aqmd.gov/home/research/pubs-docs-reports/newsletters/august-september-2022/zero-emission-locomotive>

⁹⁴ <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-10/Day%201%20Ext%205%20Caltrans%2020201026.pdf>

⁹⁵ <https://hsr.ca.gov/about/>

⁹⁶ <https://hsr.ca.gov/communications-outreach/info-center/get-the-facts/>


⁹⁷ <https://www.brightlinewest.com/>

⁹⁸ <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/barcu/regact/2022/locomotive22/appg.pdf>

Table 20. Environmental impacts of rail.

Locomotive by Type	Technology Type	GHG Emissions Reduction (Metric Ton per Year) ⁹⁹	NOx Emissions Reductions	PM Emissions Reductions
Passenger Locomotive	BEV	1565.73	100%	100%
	FCEV	650.19	100%	100%
Freight Locomotive	BEV	300.95	100%	100%
	FCEV	124.97	100%	100%
Switchers	BEV	391.41	100%	100%
	FCEV	162.54	100%	100%

Figure 18. GHG emissions (well to wheel) reductions (metric tons of CO2 per year) of locomotives by passenger or freight use and by technology type.



With respect to criteria pollutant reductions, it is assumed that BEV and FCEV will offer 100% reduction in NOx and PM emissions. Considering that there are yet no NGV locomotives being deployed in North America, the emission reductions associated with these locomotives is not fully understood and therefore excluded from this analysis. According to Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), the railroad industry is actively investigating the viability of using liquefied natural gas (LNG) and compressed natural gas (CNG) as alternative or supplementary fuels for locomotives¹⁰⁰.

Performance & Commercialization

As mentioned earlier, currently, commercially available zero- and near-zero emission locomotives are still limited, with some technologies only deployed as prototypes or within demonstration projects. As illustrated in Table 21, the initial purchase cost of locomotives varies depending on the technology type and vehicle category. For passenger locomotives, BEVs have an initial purchase cost ranging from \$10 to \$12 million while FCEVs cost \$4.25 million. For freight locomotives, BEVs have an initial purchase cost ranging from \$4.5 to \$8 million, while FCEVs cost \$10 million to \$16 million. In the case of switchers, BEVs have an initial purchase cost ranging from \$3 – 5 million, while FCEVs

⁹⁹ For FCEVs, the project team assumes that hydrogen is produced through Steam Methane Reforming (SMR) using fossil natural gas, which is currently the most common method for hydrogen production nationwide. However, the project team also explored other options. For information about GHG emissions reductions from hydrogen produced using other feedstocks, please refer to Appendix B.
¹⁰⁰ https://railroads.dot.gov/sites/fra.dot.gov/files/fra_net/18511/Liquid%20and%20Compressed%20Natural%20Gas%20and%20Locomotive%20Fuels%20brochure.pdf

cost between \$2.75 – 3 million. According to the TCO analysis conducted by the project team, it has been observed that the TCO for BEV and FCEV rail technologies exhibit a higher cost profile when compared to their diesel counterparts. Specifically, the findings reveal that the TCO for both BEV and FCEV technologies ranges from \$1 million to \$13 million more than the TCO for equivalent diesel rail technologies. The significantly higher TCO observed for FCEV rail technologies appears to be primarily driven by the high cost of hydrogen fuel. When compared to diesel, hydrogen prices are currently substantially higher, thereby inflating the overall cost profile for FCEVs. This factor is a critical consideration in the economic assessment of FCEVs, presenting a formidable challenge to their wider adoption. As the market for hydrogen and related technologies evolves, it will be important to monitor whether these cost dynamics shift in favor of FCEVs. For now, however, the elevated price of hydrogen remains a key contributor to the increased TCO for FCEV rail technologies.

Table 21. Technology characteristics of rail

Vehicle by Type	Technology Type	Initial Purchase Cost ¹⁰¹	Fuel Cost	Annual Maintenance Cost	TCO Saving	Availability	Longevity
Passenger Locomotive	BEV	\$10,000,000 - \$12,000,000	\$0.27 / kWh	\$71,100	(\$4,511,929)	<5 models	NI
	FCEV	\$4,250,000	\$17.11 / kg	\$79,000	(\$11,113,036)	< 5 models	NI
Freight Locomotive	BEV	\$4,500,000 - \$8,000,000	\$0.27 / kWh	\$71,100	(\$3,257,642)	< 5 models	NI
	FCEV	\$10,000,000 - \$16,000,000	\$17.11 / kg	\$79,000	(\$12,893,866)	< 5 models	NI
Switchers	BEV	\$3,000,000 - \$5,000,000	\$0.27 / kWh	\$71,100	(\$1,180,533)	<5 models	NI
	FCEV	\$2,750,000 - \$3,000,000	\$17.11 / kg	\$79,000	(\$4,624,008)	<5 models	NI

4.1.5 Other Vehicle Technology Considerations

As discussed earlier, the project team initially contemplated a broader set of clean technology specifications that addressed goals such as equity, accessibility, and resiliency. While criteria such as these are important ones, they are difficult to measure categorically. Similarly, the presence or lack of accessibility features for a given clean technology deployment is likely to be determined by a unique set of variables including vendor or client design specifications or accessibility requirements attached to a particular funding source. Goals such as resiliency that are broadly defined and resist easy measurement posed further challenges and were ultimately removed from the list of specifications. While challenging to measure categorically, these criteria are nevertheless critical ones for SCAG and its member jurisdictions to consider when making policies, plans, or investment decisions. The following outlines a series of additional criteria that should be taken into account when evaluating vehicle technologies. More extensive criteria for consideration are detailed in Appendix E.

Technology Readiness: Technology readiness is a critical factor to consider when deciding on clean technology for several reasons. Firstly, it provides a systematic measurement of technological maturity, helping to mitigate the risks associated with adopting new technologies. Secondly, it aids in understanding the potential challenges and resource requirements for transitioning the technology from its current stage to full-scale commercial deployment. Lastly, understanding the technology readiness can help in making informed decisions about the timeline of implementation and return on investment, crucial aspects when deciding to adopt any new technology. The technology readiness for light-duty vehicles has grown significantly in recent years, with various sustainable and efficient solutions currently in

¹⁰¹ https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2021-03/3.16.21%20Locomotive%20Reg%20-%20Preliminary%20Cost%20Document_Final.pdf

use. However, for medium-duty and heavy-duty vehicles, there remain substantial gaps in readiness, particularly when considering specialized duty cycles and equipment. The problem extends to heavy-duty vehicles in roles requiring them to carry full loads up to 55,000 lbs. Here, the payload capacity presents a considerable challenge for battery-electric trucks due to the excess weight of the battery.¹⁰² The curb weight¹⁰³ of a diesel tractor is approximately 15,000 – 17,000 lbs., whereas a battery electric truck could weigh much more due to the excess weight of the battery packs. For example, the Nikola Tre, with the largest available battery pack of 753 kWh has a curb weight of about 29,500 lbs. which is almost 13,000 lbs. higher than an average diesel truck. While the maximum allowable weight for zero emission trucks is 2,000 lbs. more than diesel trucks (82,000 lbs. for zero emission trucks vs. 80,000 lbs. for diesel trucks), the excessive weight of battery electric trucks will limit the maximum payload they can carry today. With battery technology improving, and the on-going increase in battery energy density, it is possible that such weight disparity could diminish in future models. This highlights a key area where technological readiness has not yet caught up with the demands of specific heavy-duty applications. The concern is amplified even more when we turn our attention to the rail industry. While zero-emission rail technologies are gradually being introduced worldwide, most are still in the early stages of development. These solutions have not yet been thoroughly tested in operational settings, revealing another domain where technological readiness lags behind.

Power Acceptance Rate. Power acceptance, often referred to as the fueling rate, is the ability of a system or technology to receive and store energy at a particular rate. For zero and near-zero emission technologies, this translates to how rapidly a vehicle or system can be charged or refueled. This rate is crucial for several reasons. Firstly, it directly impacts operational efficiency; the faster a vehicle or system can be re-energized, the less downtime it experiences, leading to improved productivity. For public transit or commercial vehicles, extended charging or refueling times can disrupt schedules and decrease the viability of the technology. Secondly, high power acceptance can enhance user adoption. For private users, a faster charge or refuel can mirror the convenience of traditional fueling methods, making the transition to zero or near-zero emission technologies more attractive. Currently, BEVs are being offered with various power acceptance rates. While the BYD K9¹⁰⁴ transit bus has a maximum power acceptance rate of 80 kW, the Proterra ZX5+¹⁰⁵ has a maximum charging rate of 132 using plug-in chargers and 330 kW using overhead charger which allows the vehicle to be charged at much faster rate. For instance, the BYD K9 requires a minimum of 15 minutes to charge for 10 miles (based on 2 kWh/mi), whereas the Proterra ZX5+ can achieve the same electric mileage in under 4 minutes using overhead charging.

Adaptability. Technology adaptability in the context of clean vehicle technologies evaluates the degree to which a given technology is perceived as reasonably "future-proof." Future-proof technology is designed with consideration of upcoming advancements and trends, thereby ensuring its relevancy and utility over time. In the realm of vehicles, technology adaptability encompasses several dimensions. Firstly, it relates to the ability of vehicles to integrate with emerging technologies such as vehicle-to-grid (V2G) capabilities, advanced driver-assistance systems (ADAS), or autonomous driving technologies. As these technologies mature, vehicles should be capable of either coming equipped with these technologies or being upgraded to include them. Secondly, adaptability pertains to the capability of a vehicle to respond to changes in user needs. For instance, as consumer demands shift toward faster charging times, longer

¹⁰² The payload capacity varies for different models of zero emission trucks. Battery electric trucks with smaller batteries (hence lower electric range) tends to have high payload capacity while truck technologies with larger batteries (higher range) are assumed to have lower payload capacity.

¹⁰³ Curb weight is the total weight of a vehicle, including all standard equipment and necessary operating consumables like oil and coolant, but excluding passengers and cargo.

¹⁰⁴ https://en.byd.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/4504-byd-transit-cut-sheets_k9-40_lr.pdf

¹⁰⁵ <https://www.proterra.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Proterra-ZX5-Spec-Sheet-40-Foot-Bus-U.S..pdf>

driving ranges, and enhanced vehicle performance, adaptable technology should be designed to meet these evolving expectations. Lastly, regulatory shifts are another key factor influencing technology adaptability. As policies and regulations continue to evolve in favor of cleaner and more sustainable transportation, future-proof ZEVs should be designed to comply with these changing regulations. Unfortunately, questions of adaptability are hard to address at the category level and instead specific products should be thoroughly investigated before purchase.

Resilience. Resilience refers to the ability of the clean technology system to maintain functionality and adapt in the face of disruptions or changes in the energy landscape. As the reliance on electric and sustainable transportation grows, the interdependence between the zero emission vehicles and the power grid becomes important. The surge in energy demand, particularly during peak times, can strain the grid. Therefore, when selecting a vehicle technology for adoption, it is essential to consider its impact on power system resilience. Technologies that support bidirectional energy flow, such as V2G, can help stabilize the grid by distributing energy demands more evenly, acting as energy reserves during peak times or outages, and overall, ensuring a reliable and uninterrupted power supply. Adopting technologies that enhance grid resilience safeguards both the transport and energy sectors from potential vulnerabilities, fostering a more sustainable and dependable future.

Integration. Technology integration refers to the deliberate and strategic inclusion of a particular technology into an existing system or framework. This process ensures that the new technology not only functions within the system but also complements and enhances the system's overall performance. When deciding on a specific technology it is critical to consider system integration. This involves not only focusing on the immediate benefits or functionalities of a technology in isolation but understanding its interoperability and compatibility across broader networks. For instance, while a particular rail technology might seem optimal for the SCAG region due to its unique geographical or infrastructural nuances, it is essential to consider its integration potential across a national network. If different rail technologies are siloed regionally, it could lead to inefficiencies, increased costs, and potential disruptions when transferring goods across regions. A technology that integrates seamlessly with existing and potential future systems nationwide will ensure consistent operations, reduce transition costs, and provide scalability.

Reliability. This criterion pertains to the technology's ability to consistently perform well under a broad range of conditions and over extended periods of time. It also implies a low frequency of malfunctions or breakdowns. High reliability is essential to promote user trust and satisfaction, influencing the overall adoption rate of these vehicles. For instance, in the context of EVs, reliability might include the vehicle's ability to deliver the expected range on a single charge under different driving conditions. Factors such as high-speed driving, heavy loads, or extreme weather conditions can significantly affect battery performance. Thus, a reliable EV should provide predictable and consistent range figures despite these variables, thereby reducing 'range anxiety' among users. Another crucial aspect is the longevity and durability of the battery, which should maintain a high degree of its capacity even after several years of use and numerous charging cycles. Premature battery degradation would not only entail high replacement costs but also undermine user confidence in the technology. In the case of FCEVs, reliability might involve the durability of the fuel cell stack and the performance of the hydrogen storage system. Both should function effectively over the vehicle's lifetime, without significant loss in performance.

Safe System: The Safe Systems criterion in the context of vehicles evaluates whether the introduction of a new technology maintains or improves the current safety conditions. It is essential that the implementation of any new vehicle technology does not compromise the safety of drivers, passengers, or other road users, but instead contributes to safer driving and road environments. This criterion emphasizes that no matter the potential benefits a new vehicle

technology might deliver in terms of efficiency, sustainability, or cost-effectiveness, safety must always remain a paramount concern.

Shared Use Potential: The Shared Use Potential criterion in the context of vehicles examines whether the technology has potential for applications in transit or shared-use scenarios, contributing to more efficient and sustainable resource usage. It is critical to ascertain whether any new vehicle technology can support shared mobility, thereby optimizing vehicle usage, reducing traffic congestion, and lowering environmental impact. This criterion emphasizes the importance of advancing technologies that promote shared transportation, underscoring a shift toward more sustainable and efficient mobility solutions. This criterion is particularly important for light-duty vehicles and buses.

Spatial Accessibility/Equity: This criterion assesses whether the technology can be deployed effectively in, and primarily benefit, disadvantaged communities. This criterion is particularly important for heavy-duty vehicles like trucks and buses, which often provide crucial transportation and logistical support in these areas. It emphasizes the need for the equitable geographical distribution of such technology, ensuring that marginalized or underserved areas also gain access to the benefits resulting from this technology. This is particularly important as these communities are often disproportionately impacted by pollution from traditional heavy-duty vehicles, so the transition to cleaner technologies can bring significant local health and environmental benefits.

4.2 Infrastructure

Defining the Category: Infrastructure includes stations for refueling or recharging vehicles powered by electricity, natural gas, and hydrogen. This category does not encompass gasoline and diesel stations offering renewable fuels, nor does it include other types of infrastructure that are not related to fueling.

Data Sources and Limitations:

Several data sources were used for evaluating the zero and near-zero emission infrastructure:

- Cost Data:** Over the past three years, there have been multiple studies conducted by various non-profit organizations such as International Council on Clean Transportation¹⁰⁶ (ICCT), National Renewable Energy Laboratory¹⁰⁷ (NREL), Rocky Mountain Institute¹⁰⁸ (RMI), Environmental Defense Fund¹⁰⁹ (EDF) to estimate the cost of EV charging infrastructure deployment including the cost of equipment, installation, as well as the needed utility upgrades (e.g., grid interconnections).
- Adoption Status:** The project team utilized Zero Emission Vehicle and Infrastructure Statistics¹¹⁰ published by the California Energy Commission (CEC) to determine the number of charger and hydrogen fueling stations deployed in SCAG region. Additionally, the project team leveraged the Alternative Fueling Station Locator¹¹¹ published by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Alternative Fuel Data Center to determine the number of natural gas facilities in SCAG region.
- Availability:** The project team utilized internet searches as a valuable resource to gather information regarding the number of vendors offering charging and fueling infrastructure for various clean technologies.



EV charging infrastructure such as this EVgo DC Fast charger are widely available in SCAG region. Around 3,712 chargers are available in SCAG region provided by 20-30 manufacturers.

In contrast to vehicles where cost and technology specifications are generally publicly available, information regarding charging and fueling infrastructure is often scarce. While some studies have provided estimates, these findings are often limited to specific projects and may not be universally applicable. Aside from hardware, the cost of charging and hydrogen fueling infrastructure can be significantly impacted by factors such as installation and maintenance costs, as well as regulatory requirements and potential grid upgrades needed to support the infrastructure. Moreover, the geographical location and the type of establishment (public versus private, urban versus rural) can also contribute to variations in costs due to differences in accessibility, land prices, and demand levels. Note that in this report, our focus is mainly on the hardware costs.

Furthermore, when it comes to innovative infrastructure solutions, such as advanced charging technologies, there is a lack of available information beyond basic technology descriptions. Obtaining details on costs, longevity, and market adoption of these technologies requires substantial effort, including conducting interviews with specific vendors offering such products. Additionally, the availability of this information relies on vendors' willingness to publicly disclose it.

¹⁰⁶ https://theicct.org/sites/default/files/publications/ICCT_EV_Charging_Cost_20190813.pdf

¹⁰⁷ <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2542435120302312>

¹⁰⁸ <https://rmi.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/RMI-EV-Charging-Infrastructure-Costs.pdf>

¹⁰⁹ <http://blogs.edf.org/energyexchange/files/2021/03/EDF-GNA-Final-March-2021.pdf>

¹¹⁰ <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/zero-emission-vehicle-and-infrastructure-statistics>

¹¹¹ <https://afdc.energy.gov/stations/>

4.2.1 Electricity

This category discusses, Level 2 Charging Stations (stand-alone and networked), Direct Current (DC) Fast Charging (DCFC) stations¹¹² (low power to ultra-high power), and Innovative Charging Solutions (wireless, pantograph, on-the-go, and solar charging systems) in terms of capital cost, maintenance cost, adoption status, availability, longevity, accessibility, and integration. Detailed product descriptions are displayed in Table 22.

Table 22. Electricity infrastructure product descriptions.

Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure	EV Charging System Type	Product description
Level 2 Charging Stations	Stand-Alone	Level 2 charging stations are individual charging units that provide electrical power to EVs at a medium charging rate. Stand-alone Level 2 stations are not interconnected and operate independently.
	Networked	Networked Level 2 charging stations are connected to a central management system, allowing for remote monitoring, control, and potentially offering features like payment processing and user authentication.
DC Fast Charging Stations	Low Power (50 - 100 kW)	These DC fast charging stations provide a relatively lower charging rate compared to higher power variants. They offer faster charging than Level 2 stations but are not as rapid as higher power DC fast chargers.
	Medium Power (>100 -250 kW)	DC fast charging stations with medium power provide a higher charging rate, allowing EVs to recharge their batteries at a faster pace.
	High Power (>250 - 350 kW)	DC charging stations with a maximum output of 350kW. Typically, compatible with medium-heavy duty EVs.
	Ultra-High Power (up to 1 MW)	Ultra-high-power DC fast charging stations offer extremely fast charging capabilities, potentially delivering charging speeds of up to 1 MW. These stations are designed to significantly reduce charging time and enable rapid turnaround for electric vehicles.
Innovative Charging Solutions	Wireless Electric Vehicle Charging System	This technology enables charging without the need for physical cables. It utilizes wireless power transfer to charge electric vehicles by aligning the vehicle with a charging pad or system embedded in the ground or infrastructure.
	Pantograph Charging System	Pantograph charging systems employ an overhead arm mechanism that connects to an electric vehicle for charging purposes. These systems are commonly used for charging electric buses or trucks at designated charging stations or depots. These stations can offer up to 600 kW of charging power.
	Solar Charging Canopy	Solar charging canopies incorporate solar panels as overhead structures that provide shade while simultaneously harnessing solar energy to charge electric vehicles. These canopies often integrate with charging infrastructure, enabling sustainable and renewable energy sources for charging.

Level 2 charging stations are the most widely adopted type of EV charging infrastructure and are more suitable for light and medium-duty BEVs and have a power level between 2.5 and 19.2 kW. DCFC are more likely to be needed for Class 7 and 8 trucks and lower weight vehicle classes when fast charging is necessitated due to daily range requirements. DCFCs can currently operate at power levels between roughly 20 kilowatts (kW) and 360 kW, offering a significantly faster charge than Level 2 chargers. For example, a 150 kW and 350 kW DCFC can charge an electric truck in 1.2 hours and 0.5 hour, respectively (assuming a battery capacity of 175 kilowatt-hours (kWh)). In contrast, the same truck would take 8 to 10 hours to charge using a Level 2 charger. A more recent development within the industry

¹¹² Assumed to be all networked although there might be optioned for stand-alone (non-networked) available too.

is megawatt (MW) charging technology, which has the potential to significantly reduce charging dwell times. Leading the development of a Megawatt Charging System (MCS) is the member-based Charging Interface Initiative (CharIN). The MCS is designed to provide a maximum of 3.75 MW of charging power (Figure 19). It is expected that CharIN will publish the final MCS standard in 2024.¹¹³ In October 2022, Daimler Truck North America hosted an event at their Electric Island¹¹⁴ facility in Portland, Oregon, where a MSC system was tested on a dozen medium- and heavy-duty vehicles¹¹⁵.

Figure 19. The Megawatt Charging System (MCS) Connector



Connector standardization is also important to the success of vehicle electrification. While interoperability in charging infrastructure is improving over time, there remains a lack of standardization for charger connectors. Importantly, interoperability goes beyond connector standards; it also includes the software and communications connections between charging stations and charging networks. Table 20 shows existing and upcoming charging connector standards relevant to MD-HD electric vehicles. As shown, Level 1 and 2 chargers simply use the SAE J1772, while DCFC spans several connector standards.

Table 23. Existing and Upcoming Charging Connector Standards¹¹⁶

Diagram	Connector Standard	Maximum Output Power	Application Notes
	SAE J1772	19.2 kW AC	Used for Level 1 and Level 2 charging in North America. Commonly found on home, workplace, and public chargers.
	CCS ¹¹⁷	450 kW DC	Used for DC fast charging most vehicle models in North America. Generally installed at public charging stations. ¹¹⁸
	CHAdeMO	400 kW DC	Used for DC fast charging select vehicles models in North America. Generally installed at public charging stations ¹¹⁹ .

¹¹³ Inside EVs. (2022, June 15). CharIN Officially Launches The Megawatt Charging System (MCS). Retrieved from <https://insideevs.com/news/592360/megawatt-charging-system-mcs-launch/>

¹¹⁴ <https://www.bv.com/projects/electric-island-providing-pathway-carbon-free-trucking>

¹¹⁵ <https://www.truckinginfo.com/10182667/megawatt-ev-charging-system-tested-at-electric-island>

¹¹⁶ California Energy Commission. (2021, July). Assembly Bill 2127 Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Assessment Analyzing Charging Needs to Support ZEVs in 2030. Retrieved from <https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/getdocument.aspx?tn=238853>

¹¹⁷ North American CCS standard is referred to as Type 1, CCS 2.0 is typically found in Europe.

¹¹⁸ Incentive funding provided by the federal government via the National EV Infrastructure (NEVI) Formula Program is contingent upon certain requirements including that the chargers must include at least four 150kW plugs with CCS ports. This requirement, however, is only to receive federal funding through the NEVI program. Anyone can deploy CHAdeMO charger ports if they want, they just won't qualify for federal NEVI funding. See NEVI funding guidelines here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/alternative_fuel_corridors/nominations/90d_nevi_formula_program_guidance.pdf


¹¹⁹ It is noteworthy to mention many of the zero emission vehicle manufacturers are moving away from the CHAdeMO and shifting their products to be compatible with CCS and/or Tesla

Diagram	Connector Standard	Maximum Output Power	Application Notes
	Tesla	22 kW AC 250 kW DC	Used for both AC and DC fast charging for Tesla models only.
	SAE J2954	22 kW light-duty, 200 kW MD/HD	Wireless power transfer. The standard for MD/HD vehicles is under development.
	SAE J3068	133 kW to 166 kW DC	Developed for three-phase charging, which the SAE J1772 and J1772 combo could only accommodate single-phase charging.
	SAE J3105	>1 MW	Automated connection device to charge MD/HD vehicles. Variants include pantograph "up" or "down" and pin-and-socket. LA Metro has already deployed this technology on the G/Orange Line,
	CharIN Megawatt Charging System	4 MW	Conductive MW-level charging for MD/HD road vehicles, ships and planes. The technical specification is expected in 2024.

Existing Condition

The availability of public EV charging infrastructure in SCAG region has made significant progress, however, there remains the need for accelerated growth in order to support the influx of ZEVs. According to the CEC, there are approximately 33,000 Level 2 and 3,700 DCFC chargers in the region. LA County has the highest number of EV chargers in SCAG region; specifically, 76 percent of level 2 chargers and 50 percent of DC fast chargers are located in the most populous county in the region (Figure 20). San Bernardino and Riverside counties have similar numbers of chargers, indicating that these regions are also making efforts to increase the availability of charging infrastructure. Lastly, Imperial County has the fewest chargers in the region. Figure 20 below illustrate the number of charging infrastructure deployed in SCAG region broken down by county.

Figure 20. Number of Public EVSE by County



EV charging stations typically fall under one of three ownership/accessibility categories: private, semi-public, and public. Private charging stations, whether for fleets, workplace chargers with access only granted to employees, or multi-unit dwellings, are not available to the general public. Semi-public charging stations are open to certain fleets or individuals but not open to all of the public. For example, a business may offer their customers the ability to use their

charging stations. Lastly, public charging stations are self-explanatory and are available to the broader public. Note that the statistics presented here are for the publicly available EVSE in SCAG region.

Commercialization

Table 23 provides commercialization status of EV charging infrastructure including the capital cost, maintenance costs, adoption status (number of chargers being deployed in SCAG region) as well as the number of vendors offering these charging solutions. In summary, Level 2 charging stations have an estimated cost range of \$2.5K to \$4.5K. For DC fast charging stations, the cost varies based on power capacity, with low-power (50-100 kW) stations priced around \$29.5K to \$59.5K, medium-power (>100-250 kW) stations ranging from \$59.5K to \$115K, high-power (>250-350 kW) stations costing between \$115K and \$139K, and ultra-high-power (up to 1 MW) stations priced at approximately \$400K to \$500K. According to CEC's Zero Emission Vehicle and Infrastructure Statistics, currently there are 33,000 Public Level 2, and 3,700 DCFC being deployed in SCAG region. Of these, 21,000 chargers are shared-private whereas 15,000 of them are publicly available chargers.

It shall be noted that while Level 2 and DCFC hardware are not specifically designed for a particular vehicle type, such as light-duty or heavy-duty vehicles, their accessibility can greatly depend on the parking infrastructure surrounding them. For instance, most of the current public charging stations are designed with light-duty vehicles in mind, making it challenging for heavy-duty vehicles to utilize them due to parking layout and space constraints. Consequently, the



effectiveness of these charging stations is limited by the physical design and infrastructure of their locations, and not just by their technological capabilities. In the evolving landscape of electric vehicles, the interoperability of chargers becomes increasingly critical. It's essential to consider scenarios where chargers can be shared among various vehicle categories, ensuring the maximum utility and flexibility of charging infrastructure.

Table 24. Technology characteristics of electric charging infrastructure.

Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure	EV Charging System Type	Capital Cost	Maintenance Cost ¹²⁰	Adoption Status	Availability	Longevity
Level 2 Charging Stations	Stand-Alone	\$2,500 - \$4,500	\$400 per charger per year	32,741	40-50 vendors	1-5 years ¹²¹
	Networked		\$400 per charger per year		40-50 vendors	1-5 years
DC Fast Charging Stations	Low Power (50 - 100 kW)	\$29,500 - \$59,500	\$800 per charger per year	3,712	20-30 vendors	3 years
	Medium Power (>100 -250 kW)	\$59,500 - \$115,000	\$800 per charger per year		20-30 vendors	3 years
	High Power (>250 - 350 kW)	\$115,000 - \$139,000	\$800 per charger per year		20-30 vendors	3 years
	Ultra-High Power (up to 1 MW)	\$400k - \$500k	NI	NI	NI	NI

NI indicates "no information" or a knowledge gap

Blank indicates not commercially available

Aside from the traditional wired charging solution, there also exist several innovative charging solutions that are further described here.

Wireless Electric Vehicle Charging System: The wireless electric vehicle charging system offers the convenience of charging without the need for physical cables or plug-in connections. It provides a seamless integration into the charging process, enhancing the user experience. However, this technology currently has lower efficiency compared to wired charging systems, resulting in slightly slower charging speeds. It also comes with higher installation costs and limited availability and compatibility with electric vehicle models.

Pantograph Charging System: The pantograph charging system is commonly used in the public transportation sector and is designed for rapid charging of electric buses or trucks. It offers high charging power capacity and automated connection to charging infrastructure, making it efficient for fleet charging scenarios. However, it requires specific infrastructure and equipment, limiting its use for individual or private electric vehicles. The installation costs are typically higher, and compatibility issues between different pantograph designs and vehicle types may arise.



¹²⁰ Based on data provided at https://afdc.energy.gov/fuels/electricity_infrastructure_maintenance_and_operation.html

¹²¹ https://afdc.energy.gov/fuels/electricity_infrastructure_maintenance_and_operation.html

Solar Charging Canopy: The solar charging canopy integrates solar panels as overhead structures, providing shade while harnessing solar energy to charge EVs. One of the key advantages of solar charging canopies is their ability to utilize sustainable energy sources, reducing reliance on the grid and lowering carbon emissions. By harnessing solar power, these canopies enable EVs to charge using clean and renewable energy. Solar charging canopies can be installed in various locations such as parking lots, residential areas, or commercial spaces, providing convenient charging options for electric vehicle owners. They not only offer a means of charging but also provide shading benefits, protecting vehicles from harsh weather conditions. However, there are considerations to keep in mind. The efficiency of solar panels can be influenced by factors such as the amount of sunlight available, orientation of the panels, and potential shading from surrounding structures. This can impact the charging speed and effectiveness of the canopy system. Moreover, the installation of solar charging canopies requires space and investment, which may limit their widespread adoption. Adequate space is needed to accommodate the canopy structure and the number of charging stations desired, which can be a challenge in densely populated areas or locations with limited available land. According to one vendor¹²², a 2 – 6 ports solar charging canopy can cost \$70,000 – \$90,000.



Mobile Charging (EV Charging on the Go): Mobile charging units, also known as portable charging stations or mobile EV chargers, are innovative solutions that offer flexibility and convenience for EV charging as well as for emergency use cases. These units are designed to be easily transportable and can provide charging capabilities in various locations where fixed charging infrastructure may be limited or inaccessible. Mobile charging units typically consist of a compact charging module with built-in power electronics, connectors, and cables. They can be powered by different sources, such as a built-in battery, gas, diesel or natural gas-powered generator, or by connecting to a traditional power outlet. Some mobile charging units may even incorporate renewable energy sources like solar panels for eco-friendly charging on the go. One of the key advantages of mobile charging units is their ability to provide EV charging wherever it is needed, whether it's at events, temporary parking lots, construction sites, or remote areas. They offer convenience for EV owners by providing a charging option outside of the traditional charging network, expanding the accessibility and coverage of EV charging infrastructure. However, it's important to note that mobile charging units typically have lower charging capacities compared to fixed charging stations, as they are designed for temporary or on-demand charging. This means that charging times may be longer, and the number of vehicles that can be charged simultaneously may be limited. An example of these mobile charging solutions is the one [BP Pulse Fleet North America Inc.](https://beamforall.com/) where they offer three mobile and non-permanent charging solutions. The first solution is containerized, which involves upcycled 20' or 40' shipping containers with exterior chargers and electrical switchgear inside. These containers are pre-assembled off-site and can accommodate different charger types and power levels. The second solution is mobile, which consists of fully portable battery-supported charging units on wheels. These units do not require existing access to electricity, allowing for deployment in any location worldwide. The third solution is surface mounted, which utilizes above-ground cable



¹²² <https://beamforall.com/>. Cost data were acquired through personal communication with Beam representatives during the 2023 ACT Expo


raceways and portable transformers. This solution is compatible with any charger type and does not require trenching for electrical wiring. It offers quick installation and easy relocation while providing the convenience and stability of permanent infrastructure. According to our survey responses the cost for these solutions could vary by scope.

4.2.2 Hydrogen Infrastructure

Hydrogen fueling infrastructure is an integral part of the transition toward clean energy transportation. As discussed earlier, FCEVs are an attractive alternative to traditional fossil fuel vehicles, as they emit only water vapor and warm air. However, their adoption relies heavily on the availability and accessibility of hydrogen fueling stations. These stations, similar to traditional gas stations, pump hydrogen gas into the fuel cell of the vehicle. However, the development and deployment of hydrogen fueling infrastructure pose unique challenges, including high capital costs, technical complexities, and safety considerations. Despite these hurdles, investing in hydrogen infrastructure can provide significant environmental benefits and contribute to energy diversity and resilience.

Hydrogen fuel has a low volumetric energy density compared to other liquid fuels, such as gasoline. For this reason, the fuel is stored onboard a vehicle as compressed gas in order to achieve a driving range comparable to conventional vehicles. Current applications often use high-pressure tanks capable of storing hydrogen at either 5,000 or 10,000 pounds per square inch (psi). The emphasis within the industry is hyper focused on achieving fueling times as close as possible to conventional vehicles, such that users in the light-duty, and particularly, the medium- and heavy-duty sector can adopt these ZEVs without significant change to their daily operations. Retail hydrogen dispensers are typically co-located at gasoline stations and are able to fill an average fuel take in roughly 5 minutes. With the DOE's target of achieving fueling times of 2.5 mins (for 5 kg of fuel), continued effort is being targeted at lowering the time to refill. In a study from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) found that the average time spent fueling an FCEV is less than 4 minutes, with 37% of fueling times less than 3.3 minutes and 15% of fueling times more than 2.5 minutes (Figure 21). For larger FCEVs, such as busses, refilling times are between 10-15 minutes.¹²³ For small and large fleets of MHD FCEBs, slow fill dispensing is utilized, which is more economical particularly for vehicles that are domiciled at a central depot and sit overnight.


Figure 21. Average Hydrogen Refueling Times



¹²³ https://afdc.energy.gov/fuels/hydrogen_basics.html

Current hydrogen delivery systems include gaseous hydrogen delivery, liquid hydrogen delivery, and on-site hydrogen production and storage. Gaseous hydrogen delivery entails compressing hydrogen prior to transport, which is then delivered by truck or pipeline to the customer. Liquid hydrogen delivery converts hydrogen to liquid form where it must be cooled to below -423 degrees Fahrenheit using a process called cryogenic liquefaction. It is then transported as a liquid in super-insulated, cryogenic tanker trucks to its end destination. Before dispensing the hydrogen, it is vaporized to a high-pressure gaseous product. One of the advantages of this delivery pathway is that it can be more economical than trucking gaseous hydrogen over long distances. Hydrogen may also be produced on-site using several processes. On-site production can reduce transportation and distribution costs but increase production costs due to the high capital costs of constructing production facilities. On-site production can be particularly suitable for more remote locations where regular delivery of hydrogen is not feasible, with one example being fuel cell electric buses (FCEBs) deployed at Sunline Transit in the Coachella Valley. Figure 22 depicts the three types of hydrogen delivery pathways.

Figure 22. Hydrogen Delivery Pathways¹²⁴



The hydrogen fueling infrastructure category of this compendium evaluates different hydrogen fueling station types in terms of capital cost, maintenance cost, adoption status, availability and longevity. Hydrogen fueling station types include slow fill, fast fill, on-site production, off-grid, mobile stations, and on-the-go stations. Note that almost all of the public hydrogen fueling stations deployed in California are fast-fill hydrogen fueling stations. Detailed product descriptions of each fueling station type can be found in Table 25.

Table 25. Product descriptions for hydrogen fueling infrastructure.

Hydrogen Fueling Station Type	Product description
<p>Slow Fill</p>	<p>These stations fill the hydrogen tank of a vehicle at a slower rate, typically over a period of several hours. This method usually does not require pre-compressed hydrogen or on-site compressors because it slowly compresses the hydrogen as it's being dispensed. These stations are smaller and less expensive to construct and operate than fast-fill stations. Slow-fill stations are ideal for fleet applications where vehicles return to a central location at the end of the day and can be refueled overnight.</p>
<p>Fast Fill</p>	<p>These stations are designed to fill the hydrogen tanks of vehicles rapidly, typically within 3 to 5 minutes, similar to a conventional gasoline fill-up. Fast-fill stations are often larger, more complex, and more expensive to build and operate because they need to store pre-compressed hydrogen or have powerful compressors on-site to fuel vehicles quickly. Fast-fill stations are best suited for public and retail locations where users need to refuel and leave as quickly as possible, similar to traditional gas stations.</p>


¹²⁴ California Fuel Cell Partnership. (n.d.). Costs and Financing. Retrieved from <https://h2stationmaps.com/costs-and-financing>

Hydrogen Fueling Station Type	Product description
On-Site Production	These stations produce hydrogen on-site using renewable energy or natural gas. On-site production stations can be useful in areas where hydrogen production and transportation costs are high as they can reduce the cost of transporting hydrogen to the station.
Off-Grid	These stations are powered by renewable energy sources such as solar or wind power, allowing them to operate without being connected to the electrical grid. Off-grid stations can be useful in remote locations where grid power is not available, or as a way to reduce the carbon footprint of the hydrogen production process.
Mobile (On the Go) hydrogen stations	On-the-go hydrogen stations are mobile stations that can be used to refuel hydrogen fuel cell vehicles in locations where permanent refueling infrastructure may not be available. These units typically consist of a refueling station mounted on a trailer or other mobile platform, which can be moved to different locations as needed.

Existing Condition

In terms of hydrogen fueling infrastructure, Southern California is one of the few regions in the world with a significant network of hydrogen fueling stations. SCAG region is gradually increasing its hydrogen fueling infrastructure with a total of 39 fueling stations available as of January 2023. The majority of these stations are concentrated in Los Angeles and Orange County, with only five, four, and three stations located in San Bernardino, Riverside, and Ventura counties, respectively. This lack of infrastructure, and particularly the concentration of fueling stations in high populations centers, speaks to the nascent nature of this technology. While there are currently 34 light-duty retail stations open, 20 additional stations are planned to open in the future. For heavy-duty hydrogen fueling stations, there are five currently operating, with one planned to open in the near future (Figure 23).

Figure 23. Number and type of Hydrogen Fueling Stations within SCAG Region by County¹²⁵



Source: CEC

Commercialization

Hydrogen is an attractive option for decarbonizing long-haul trucks, buses, and other heavy-duty applications where BEVs may face challenges due to weight, range, or charging infrastructure limitations. Hydrogen fuel cell vehicles offer extended driving ranges and faster refueling times compared to battery electric counterparts, providing operational flexibility for long-distance travel and reducing downtime. However, as illustrated earlier, a significant portion of the existing hydrogen fueling infrastructure in the region is primarily designed to cater to light-duty vehicles and may not be suitable for heavy-duty vehicles. The infrastructure development for heavy-duty hydrogen fueling stations requires additional considerations due to the higher fueling capacity and specific requirements of these larger vehicles. As part of the Clean Transportation Program, the CEC invests in charging as well as hydrogen fueling infrastructure. Table 26 below provides a list of medium and heavy-duty hydrogen fuel stations that are funded through this program. The funding for these projects covers direct and indirect labor for designing, engineering, and building the stations along with the equipment and shipping of the equipment. As shown, the typical cost of these stations is anywhere between \$4,00,000-\$8,000,000 to build and around \$142,000/year to maintain.¹²⁶ This information is summarized in Table 27.

¹²⁵ <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/zero-emission-vehicle-and-infrastructure-statistics/hydrogen-refueling>
¹²⁶ https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2021-10/hydrogen_self_sufficiency_report.pdf

Table 26. Cost of H2 Fueling Station - CEC Clean Transportation Program

Recipient Name	Purpose	Capacity	Capital Cost
Equilon Enterprises LLC	Renewable hydrogen fueling station for freight at the Port of Long Beach	1,000 kg/day	\$8,000,000
North County Transit District	North County Transit District Next Generation Hydrogen Fueling Infrastructure Project	Under Development	\$6,000,000
Sunline Transit Agency	Liquid hydrogen refueling infrastructure for transit buses	1,680 kg/day	\$4,986,250
Alameda Contra-Costa Transit District	Division 4 Hydrogen Fueling Infrastructure Upgrade	Under Development	\$4,565,975
Center for Transportation and the Environment	NorCAL Drayage Truck Project	1,600 kg/day	\$9,898,218
Equilon Enterprises LLC	Shell Multi-Modal Hydrogen Refueling Station (at the Port of West Sacramento for Sierra Northern Hydrogen Locomotive Project)	1,450 kg/day	\$4,000,000

Table 27. Technology characteristics of hydrogen fueling infrastructure

Hydrogen Fueling Station Type	Capital Cost	Maintenance Cost	Adoption Status	Availability	Longevity
Slow Fill	\$4,000,000 - \$8,000,000	\$142,000/year	0	5 - 10 vendors	NI
Fast Fill			39	5 - 10 vendors	NI
On-Site Production	NI	NI	NI	5 - 10 vendors	NI
Off-Grid	NI	NI	NI	5 - 10 vendors	NI
Mobile Stations	NI	NI	NI	5 - 10 vendors	NI
On the Go hydrogen stations	NI	NI	NI	< 5 vendors	NI


NI indicates "no information" or a knowledge gap

Blank indicates not commercially available

4.2.3 Natural Gas

When burned, natural gas produces fewer greenhouse gas emissions, particulate matter, and smog-forming pollutants compared to traditional petroleum-based fuels. Furthermore, the availability of natural gas infrastructure, such as pipelines and refueling stations, makes it easier to integrate NGVs into existing transportation systems. Many fleet operators, including transit agencies and delivery companies, have adopted natural gas as a fuel option for their vehicles. Similar to diesel, a low carbon alternative to natural gas is Renewable Natural Gas (RNG). RNG is produced through the process of capturing and refining biogas emitted from various sources such as landfills, wastewater treatment plants, agricultural waste, and anaerobic digesters. The biogas captured from these sources primarily consists of methane, carbon dioxide, and trace amounts of other gases. To transform it into RNG, the biogas undergoes

Figure 24. CNG and LNG Stations in the Southern California



a purification process where impurities like carbon dioxide, hydrogen sulfide, moisture, and other trace elements are removed. This purification step increases the methane content to a level comparable to or even higher than conventional natural gas. The resulting RNG is considered a renewable fuel because it is produced from organic waste materials, diverting these materials from landfills and reducing methane emissions, which is a potent greenhouse gas. By capturing and utilizing biogas through RNG production, it provides a valuable strategy for managing organic waste while also generating a sustainable energy source. Despite RNG being a lower-emission alternative, it is not a completely carbon-neutral and zero emission solution. Methane, a potent greenhouse gas, can be emitted during the production, transmission, and distribution of natural gas (or RNG). In addition, while the majority of methane is converted to CO₂ upon combustion, a minuscule fraction might not burn completely and could be emitted from the vehicle's tailpipe. Natural gas can be used as compressed natural gas (CNG) or liquified natural gas (LNG) to power vehicles.

LNG fueling involves cooling natural gas to approximately -162 degrees Celsius (-260 degrees Fahrenheit), which transforms it into a liquid state. This liquefaction process reduces the volume of natural gas, making it more efficient to transport and store. LNG is typically stored in insulated cryogenic tanks at atmospheric pressure. When needed, LNG is vaporized back into its gaseous state and then pressurized for injection into the vehicle's fuel tank. LNG fueling infrastructure requires specialized storage tanks, vaporizers, and dispensers capable of handling cryogenic temperatures and ensuring safe fueling operations. LNG is commonly used in heavy-duty transportation applications. CNG fueling, on the other hand, involves compressing natural gas to high pressures, typically around 3,600 to 3,900 pounds per square inch (psi), or even higher for certain applications. Compressed natural gas is stored in high-pressure cylinders or tanks at the vehicle fueling station. When a vehicle is refueled, the compressed gas is directly delivered from the dispenser into the vehicle's onboard storage tanks. CNG fueling infrastructure requires compressors to achieve the necessary pressure levels and dispensers to deliver the compressed gas to the vehicles. CNG is commonly used in light-duty and medium-duty vehicles, such as cars, vans, buses, and some smaller trucks.

Time-fill and fast-fill CNG stations are two different types of compressed natural gas (CNG) refueling methods with distinct characteristics and applications. Time-fill CNG stations are designed for overnight or prolonged refueling periods. They are typically used in fleet operations where vehicles are parked for an extended duration, such as overnight or during off-peak hours. Time-fill stations utilize lower pressure and flow rates to slowly fill the CNG tanks of multiple vehicles simultaneously. This method allows for efficient use of infrastructure by staggering the refueling process and taking advantage of the available time. Time-fill stations are cost-effective and convenient for fleet owners, as they can take advantage of non-peak electricity rates and ensure their vehicles are fully fueled and ready for operation the next day. However, the refueling process is relatively slow compared to fast-fill stations, as it is optimized for longer periods of stationary refueling. On the other hand, fast-fill CNG stations are designed for quick refueling, similar to conventional gasoline or diesel stations. These stations provide higher pressure and flow rates to rapidly fill CNG tanks, allowing for faster turnaround times. Fast-fill stations are suitable for applications where vehicles need to refuel on the go or in a time-constrained manner, such as public transit buses, or other vehicles with demanding schedules. They offer the convenience of rapid refueling, similar to traditional liquid fuel stations, enabling efficient operations for vehicles with higher fuel consumption or limited time availability. However, fast-fill stations require larger compressors and storage systems to meet the higher flow rate demands, making them more expensive to install and operate compared to time-fill stations.

Here in this section, the project team evaluates both types of CNG fueling stations (Time-Fill, and Fast Fill CNG stations), as well as the LNG stations (Table 28).


Table 28. Product descriptions for natural gas infrastructure.

Natural Gas Fueling Stations	Natural Gas Fueling Station Type	Product description
Compressed Natural Gas (CNG)	Time-Fill CNG Stations	Time-fill stations source CNG from a local utility and refuel vehicles at a low-pressure directly from the compressor. Slow-fill stations are generally used by fleets and fill vehicles with large tanks over the course of multiple hours.
	Fast-Fill CNG Stations	Fast-fill CNG stations source CNG from a local utility line at a low pressure, use a compressor on site to compress the gas into a high pressure and store the CNG in vessels at a high service pressure (4,300 psi). Fast-fill stations refuel vehicles at a similar rate to traditional gasoline pumps.
Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Stations		LNG fueling stations fill vehicles at a pressure of 30-120 psi. LNG is stored and dispensed as a super-cooled liquefied gas.

Existing Condition

Natural gas infrastructure is also an important component of the region's clean fueling infrastructure. Natural gas fueling infrastructure in SCAG region is spread relatively evenly across four of the six counties within the region. Los Angeles has the most stations at 34, while Riverside and San Bernardino counties both have 19, and Orange County has 13 stations. Ventura County currently only has two stations, and Imperial County has only one station.

Figure 25. Number of CNG/LNG Fueling Stations within SCAG Region by County



Source: https://afdc.energy.gov/stations#/analyze?region=US-CA&fuel=ELEC&ev_levels=all&location_mode=address

Commercialization

Table 29 provides an assessment of various natural gas stations in terms of capital cost, maintenance cost, adoption status, availability, and longevity. As shown, Time-Fill stations, which are designed for overnight or prolonged refueling, can be constructed within a cost range of \$5,500 to \$850,000. In contrast, Fast-Fill stations, catering to quick refueling needs, involve higher capital investments, typically ranging from \$45,000 to \$1.8 million, with an average annual maintenance cost of approximately \$12,000. LNG stations, which utilize liquefied natural gas, require a higher initial capital investment, averaging around \$1.7 million. Meanwhile LNG stations cost around \$1.7 million. Notably, fast-fill CNG stations are the most widely adopted type of natural gas fueling station. The adoption status of natural gas fueling stations within region varies depending on the type. There are a total of six time-fill CNG stations, 78 fast-fill CNG stations, and 11 LNG stations. Fast-fill stations are widely embraced, possibly due to their ability to provide quick refueling for vehicles with time-sensitive operations, such as public transit buses and delivery fleets.

Table 29. Technology characteristics of natural gas infrastructure.

Natural Gas Fueling Stations	Natural Gas Fueling Station Type	Capital Cost	Maintenance Cost	Adoption Status	Availability	Longevity
Compressed Natural Gas (CNG)	Time-Fill CNG Stations	Base Station (5-10 gge/day): \$5,500 - \$10,000 Starter Station (20-40 gge/day): \$35,000 - \$50,000 Small Station (100-200 gge/day): \$250,000 - \$500,000 Medium Station (500-800 gge/day): \$550,000 - 850,000	\$12,500/yr	6	30-50 vendors	1-10 years
	Fast-Fill CNG Stations	Starter Station (20-40 gge/day): \$45,000 - \$75,000 Small Station (100-200 gge/day): \$400,000 - \$600,000 Medium Station (500-800 gge/day): \$700,000 - 900,000 Large Station (1,500+ gge/day): \$1.2 - \$1.8M	NI	78	30-50 vendors	1-10 years
Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Stations		\$1.7M (includes all design, construction, equipment, installation, project management, inspections, commissioning and project closeout)	NI	11	5 - 10 vendors	NI

NI indicates "no information" or a knowledge gap

Blank indicates not commercially available

4.2.4 Other Infrastructure Technology Considerations:

Similar to the discussion provided for vehicles, there are other factors that need to be considered when consumers, whether private or public entities, consider the acquisition of clean technology infrastructure. The following outlines a series of additional criteria that should be taken into account when evaluating infrastructure technologies. More extensive criteria for consideration are detailed in Appendix E.

Technology Readiness: The concept of technology readiness, in the context of infrastructure technology, assesses the maturity and reliability of a technology, gauging its feasibility for broad-scale implementation. Implementing nascent charging and fueling technologies prematurely can lead to unforeseen challenges, potential inefficiencies, and increased costs. For example, ultrafast charging technology, often referred to as high-power charging or megawatt charging, represents the cutting edge of EV charging technologies. As discussed earlier, while foundational technology is proven, its widespread commercial deployment remains in the intermediate stages of technology readiness. This is due to several factors, including the need for substantial power infrastructure upgrades, concerns over grid stability, and the capability of vehicles to handle such rapid charging rates without adverse impacts on battery life. When considering investments or policymaking related to these cutting-edge charging technologies, it is essential to recognize that while the technology holds significant potential for revolutionizing EV charging, its full-scale, broad implementation is still in a maturing phase, necessitating ongoing research, development, and real-world testing.

Refueling Time: When selecting an appropriate charging or refueling system, the availability of refueling or charging time is significant. This factor directly impacts the practicality and efficiency of the system for users. For instance, a long-haul trucking company operating on tight schedules would prioritize fast-charging solutions (e.g., 350 kW chargers) to minimize downtime. Conversely, urban transit systems or private vehicle owners might have overnight periods available, making slower, overnight charging systems (e.g., 50 kW chargers) more feasible and potentially more economical. The selected charging or refueling system should align with the operational patterns and time constraints of the user, ensuring that the vehicles are charged or refueled when needed without causing disruptions or inefficiencies in their primary function. Thus, understanding the temporal dynamics of vehicle usage is crucial in determining the most appropriate and efficient charging or refueling solution. Furthermore, while modern infrastructure offers public chargers with capacities reaching up to 800 kW, it is essential to recognize that not all vehicles can accept such high levels of charging. Every vehicle has a maximum charging or fueling acceptance rate, which sets a limit on how fast a charger or refueling system can operate without causing potential harm or inefficiencies. Therefore, the optimal choice in charging or refueling system should not only align with the operational patterns and time constraints but also the technological capabilities and limits of the vehicles in question.

Physical Accessibility: The measure of physical accessibility refers to whether the technology can be operated and used by individuals with disabilities. This includes, but is not limited to, individuals with mobility impairments, visual impairments, and auditory impairments. For instance, people with mobility impairments might require infrastructure that allows for easy access to charging points, perhaps by means of ramps, automatic doors, or easy-to-use controls that do not require significant physical strength or skill. The design and layout of charging stations should also consider wheelchair users, with enough space for maneuvering and reaching the necessary equipment. For visually impaired individuals, accessibility can involve the implementation of tactile markers, braille instructions, or auditory guidance systems at charging or fueling stations. The use of contrasting colors and large, clear fonts for any visual elements can also make a significant difference. Those with auditory impairments, on the other hand, may benefit from visual alerts and signals, such as light-based indicators for charging or fueling status or system alerts. Text-based communication or sign language interpretation could also be integrated into instructional materials or real-time assistance services.

Integration: Technology integration within the scope of zero-emission infrastructure means that these technologies need to be interoperable, conforming to various industry standards. The central idea is to ensure these technologies can function in harmony with other systems, thereby enhancing user convenience and facilitating seamless operations across a diverse set of platforms and devices. A practical example is EV charging infrastructure. Interoperability in this context means that an EV from any manufacturer should be able to use a charging station from any other manufacturer. This requires standardization in charging connectors, protocols, and power requirements, allowing the infrastructure to accommodate a wide range of vehicles. On a broader scale, zero-emission infrastructure should also be designed to integrate with existing energy grids and demand management systems. For example, EV charging stations could be equipped with smart technologies to align charging cycles with off-peak electricity demand periods, reducing strain on the grid and taking advantage of lower energy prices. Additionally, integration with user-facing technology like mobile apps is also crucial. This allows customers to locate charging stations, reserve charging slots, and pay for services with ease. In essence, technology integration in the context of zero-emission infrastructure is about ensuring these systems not only function independently but also harmonize with the broader technological and operational landscape.

Locality: This measure refers to the presence of technology providers or vendors within a specific region, in this case, SCAG region. A substantial local presence can be highly beneficial, offering numerous advantages, from regional economic development and local employment opportunities to easier coordination with community stakeholders. Firstly, a significant local presence stimulates regional economic development. Investments in zero-emission infrastructure can lead to a direct financial influx into the region. Secondly, a robust local presence of zero-emission technology providers can lead to job creation. This spans a wide range of roles, from the construction of charging or refueling stations to the maintenance, and even roles in research and development. Finally, having technology providers or vendors situated locally can facilitate better coordination and communication with local stakeholders. This includes local government, businesses, and community groups. Local providers would have a better understanding of the regional context, such as environmental conditions, energy infrastructure, and specific community needs, which would enable them to deliver solutions that are tailored to meet these local requirements. Moreover, it can foster stronger relationships and ongoing collaboration, as local stakeholders can easily engage in face-to-face meetings, site visits, and other direct interactions. This proximity can accelerate decision-making processes, enhance the efficiency of project implementation, and ultimately drive the successful and widespread adoption of zero-emission technologies in the region.

Scalability: This criterion refers to the ability to adjust the technology's size, capacity, or functionality to suit different use cases or geographical contexts. This attribute is crucial for the widespread adoption of clean technology, allowing it to meet diverse demands and integrate seamlessly into different environments. When evaluating the scalability of a technology, especially within the context of zero-emission infrastructure, the technology's inherent characteristics such as cost-effectiveness and feasibility for mass production are key determinants. If a technology is prohibitively expensive or not amenable to mass production, it can greatly hinder its scalability. Moreover, the technology should be able to maintain or improve its performance as it scales. A technology that works well at a small scale but experiences significant performance degradation or increased failure rates when scaled up would not be considered scalable.


Incentivization: Incentivization plays a significant role in fostering the development and adoption of zero-emission infrastructure. Adopting new technologies often comes with uncertainties and risks and not all zero-emission infrastructure technologies may be eligible for public incentives, which can influence their financial viability and investment risk. Financial incentives such as grants, subsidies, tax breaks, or rebates can significantly offset the upfront costs associated with the adoption and implementation of zero-emission technologies. However, these incentives may

be targeted toward specific technologies, technology types, or sectors based on the public policy objectives. Therefore, when selecting a technology for adoption, it is crucial to identify whether it is eligible for such incentives. If a particular technology is not covered by existing incentive schemes, the financial burden, and thus the overall cost of implementation, may be considerably higher, impacting the financial viability of the project.

4.3 Other Supporting Products

Category Definition

The supporting products category evaluates products that facilitate the use of zero- and near-zero emission products. Evaluated products include charge management software, battery management software (centralized, distributed, and modular BMS), smart grid technologies (stationary battery energy storage, and vehicle-to-grid technologies), fleet management software (telematics, predictive maintenance, smart routing), and payment systems (in-vehicle, subscription services and contactless). More detailed descriptions of each supporting product can be found in Table 30.



Stationary battery energy storage systems like this power bank are able to store energy generated from renewable sources and release it when needed.

Table 30. Product descriptions of supporting products.

Supporting Product	Subtype	Product description
Charge Management Software	Energy Management System	Charge management software plays a crucial role in efficiently managing the charging process for electric vehicles. It enables users to monitor and control the charging sessions, optimize charging schedules, and even integrate with renewable energy sources. With advanced features and real-time data analytics, charge management software helps maximize the utilization of charging infrastructure and ensures a smooth charging experience for EV owners.
Battery Management Systems (BMS)	Centralized BMS	<p>A battery management system (BMS) is an essential component of battery energy storage systems (BESS). It is responsible for monitoring, controlling, and protecting the battery packs to ensure their safe and optimal performance. BMS encompasses various types, including centralized, distributed, and modular BMS. BMS enables real-time monitoring of BESS health, temperature, voltage, and other critical parameters to ensure safe and efficient battery operation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A centralized BMS uses one control unit to manage all battery cells in a system. The control is connected to battery cells through multiple cables. • A distributed BMS uses multiple control units to manage battery cells in a system. A board is installed at each cell with a communication cable between the battery and controller. • A modular BMS uses multiple control units. Each unit controls a number of battery cells. Communication cables exist between each control unit.
	Distributed BMS	
	Modular BMS	
Smart Grid Technologies	Stationary Battery Energy Storage	A stationary battery energy storage system stores energy and releases it in the form of electricity when needed. The system enables the integration of renewable energy sources, enhance grid stability, and provide backup power during peak demand periods.
	Vehicle-to-Grid Technologies	Vehicle-to-grid technologies enable bidirectional energy flow between electric vehicles and the power grid, allowing EVs to provide grid services, support demand response programs, and optimize energy usage. The California legislature has recently proposed Senate Bill 233 ¹²⁷ , mandating that all new electric vehicles (EVs) sold in the state by 2030 should be equipped with bidirectional charging technology. At the time of writing this report, this bill passed the State Senate while it is being considered in Assembly.
Fleet Management Software	Telematics	Telematic systems for vehicles refer to integrated use of telecommunications and informatics to provide a range of services and features that enhance vehicle functionality, safety, and convenience. Core services include fleet tracking, diagnostics, navigation, and emergency services, facilitated by on-board sensors, GPS technology, and wireless communication. By monitoring vehicle location and status, these systems contribute significantly to advancements in smart mobility, including optimized fleet management, preventive maintenance, and autonomous driving.

¹²⁷ https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202320240SB233

Supporting Product	Subtype	Product description
	Predictive maintenance	Predictive maintenance algorithms analyze vehicle data to identify maintenance needs in advance, optimizing vehicle uptime and reducing maintenance costs.
	Smart routing	Smart routing algorithms help optimize route planning, considering factors like traffic, weather, and charging station availability, to improve fleet efficiency and reduce operating costs.
Payment Systems	In-vehicle payments	In-vehicle payment systems enable seamless and convenient payment transactions for EV charging directly from the vehicle.
	Subscription services	Subscription services offer charging plans with fixed monthly fees, providing access to a network of charging stations.
	Contactless payment	Contactless payment options, such as mobile wallets or RFID cards, allow users to make payments without physical contact, enhancing the convenience and accessibility of EV charging services.

Aside from supporting the adoption of zero and near-zero emission technologies, some of these supporting products such as Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS), Vehicle-to-Grid/Vehicle-to-Everything (V2G/V2X) technologies and charging management solutions can significantly contribute to enhancing power system stability. Power system stability refers to the ability of a power system to regain an equilibrium state after experiencing a disturbance and is crucial in ensuring the continuous and reliable supply of electricity, thereby supporting the smooth functioning of various economic operations. For example, BESS can instantly respond to fluctuations in power demand or supply, providing power during high demand periods or storing energy when supply exceeds demand. V2G/V2X allows electric vehicles to interact with the power grid, either supplying power back during peak times or drawing power in low-demand periods, thus serving as mobile energy storage units. Charging management solutions can intelligently schedule the charging of electric vehicles or other energy storage systems to align with grid conditions, helping to avoid demand spikes that could threaten system stability.

Data Sources and Limitations

Limited information was accessible for many of the supporting products examined. While details on the capital costs of battery management systems, smart grid technologies, and telematics were obtainable, comprehensive information regarding the adoption status of these products was not readily available. This highlights the need for further research and data collection to better understand the current usage and acceptance of these technologies in the market.

Commercialization

Table 31 provides an overview of the available data surrounding capital cost, adoption status and availability of these technologies. As indicated earlier, the cost and adoption data for these supporting products are scarce. For example, our survey responses included two responses on charging management solutions, however, none of them had specific on the potential cost. The first responder indicated that pricing for their charge management system varies depending on factors such as the number of chargers, fleet vehicle size and class, charger voltage, and selected features. They indicated that the cost of the system includes a one-time setup fee and a monthly software subscription fee. The second respondent also did not provide any cost information and mentioned that the price could vary based on the scope of the project and additional information would need to be obtained to determine the pricing. With respect to Vehicle-to-Grid (V2G) technologies, the project team received information from BorgWarner, a vendor that offers high power (60-360kW) DCFC with V2G capabilities. According to the vendor, their product could cost up to \$80,000 with an annual maintenance cost of \$3,500. Also, in discussion with Nuvve¹²⁸, a V2G charging solution provider, their V2G product

¹²⁸ <https://nuvve.com/technology/>. Cost data were acquired through personal communication with Nuvve representatives during the 2023 ACT Expo

could cost anywhere between \$45,000 – \$60,000 (depending on whether the product is acquired through Sourcewell or not). However, note that these cost estimates are inclusive of the charging solution as well. At the same time, an article by CleanTechnica¹²⁹ cites the Alliance for Automotive Innovation, suggesting that the inclusion of V2G technology could add approximately \$3,300 to the cost of a new vehicle. This cost is reflected in the table below.

Table 31. Technology characteristics of supporting products

Supporting Product	Subtype	Capital Cost	Adoption Status	Availability
Charge Management Software	Energy Management System	NI	NI	30-40 vendors
Battery Management Systems (BMS)	Centralized BMS	\$300 - \$10,000 ¹³⁰	NI	30-40 vendors
	Distributed BMS		NI	30-40 vendors
	Modular BMS		NI	30-40 vendors
Smart Grid Technologies	Stationary Battery Energy Storage	\$143 per rated kWh (utility scale)	SoCal Edison: 2,050 MW	30-40 vendors
	Vehicle-to-Grid Technologies	\$3,300 for adding the technology to the vehicle	NI	10-20 vendors
Fleet Management Software	Telematics	12– \$200 per month, per vehicle	NI	30-40 vendors
	Predictive maintenance	NI	NI	20-30 vendors
	Smart routing	NI	NI	10-20 vendors
Payment Systems	In-vehicle payments	NI	NI	10-15 vendors
	Subscription services	NI	NI	10-20 vendors
	Contactless payment	NI	NI	20-30 vendors

NI indicates “no information” or a knowledge gap

Blank indicates not commercially available

Other Supporting Product Technology Considerations

Similar to the discussion provided for vehicles and infrastructure, there are other factors that need to be considered when consumers, whether private or public entities, consider the acquisition of clean technology supporting products. The following outlines a series of additional criteria that should be taken into account when evaluating supporting product technologies. More extensive criteria for consideration are detailed in Appendix E.

Interoperability: Similar to the integration metric discussed for infrastructure, this criterion is a crucial factor when evaluating zero-emission supporting products. Interoperability refers to the ability of different systems, devices, applications, or products to communicate, exchange data, and use the information that has been exchanged. This is integral to building an efficient, user-friendly, and universally accessible network for zero-emission technologies. With respect to payment systems, interoperability means that customers should be able to use a variety of payment methods at any charging or fueling station, regardless of the service provider. The technology should support a diverse range

¹²⁹ <https://cleantechnica.com/2023/05/08/california-ponders-v2g-mandate/>

¹³⁰ <https://poweringautos.com/how-much-does-a-battery-management-system-cost/>

of payment platforms, including credit cards, mobile payments, and digital wallets. This not only enhances user convenience but also encourages the use of zero-emission technologies by removing barriers related to payment modes. Interoperability is equally critical for charging management solutions. A fully interoperable system would mean that the charging management system should be capable of communicating with the grid and other smart devices to optimize charging schedules based on electricity demand, pricing, and the state of charge of the vehicle. Such a system should also work with various charging technologies, energy management systems and conform to grid regulations.

Resilience: When evaluating zero-emission supporting products, it is important to consider how well they integrate with the power grid and contribute to its resilience. For consumers, this involves analyzing a technology's capacity to maintain power system stability, manage variable loads, and support system recovery after disruptions. It also includes assessing whether a technology can help the power system adapt to evolving conditions, like the increasing penetration of intermittent renewable energy sources. For example, BESS and charging management solutions offer good examples of technologies that can bolster grid stability and resilience. BESS, particularly when integrated with renewable energy sources, can significantly enhance grid resilience. It can supply power during disruptions or peak demand periods, acting as a backup source to prevent outages. Moreover, BESS can absorb surplus power generated during off-peak times, promoting a more efficient use of renewable energy and enhancing the balance between power generation and consumption. For instance, if a sudden influx of power due to high wind speeds threatens the stability of the grid, BESS can store this excess power, helping to maintain grid stability. Similarly, charging management solutions for EVs can also contribute to grid resilience. They can manage the charging of EVs to align with grid conditions, helping to balance power demand and supply. V2G technology is also an excellent example of how zero-emission supporting products can contribute to grid resilience. For instance, during peak electricity demand periods, instead of firing up an additional power plant or importing power, grid operators can draw upon the energy stored in EV batteries to meet the additional demand. EV owners can set their vehicles to provide power back to the grid when the battery is sufficiently charged, and the vehicle is not in use. This not only helps balance the grid, reducing the risk of blackouts, but can also provide an extra source of revenue for EV owners who are compensated for the power they provide.

Intelligent Transportation Systems: When evaluating zero-emission supporting products, one important criterion is their ability to contribute to the efficient use of existing transportation systems. This involves assessing if the technology can help reduce congestion, improve traffic management, or facilitate better route planning, thus optimizing the overall transportation network. Fleet management systems offer an excellent example of such technologies. They utilize real-time data to monitor vehicle locations and statuses, allowing fleet operators to effectively manage their vehicles and schedule optimal routes. By employing real-time traffic data, these systems can predict and avoid congested areas, reducing travel time and enhancing the overall efficiency of fleet operations. As a result, energy consumption and emissions from vehicles, especially in the case of large fleets, can be significantly reduced. Another exemplary technology is smart routing systems. These technologies use advanced algorithms and real-time traffic information to provide optimal routes for drivers. They can guide vehicles along less congested routes and recommend optimal departure times to avoid rush hours, enhancing the overall flow of traffic. In addition to reducing congestion and travel time, these smart systems can also lead to significant energy savings and emission reductions, particularly beneficial for EVs by optimizing the usage of battery charge. Furthermore, these technologies can contribute to the creation of a connected transportation system, integrating various elements like vehicles, infrastructure, and traffic management systems. Such an integrated system could intelligently manage traffic flow and vehicle movement, further enhancing the efficiency and sustainability of transportation networks

4.4 Knowledge Gaps

As highlighted in the previous sections, there are still significant knowledge gaps related to zero and near-zero emission technologies. This lack of information becomes particularly pronounced for supporting products and to some extent charging and fueling infrastructure, where a comprehensive array of data is not readily available to assist stakeholders in making informed procurement decisions or in crafting policies that champion particular technologies. The scarcity of details regarding cost, current adoption status, longevity, and interoperability make it challenging to accurately evaluate and assess the potential and efficacy of these emerging technologies. For instance, while there is a wealth of information available regarding the adoption status of vehicles and infrastructure in the region, there is a noticeable gap when it comes to specific supporting products. Data on products such as charging management solutions or telematics, which are crucial for a seamless integration and operation of these technologies, is notably sparse. This absence of data hinders a comprehensive understanding of the level of adoption and use of these auxiliary systems.

In addition to the existing knowledge gaps surrounding clean technologies themselves, there is also a pronounced gap in our understanding of how these technologies will evolve and incorporate within the broader transportation ecosystem. As we stand at the cusp of a transportation revolution driven by clean technologies, it becomes important to comprehend not just the intricacies of the technologies in isolation but also their dynamic interplay with existing systems, infrastructures, and user behaviors. The following list provides some of the critical knowledge gaps where further investigation and research are needed to advance the successful adoption of clean technologies:

- **Consumer Behavior:** Understanding and influencing consumer preferences and behaviors is a critical factor in facilitating the successful transition to cleaner transportation technologies. Consumer choices regarding vehicle selection, charging habits, and the acceptance of alternative transportation modes play a pivotal role in shaping the adoption and usage of cleaner transportation options. To achieve widespread acceptance and uptake of these technologies, it is imperative to delve deeper into consumer preferences, motivations, and barriers that influence their decision-making processes. Comprehensive research should explore factors such as cost considerations, range anxiety, infrastructure availability, and the perceived benefits of cleaner transportation options. This research can help identify effective strategies to influence consumer behavior, such as targeted educational campaigns, financial incentives, and the development of convenient and reliable charging infrastructure.
- **Effective Incentive Program Design:** There exists a significant knowledge gap concerning the design of effective incentives that can minimize the presence of free riders¹³¹, and maximize the cost-effectiveness of programs promoting clean transportation technology adoption. This gap pertains to understanding the myriad of factors that influence consumer preferences and how they can be factored into incentive program design to ensure that resources are not expended on those who would have adopted clean technologies even without incentives. Also, it revolves around discerning the optimal mix of incentives to maximize adoption while minimizing program costs. This includes considerations like whether to provide upfront cost reductions, ongoing operational cost savings, or non-monetary benefits such as preferential parking or access to high occupancy vehicle lanes. By filling this gap, regional authorities can design incentive programs that are not

¹³¹ individuals or entities who would have acquired a clean transportation technology even without the incentive, but who take advantage of the program to reduce their costs

only more cost-effective, but also have a greater potential to influence consumer behavior and promote widespread adoption of clean transportation technologies.

- **Technological Advancements:** Improvements in lightweight materials, energy-efficient design, and advanced propulsion systems can significantly reduce the energy consumption and environmental impact of all types of vehicles. Such advancements will be needed for the zero-emission technology including BEVs to become a viable solution across all transportation modes.
- **Battery Technology:** Significant breakthroughs in battery technology are crucial for the successful adoption of battery electric technology, particularly in the heavy freight sector. The heavy freight industry requires vehicles with substantial power and range capabilities to handle long-distance hauling and heavy loads. Current battery technology faces limitations such as limited energy density and long charging times, which impede its viability in meeting the demanding requirements of the heavy freight sector. Additionally, current battery technology also poses the issue of significant weight addition to vehicles or equipment. The additional weight of batteries can disrupt the regular operation of heavy freight vehicles, impacting their payload capacity, maneuverability, and overall efficiency. Breakthroughs in battery technology, such as advancements in energy storage capacity, faster charging rates, and improved durability, are necessary to address these challenges. Addressing issues related to raw material availability and recycling will also be essential.
- **Longevity:** There are several uncertainties and knowledge gaps regarding the longevity of zero-emission technologies, particularly those used in EVs. The primary source of uncertainty is battery degradation, which can cause capacity loss and reduce overall range and performance. Environmental factors such as temperature and humidity can also impact performance and longevity, as can the durability of other components in EVs such as electric motors and power electronics. While ongoing research and development efforts are expected to improve our understanding of these factors, there is still a need for more long-term data on how zero-emission technologies will perform over the lifetime of a vehicle.
- **Safety:** Hydrogen is a highly flammable gas and requires special handling and storage procedures to ensure safety. While FCEVs are designed to be safe, there is still some concern about the potential for accidents or explosions. At the same time, EV batteries can pose safety risks, particularly in the event of a crash or fire. Lithium-ion batteries, which are commonly used in EVs, can catch fire or explode if they are damaged or punctured. There is a need for more research on how to prevent these types of incidents and how to safely manage and dispose of damaged or end-of-life batteries.
- **Ultra-High Power Charging Infrastructure:** While ultra-high power charging infrastructure for electric vehicles offers significant advantages, such as faster charging and reduced range anxiety, there are still several knowledge gaps that need to be addressed. Ultra-high-power charging can cause additional stress on EV batteries, which can lead to faster degradation and reduced battery life. There are also safety concerns related to the high levels of heat and electrical current generated by ultra-high power charging stations, and there is a need for more research on how to minimize these risks.
- **EVSE Standards:** There is currently no universal standard for EVSE. Different charging stations use different connectors and communication protocols, which can make it difficult for drivers to find a compatible charging station. This lack of standardization also makes it difficult for charging station manufacturers to scale up production and for utilities to manage the demand for electricity from EV charging. For example, currently DC fast charging infrastructure could use three different types of connectors: CHAdeMO, Combined Charging

System (CCS), and North American Charging Standard (NACS). While there have been national and regional efforts to standardize technology and improve features such as vehicle communication protocols¹³², the lack of universal EVSE standards presents significant challenges and barriers for large-scale EVSE deployment.

- **Grid Integration:** As the number of EVs on the road continues to increase, there is a growing concern regarding the potential impact on the electrical grid. Without adequate planning and integration strategies, the simultaneous charging of a large number of EVs could pose challenges to grid stability and even lead to blackouts. It is crucial to conduct further research to better comprehend the long-term demand for EV charging and its implications for electricity generation and distribution. This research should delve into understanding the patterns and behavior of EV charging, assessing the required infrastructure upgrades, and exploring innovative solutions such as smart grid technologies and demand response programs.
- **Energy Storage:** The intermittent nature of renewable energy sources, such as wind and solar, presents challenges when it comes to charging zero-emission vehicles. As these energy sources rely on natural elements, their generation is subject to variability and intermittency. To mitigate this challenge, energy storage solutions, such as batteries or hydrogen storage, can play a vital role in storing excess renewable energy during periods of high generation and making it available for use during periods of low generation. However, further research is necessary to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of energy storage systems specifically tailored for transportation applications. This research should focus on optimizing storage capacity, exploring advanced storage technologies, and developing intelligent energy management systems to ensure a seamless integration of renewable energy into the transportation sector.
- **Cybersecurity:** As vehicles become more connected and reliant on software and communication systems, it brings about a new set of cybersecurity risks. The integration of advanced clean technologies opens the possibility of hackers remotely accessing and compromising the vehicle or its systems, which can have serious implications for driver safety and privacy. To ensure the secure and resilient operation of clean technologies, further research is needed in developing robust cybersecurity measures. This research should encompass the exploration of encryption protocols, secure communication frameworks, and intrusion detection systems. Additionally, collaboration between automotive manufacturers, software developers, and cybersecurity experts is crucial to identify and address potential vulnerabilities, proactively prevent cyber-attacks, and swiftly respond to any emerging threats.
- **Automation and Artificial Intelligence:** Given the rapid advancements in clean technologies, a significant knowledge gap exists regarding the role of Automation, Artificial Intelligence (AI), and other IT developments in influencing their deployment and usage. As the transportation sector moves steadily toward a digitally-driven future, the integration of clean technologies with AI and automation holds the potential for transformative change. However, a lack of clear understanding of how these digital innovations will impact adoption patterns, operational efficiencies, and user behaviors with clean technologies not only complicates accurate forecasting and strategic planning but also risks overlooking potential synergies or challenges arising from the merger of clean technology and advanced digital tools.

¹³² California Public Utilities Commission, Resolution E-5175, available at <https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Published/G000/M424/K359/424359510.PDF>

5. Challenges and Barriers to Adoption

This section includes a summary of existing barriers and concerns related to the deployment of ZEV and NZEV technologies in the SCAG region. These barriers encompass various aspects, including cost, technology readiness, charging and fueling infrastructure access, technology awareness, and regulatory support.

5.1 Cost


The high cost of zero and near-zero emission technologies can significantly impede their adoption. The higher upfront cost of these technologies compared to traditional combustion engines can make it difficult for individuals and businesses to justify the investment, particularly for those with limited financial resources. As shown earlier in this report (Tables 10, 14, 15, 18, and 21), the upfront cost of zero and near-zero emission technologies is still much higher as compared to their conventional counterpart. For instance, a battery electric refuse truck may cost \$200,000 more upfront compared to a diesel model (Table 1) and a conventional passenger locomotive only costs around \$2.5 million, while its BEV models can cost anywhere between \$10 to \$12 million.¹³³ The high cost of these technologies is driven by a number of factors, including the cost of research and development, the need for specialized materials and components, and the limited scale of production. As production volumes increase, the cost of manufacturing can be reduced through economies of scale. However, when production volumes are low, the cost of manufacturing is higher, which can drive up the cost of the final product. Current CARB regulations set targets and fleet sales requirements, providing a signal for manufactures to scale up production. Figure 26 presents an example of declining costs of new technologies that CARB has projected as the market expands.¹³⁴ As indicated, the purchase price for clean technology vehicles is not anticipated to reach parity with that of their conventional counterparts. Nonetheless, as demonstrated in Section 4.1, some of these technologies present significant cost savings when evaluated based on their Total Cost of Ownership (TCO). Similarly, an NREL analysis has also demonstrated that ZEVs can achieve cost parity (in terms of TCO) with ICEs before 2035 for all MDVs and HDVs, however, the upfront cost is expected to remain higher than their counterpart ICE vehicles for the foreseeable future¹³⁵

¹³³Argonne National Laboratory, Total Cost of Ownership for Line Haul, Yard Switchers and Regional Passenger Locomotives Preliminary Results, <https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2019/04/f62/fcto-h2-at-rail-workshop-2019-ahluwalia.pdf>

¹³⁴ California Air Resources Board, Advanced Clean Fleets Regulation: Appendix G. Total Cost of Ownership Discussion Document, <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/barcu/regact/2022/acf22/appg.pdf>

¹³⁵ National Renewable Energy Lab, Decarbonizing Medium- & Heavy-Duty On-Road Vehicles: Zero-Emission Vehicles Cost Analysis, <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy22osti/82081.pdf>. Slide 45 demonstrates the vehicle cost projections.

Figure 26. Class 8 Day Cab Tractor New Vehicle Price Forecast.



The difficulties in complying with various performance standards and regulatory requirements can also contribute to the high cost of these technologies. Regulations related to safety, emissions, and vehicle standards can be complex and costly to navigate, particularly for smaller businesses. Compliance with these regulations can drive up the cost of developing and manufacturing zero and near-zero emission technologies. These factors can contribute to higher costs for consumers, which can make these technologies less accessible to a wider range of individuals and businesses.

5.2 Technology Readiness

A criterion for inclusion in the compendium was commercialization status, meaning the technology was available or close to being available. Upon investigation, our survey of products also included technologies in their early stages of development and may not be as reliable as conventional vehicles/equipment. The rail sector faces a significant commercialization barrier due to technology limitations, where less than five models are currently available for each application (Table 21). For example, the large size and weight of freight trains pose unique challenges for zero-emission technology and battery-electric systems may not have the necessary range or power to meet the demands of heavy freight trains without frequent recharging, which can significantly impact operations. Similar issues of vehicle range and compromised vehicle payload due to added battery weight also exist in the on-road heavy-duty truck sector (Table 15). While the emerging ultrafast charging techniques such as MCS may alleviate these concerns, the technologies are yet to be ready for commercialization and large-scale deployment. In another example, one of the primary challenges in the development of ultra high-power charging systems is the lack of reliable technology that can withstand the high-power demands of charging electric vehicles quickly. These charging systems require advanced power electronics and cooling systems to manage the high-power levels involved. In addition, existing technologies can also be further improved to ensure industry sustainability and business profitability. For example, the dependence of battery manufacturing on critical materials should be lessened given the limited mineral resources and the overall manufacturing process of new technologies also needs to be optimized to further reduce capital cost. Developing and improving these systems requires significant investment in research and development as well as rigid and reliable testing protocols to ensure reliability and safety.

5.3 Lack of Charging and Fueling Infrastructure

The availability and accessibility of infrastructure needed to power clean technologies, such as charging or hydrogen refueling stations can be a major barrier to adoption. The insufficient access to infrastructure can significantly limit the

practicality of using these technologies. For example, it has been estimated that the SCAG region may need between 185,000 and 564,000 EVCS by the end of the decade, while the region currently only hosts 33,000 Level 2 and 3,700 DCFC stations (Figure 20).¹³⁶ The lack of charging access poses severe concerns of regional transition to zero-emission medium and heavy-duty vehicles as the high-power demands and limited range of these vehicles require specialized charging infrastructure. With respect to hydrogen fueling stations, the California Fuel Cell Revolution has projected that 1,800 stations will be needed for the entire state to support the deployment of 1.8 million FCEV operated on-road¹³⁷, while there are in total 54 available retail hydrogen stations in California as of August 2023.¹³⁸ A majority of these stations will fall within the SCAG region given the critical role it plays in regional passenger and freight transportation, and expanding the current network to meet regional demand requires significant investment in research and development, infrastructure, and coordination among stakeholders in the next decades (Figure 23).

In addition, in order to successfully transition line-haul trucks operating interstate to zero-emission technologies, a national network of charging or fueling infrastructure is a necessity. These heavy-duty trucks, often traveling vast distances across states, will rely heavily on the availability and accessibility of charging or refueling stations. Federal incentive programs such as NEVI and the Clean Heavy-Duty Vehicle Program can facilitate the buildout of infrastructure across state borders, but they cannot ensure sufficient access can be provided to interstate transportation. Due to inconsistent ZEV adoption targets, the time alignment for infrastructure buildout will also be difficult to navigate. The installation of charging and refueling infrastructure for medium and heavy-duty vehicles can be costly and complex, requiring significant investment in electrical infrastructure and coordination among government agencies, utility companies, and private sector stakeholders.

The challenge faced by freight rail is similar to the one mentioned earlier but on a much larger scale. Although battery-electric and hydrogen fuel cell technologies have been developed and utilized in certain light rail and commuter rail systems, achieving zero emissions for freight locomotives necessitates a substantial investment in nationwide charging or fueling infrastructure.

5.4 Lack of Consumer Knowledge & Awareness

According to a recent poll conducted by the Associated Press and the University of Chicago, more than 45% of respondents indicated that they would not purchase an electric vehicle as their next car.¹³⁹ Consumers might not be aware of the benefits of zero and near-zero transportation technologies or may be hesitant to switch from their traditional vehicles, which can be a significant barrier to adoption. One of the main reasons for this lack of knowledge and awareness is the limited availability of information and education about these technologies. Consumers may not be aware of the different types of zero and near-zero emission technologies available, their performance characteristics, or the potential cost savings associated with them. Furthermore, there may be misconceptions about the reliability and safety of these technologies. In a survey conducted by SCAG, the top concerns for EV adoption by survey respondents are purchase cost, limited range, lack of public or home access to EV charging, and preferred vehicle type not available.¹³⁶ While general consumers may have doubts about reliability of battery-electric vehicles, or the safety of hydrogen fuel cell vehicles, commercial fleets and owners-operators may be concerned with the range,

¹³⁶ Southern California Association of Governments, SCAG EV Charging Station Study, https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/final_report_and_regional_pev_plan.pdf?1684341506

¹³⁷ California Air Resources Board, Hydrogen Station Network Self-Sufficiency Analysis per Assembly Bill 8, https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2021-10/hydrogen_self_sufficiency_report.pdf

¹³⁸ Hydrogen Fuel Cell Partnership, FCEV Sales, FCEB, & Hydrogen Station Data, https://h2fcp.org/by_the_numbers

¹³⁹ 2023 AP-NORC/EPIC Energy Survey, https://epic.uchicago.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/EPIC-Energy-Policy-Survey-2023_Topline.pdf

charging time, and the additional weight of battery-electric vehicles. According to a recent study conducted by NV Energy, 49% fleet respondents indicated limited driving range remains the biggest barrier to purchase or lease EV, and both charging infrastructure logistics and limited hauling capacity are also among the top 5 choices.¹⁴⁰ In addition, while there have been numerous policies and programs at federal, state, and local level to support the deployment of ZEV and NZEV technologies, consumers (both general consumers as well as fleet) may have limited understanding to fully digest and take advantage of these existing programs and the administrative barriers are high. The lack of consumer knowledge and awareness can also impact demand for these technologies. Without a significant level of demand, manufacturers may be less likely to invest in the research and development necessary to improve the technology, reduce costs, and expand availability.

5.5 Regulatory support

Performance Targets

The lack of robust regulatory support in setting performance targets for vehicles and equipment serves as a significant barrier to the widespread adoption of clean transportation technologies. Regulation plays a critical role in establishing the benchmarks and standards to which manufacturers should aspire, incentivizing technological advancements and encouraging market competitiveness. However, without specific, ambitious targets in place, manufacturers may lack the incentive to develop and integrate cleaner technologies into their vehicles and equipment, impeding the industry's transition toward cleaner technologies. Furthermore, this regulatory gap may contribute to uncertainty among potential adopters of clean technologies, as they cannot rely on a standard baseline of performance or efficiency. A notable example of the lack of ambitious goals and targets slowing technology advancement is the state of rail technology in the U.S., specifically in the context of zero emission rail systems. The most common form of rail propulsion in the country is still diesel-electric, which is not only less efficient but also more environmentally detrimental than zero-emission alternatives. Other countries, such as Germany¹⁴¹, have already started testing and deploying hydrogen-powered trains. Despite the technology's potential, the U.S. has been slow to set targets or incentives for the adoption of hydrogen or electric rail propulsion.

Standardization

The lack of regulatory guidance in establishing design and standard protocols for clean technology infrastructure is a significant impediment to the uptake of these technologies. Regulatory parameters play a key role in promoting the creation of infrastructure that is universally adaptable and highly efficient, ensuring its suitability for a wide range of vehicles and equipment. However, in the absence of such regulatory frameworks, issues of inconsistency and incompatibility may surface across distinct charging and refueling stations, leading to user inconvenience and hindering adoption. This regulatory void also fosters uncertainty among infrastructure developers and investors, potentially slowing the pace of infrastructure development and diversification. Consequently, without a well-structured, standardized regulatory approach to ZEV infrastructure, the journey toward a fully clean and sustainable transportation network faces notable challenges.

¹⁴⁰ NV Energy, Fleet Customer EV Survey 2022, https://www.nvenergy.com/publish/content/dam/nvenergy/brochures_arch/cleanenergy/ertep/Fleet-Customer-EV-Survey.pdf

¹⁴¹ <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smart-news/hydrogen-powered-passenger-trains-are-now-running-in-germany-180980706/>

Incentives

The lack of regulatory support, such as incentives for purchasing zero and near-zero transportation technologies or clear performance targets, can also be a barrier to adoption. Furthermore, inconsistent, or ambiguous regulations can create uncertainty and slow down the development and adoption of these technologies. Varying regulations across different jurisdictions create a complex and uncertain landscape for businesses and individuals seeking to invest in and deploy these technologies. Inconsistencies may include conflicting emission standards across state and national borders, differing incentives and subsidies or frequent changes to existing programs, and disparate charging standards or operating protocols. These inconsistencies not only lead to confusion but also impede the scalability of these clean technology solutions. The lack of harmonization between federal and state regulations creates barriers to market entry and expansion, discouraging potential adopters and stifling innovation in the clean transportation sector.

Government support in the form of financial incentives is crucial to address the cost disparity, also known as the “green premium,” between clean technologies and conventional counterparts in the near term. These financial incentives help bridge the affordability gap, making clean technologies more accessible and attractive to consumers and businesses. By offsetting the higher upfront costs associated with clean transportation solutions, governments can incentivize adoption and drive market demand. This support is particularly important until economies of scale are achieved, enabling the production and deployment of clean technologies at a larger scale, which can help close the cost gap organically over time. Without this support, the adoption of clean transportation technologies may be significantly slowed down or even stalled altogether and resulting in uneven and delayed adoption across different socioeconomic groups.

Permitting

Regulatory guidelines for permitting can streamline the deployment of crucial infrastructure such as charging and fueling stations and clarify the legal and safety requirements for clean technology implementation. However, the absence of clear and unified permitting processes can result in bureaucratic complexities and delays, hindering efforts to build out necessary infrastructure and adopt clean technologies at a larger scale. This lack of standardized regulatory protocols can also contribute to significant disparities in the availability and accessibility of clean technology infrastructure across different regions, thereby further inhibiting widespread adoption.

6. Recommendations

As part of its ongoing metropolitan planning efforts, SCAG can facilitate regional discussion with stakeholders on potential next steps, roles, and responsibilities to better facilitate the advancement of the clean transportation technologies in the region. This section summarizes a comprehensive list of recommendations to facilitate the regional transition to ZEV and NZEV technologies.

6.1 Targeted Incentive Programs

State and federal funding and grants can be used to encourage regional ZEVs and NZEVs deployment. For instance, in February 2022, SCAG awarded a total of \$6.75 million to six projects across the region designed to promote clean transportation and reduce harmful emissions during last-mile freight and delivery operations. These six projects are in addition to 26 clean-energy projects that awarded a total of \$10 million in 2021 under SCAG's Last-Mile Freight Program, funded through the state's Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee (MSRC).¹⁴²

While there are a number of incentive programs at the state and federal level, there is still a significant gap for low- and moderate-income communities to deploy NZEVs and ZEVs. For example, a study conducted in California has found income- and advantage-based disparities in the adoption of EVs through CVRP. Equity analysis indicated that the bottom 75% based on median income census tracts receives only 38% of the total PEVs subsidies, while the top 12.5% of the most advantaged census tracts receives a quarter of the total rebate amount. It was also evident that the gradual closing of EV incentive equity gaps is accelerated in the aftermath of an income-cap and low-income rebate increase policy, which was implemented in 2016.¹⁴³ Therefore, it is important to develop and adopt more equitable incentive mechanisms, potentially including income-caps and tiers, adding pre-owned vehicles to subsidized inventory, and taking into consideration regional socio-economic characteristics in order to bridge existing disparities in the adoption of clean vehicles.

Given the existing grants and funding programs discussed in Section 2, potential additional incentive programs should focus on reducing the upfront costs of ZEV and NZEV equipment and prioritizing clean technology deployment in Disadvantaged Communities (DACs) or low-income communities (LICs).

- **Purchase incentives:** Provide financial incentives to consumers who purchase clean transportation technologies, such as electric or hydrogen fuel cell vehicles. These incentives can take the form of rebates, or grants, such as targeted incentive programs for pre-owned vehicle purchase and electrical mobility, or programs designated to low-income applicants, small businesses or independent owner-operators, etc.
- **Infrastructure incentives:** Provide incentives for the installation of infrastructure, such as charging or refueling stations, to support the use of clean transportation technologies. This can include grants or other financial support for the construction or operation of these facilities. SCAG has already published an EV Charging Station Funding Guide¹⁴⁴ that documented all the existing funding opportunities provided by federal, state, and local jurisdictions within in the region to reduce the cost of EV infrastructure or EVs for municipal and commercial fleets specific to Passenger Electric Vehicles (PEV). Additional programs may be needed to

¹⁴² California Association of Councils of Governments, SCAG Awards \$7 Million for Last Mile Freight Electrification, <https://calcoq.org/scag-last-mile-freight-electrification/>

¹⁴³ Guo et al., Disparities and Equity Issues in Electric Vehicles Rebate Allocation, Energy Policy (154), 2021, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421521001609>

¹⁴⁴ SCAG, EV Charging Station Funding Guide, https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/ev_funding_guide.pdf?1684340967

accelerate the deployment of charging and fueling infrastructure within DACs and LICs, and to encourage clean and renewable energy generation and distribution.

- **Access incentives:** These types of incentives can promote the use of clean transportation technologies in certain areas or for certain purposes. For example, cities and local jurisdictions can fund programs such as free parking or toll discounts for electric or hydrogen fuel cell vehicles and launch low or zero-emission zones. As early as 2020, SCAG already partnered with the Los Angeles Cleantech Incubator (LACI) to launch the country's first Zero Emission Delivery Zone (ZEDZ) Pilot in the City of Santa Monica, followed by a similar program launched in Los Angeles in 2021.^{145, 146} The pilot program lasted for about two years and incentivized clean, electric delivery vehicles by offering priority curb space in a one-square mile test zone in Downtown Santa Monica and along Main Street. Funded through a DOE grant, SCAG and LACI built upon these efforts to harness curb management to prioritize ZEVs by extensively scaling to deployments in two U.S. metropolitan areas with the worst air quality, the Los Angeles area and Pittsburgh, PA. By utilizing data – both from initial deployments in the two Los Angeles area cities and Pittsburgh enabled by computer vision – this program informed real-world implementation and scale up of urban zero emission curb zones and provided cities across the country with a roadmap for using curbside management as a key tool to accelerate electrification and improve efficiency and accessibility in the transportation sector, specifically for delivery and TNCs. This project demonstrates a role for access or operational incentives. Providing more similar funding opportunities can help deploy, implement, and utilize ZEV or NZEV technologies in various areas across the region.
- **Research and development incentives:** Provide funding or other support for research and development of new clean transportation technologies, including funding for research institutions or startup companies. As mentioned in Section 5, large-scale deployment of ZEV and NZEV technology will rely heavily on technological advancements, and funding can support scientific research that aim to reduce battery weight and cost, optimize battery manufacturing process, improve charging time and cycle, advance V2G technology, upgrade current clean vehicle design, and generate clean upstream energy.

6.2 Public Education & Outreach

Public education and outreach play a critical role in accelerating the adoption of clean technologies. By raising awareness and knowledge about the benefits and availability of clean technologies, the public can make informed choices and actively participate in the clean technology transition. Additionally, effective outreach efforts can address misconceptions, dispel myths, and alleviate concerns surrounding clean technologies, fostering greater acceptance and confidence in their use. The project team has identified several outreach and engagement strategies that can support identifying, understanding, and addressing concerns and barriers related to regional clean technology deployment. Public education campaigns can increase awareness of the benefits of zero and near-zero transportation technologies, such as reduced emissions and lower operating costs. These campaigns can include information on available technologies, incentives and other government support programs, and how to access them. Existing programs and resources can be leveraged, such as the General Assembly¹⁴⁷, the Regional Planning Working Groups

¹⁴⁵ City of Santa Monica, Zero Emission Delivery Zone, <https://www.santamonica.gov/zero-emission-delivery-zone>

¹⁴⁶ City of Los Angeles, Zero Emission Delivery Zone, https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2021/21-0147_rpt_dot.pdf

¹⁴⁷ SCAG, General Assembly, <https://scag.ca.gov/leadership-general-assembly>

(RPWG)¹⁴⁸ or through sponsorships or collaborations with others. Specific education and outreach programs can include:

- **Informational campaigns:** This could include a platform (e.g., website, smart phone app, or article subscriptions service) that can help **to educate** the public about the benefits of zero and near-zero transportation technologies. These campaigns can include information about the technologies themselves, available government support programs and incentives, and the environmental and economic benefits of switching to cleaner transportation options.
- **Test drive events:** Local manufacturers and dealerships can organize test drive events for zero and near-zero transportation technologies to provide the public with hands-on experience and demonstrate the practicality and effectiveness of these technologies.
- **Workshops and seminars:** Workshops and seminars are useful tools to educate the public about the technical aspects of zero and near-zero transportation technologies, such as charging or refueling infrastructure, battery technology, and energy management systems.
- **Public-private partnerships:** Collaboration between public and private sector partners, such as auto manufacturers or technology companies, can support joint education and outreach events, such as technology showcases or seminars.
- **Community events:** Collaboration between local jurisdictions, communities, and non-profit organizations to leverage community events, such as fairs and festivals, can promote zero and near-zero transportation technologies and provide information about government support programs and incentives. Through the recent PEV Study, SCAG conducted such outreach at 15 community events.

6.3 Building Codes

Local jurisdictions can implement building codes that encourage the development of infrastructure to support zero and near-zero transportation technologies. For example, in early 2023, the City of Los Angeles has just announced its amendments to its previous code, the 2020 Los Angeles Green Building Code (GBC) to increase requirements for electric vehicle parking. The updated GBC has set a 30% EV capable requirement for multifamily developments within the city.¹⁴⁹ Building codes can play an important role to ensure access to charging for multifamily housing, commercial districts, hotels, and recreation areas, etc. In addition, they also help to improve accessibility for people with disabilities. Several building code updates that local jurisdictions within the region can consider include:

- **EV-Ready parking:** Requiring new developments to have a certain number of parking spaces that are "EV-Ready," means they have the necessary infrastructure in place to support the installation of electric vehicle charging stations. This can include provisions for conduit, wiring, and other necessary electrical infrastructure for as many variations of zoning as possible.
- **EV-Only parking:** Designated "EV-Only" parking spaces can help to encourage the use of electric vehicles and promote the development of charging infrastructure.

¹⁴⁸ SCAG, Regional Planning Working Groups, <https://scag.ca.gov/regional-planning-working-groups>

¹⁴⁹ City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety, Green Building, <https://www.ladbs.org/forms-publications/forms/green-building>

- **EV charging infrastructure in existing buildings:** Requiring the installation of EV charging infrastructure in existing buildings, such as parking garages and office buildings, can help to expand the availability of charging infrastructure and make it more convenient for electric vehicle owners. Local governments may also establish policies where other building upgrades trigger the need for parking to be become EV ready.
- **Green building codes (GBC):** Adoption of GBCs could require new buildings to meet certain sustainability standards, such as energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy sources, informed by best practices that have already been developed and implemented by sister agencies such as City of San Diego's Zero Emissions Municipal Buildings and Operations Policy (ZEMBOP).¹⁵⁰ This can help to promote the adoption of zero and near-zero transportation technologies, as they are often used in conjunction with renewable energy sources.

6.4 Land Use & Zoning

Land use policies, and zoning regulations are also effective strategies at the local level to ensure charging and fueling is an allowed land use (either as an accessory or a principal use) in a variety of zoning classifications and to promote adoption of zero and near-zero emission technologies. Innovative planning and local development projects aimed at optimally coordinating land use with transportation measures to enhance mobility, livability, prosperity, and sustainability within the region will help local jurisdictions to balance future mobility and transportation needs with economic, environmental, and public health goals. Specific examples to update land use and zoning policies include:

- **Leverage Public Property:** Cities and municipalities can identify and allocate public land for ZEV infrastructure development, such as government-owned parking lots, parks, or underutilized spaces. This can help reduce land acquisition costs, streamline the development process, and provide accessible charging and fueling facilities to the public. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), for example, has installed chargers on streetlamp posts near curbside parking through its incentives for low-income households to adopt EVs.¹⁵¹
- **Land Banking:** Local governments can develop policies and programs to acquire and hold land specifically for future ZEV infrastructure development. This proactive approach can help ensure that suitable land is available as demand for ZEV infrastructure increases.
- **Amend Zoning and Land Use Regulations:** Cities and counties can revise zoning and land use regulations to facilitate ZEV infrastructure development. This could include permitting charging stations in residential and commercial zones and creating designated zones for hydrogen refueling stations. For example, ever since Petaluma banned the creation, expansion, reconstruction, and relocation of gas stations in 2021, multiple California cities have also been consider taking similar measure through zoning amendment to encourage the transition to stations that serve electric and hydrogen-powered vehicles.¹⁵²
- **Streamline Permitting Processes:** Local jurisdictions can simplify and expedite permitting processes for ZEV infrastructure projects, reducing bureaucratic hurdles and approval times. This can encourage private

¹⁵⁰ City of San Diego, Municipal Energy Implementation Plan,

https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/city_of_san_diego_municipal_energy_implementation_plan_0.pdf


¹⁵¹ LA Lights, Streetlight EV Charging Stations, https://lalights.lacity.org/connected-infrastructure/ev_stations.html

¹⁵² Los Angeles Times, Petaluma first city in nation to ban new gas stations, <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2021-03-04/sixteen-gas-stations-for-60-000-people-thats-enough-petaluma-says>

developers to invest in ZEV infrastructure. AB 1236 (Chiu, 2015), also known as California's permit streamlining law, requires all jurisdictions to enact and implement a streamlined permitting process for charging station applications.¹⁵³ The "EVCS Permit Streamlining Map" shows the status of permit streamlining across the region (Figure 26). Most of the local jurisdictions have already streamlined the permitting process and some also hosted listening sessions to better understand regional barriers facing EVCS permitting.¹³⁶

- **Incentives for developers:** Local governments can secure incentives for developers to include EV charging infrastructure in their projects, such as by offering tax credits or grants for the installation of charging stations.

Figure 27. EVCS Permit Streamlining Map for SCAG. Accessed June 2023¹⁵⁴



6.5 Promoting Public-Private-Partnership (P3) Business Models

While SCAG, local jurisdictions, and municipal agencies will continue to provide funding for clean technology deployment, promoting public-private partnerships and exploring alternative financing or ownership models can help to further relieve financial burdens. As mentioned in the SCAG EV Charging Station Funding Guide, there are many existing P3 models that aim to bring together the resources and expertise of both the public and private sectors to accelerate the deployment of clean technologies. The existing Clean Cities Coalition¹⁵⁵ can be leveraged to coordinate the activities for both private and public sector proponents of clean technologies to discover commonalities, collaborate on public policy, and investigate opportunities for joint project. Collaboration with private sector partners, such as utility companies, can help develop and implement infrastructure and technology projects. This can include the development of charging or refueling stations, investment in renewable energy sources, or partnerships to develop new technology solutions. Specific strategies include:

- **Public-private funding:** Apply and provide fundings to private sector companies, such as through grants or loans, to support the development of zero-emission transportation technologies, infrastructure, and related research and development.
- **Demonstration projects:** Partner with private sector companies to develop and implement demonstration projects for zero-emission transportation technologies, such as pilot programs for electric or hydrogen fuel cell buses or zero emission freight rail. These projects can help demonstrate the viability and effectiveness of

¹⁵³ AB 1236, as amended, Chiu. Local ordinances: electric vehicle charging stations, http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/asm/ab_1201-1250/ab_1236_bill_20150827_amended_sen_v95.htm

¹⁵⁴ CA Electric Vehicle Charging Station Permit Streamlining Map, <https://california.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=5b34002aaffa4ac08b84d24016bf04ce>

¹⁵⁵ SCAG, Clean Cities Coalition, <https://scag.ca.gov/clean-cities>

these technologies and pave the way for wider adoption. A great example of public-private partnerships on demonstration projects is the Joint Electric Truck Scaling Initiative (JETSI) project which aimed at introducing cutting-edge innovation and best practices to facilitate the large-scale deployment of Class 8 battery-electric trucks in North America. Spearheaded by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD), JETSI is a collaborative effort involving various public and private organizations, with a mission to deploy 100 battery electric regional haul and drayage trucks in Southern California.

- **Training and workforce development:** Work with private sector partners to provide training and workforce development programs for the deployment and maintenance of zero-emission transportation technologies. This can help to create a skilled workforce that is prepared to support the growing demand for these technologies. Organizations and institutions such as vocational rehabilitation programs, non-profits, school districts, community college consortiums can develop training programs for ZEV and NZEV workforce, and design targeted programs for DACs.
- **Joint research and development:** Partner with local universities and research institutions to conduct joint research and development on zero-emission transportation technologies, such as battery technology or fuel cell technology. This can help to accelerate the development of new and more effective technologies and reduce costs through economies of scale.

6.6 Technical Assistance

Providing technical assistance to local partners, such as transit agencies or local governments, can help them evaluate and implement zero-emission transportation technologies. This can include providing guidance on vehicle procurement, infrastructure development, and policy and regulatory issues. Specific strategies include:

- **Providing information and resources:** Provide regional partners with information and resources related to zero and near-zero emission technologies, such as vehicle types and specifications, charging and refueling infrastructure, and funding and incentive programs available for their implementation. SCAG has already led the development of a visionary Regional Data Platform (RDP), which serves as a clearinghouse of demographic, economic, land-use and transportation data while providing technical resources for in-depth analysis locally and regionally.¹⁵⁶ Tools such as RDP can be updated and expanded for future ZEV and NZEV information and resource sharing.
- **Developing implementation strategies:** Assist local partners in developing implementation strategies for zero and near-zero emission technologies, such as developing plans for fleet conversions or establishing partnerships with private sector companies for infrastructure development. For example, currently SCAG is developing plan for a zero-emission charging and fueling network for medium and heavy-duty vehicles in the region. The projects involve studying truck travel patterns, understanding fueling needs, and involving key stakeholders, with the goal of establishing a blueprint for deployment of the needed infrastructure to support zero emission medium- and heavy-duty operation in the region.

¹⁵⁶ SCAG, Final SCAG Future Communities Framework, https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/final_scafuturecommunitiesframework.pdf?1604269152

- **Conducting feasibility studies:** Conduct feasibility studies to assess the potential for the adoption of zero and near-zero emission technologies in different local contexts, such as city centers, rural areas, or the Port, and provide guidance on the most effective strategies for implementation.
- **Sharing best practices:** In January 2021, SCAG kicked off the Electric Vehicle Charging Station Study (EVCSS), partnering with 18 cities to help local jurisdictions promote development and deployment of EV charging infrastructure to accelerate transportation electrification. This program has offered valuable opportunities for members to share policy guidance around station permitting, outreach materials and findings, EV planning guides for cities and property developers, a regionwide Site Suitability Analysis to target areas for future EV charging infrastructure, and initial conceptual plans for site locations. Sharing best practices and lessons learned from successful implementation of zero and near-zero emission technologies in other regions, as well as providing guidance on how to overcome barriers and challenges in their implementation, can help local jurisdictions navigate the complexities of adopting and integrating clean technologies into their transportation systems.
- **Advocating for policy and regulatory changes:** Advocate for policy and regulatory changes at the state or federal level to support the adoption of zero and near-zero emission technologies, such as emissions standards, tax incentives, or funding programs. As SCAG shares its border with Nevada, Arizona, and Northern Baja California, inconsistent ZEV or NZEV policies across state and national borders may place significant barriers for both passenger and goods movements across borders.

6.7 Workforce Development

With the large-scale adoption of ZEV and NZEV technology, the skills, knowledge, and experience required by workers in passenger and freight transportation, utilities, and vehicle operation and maintenance industry will significantly differ from those in the conventional realm. School districts, training programs, community colleges and universities can develop educational programs that focus on zero and near-zero transportation technologies. Specific strategies may include:

- **Developing curriculum materials:** The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics has highlighted the importance to generate demand for labor in three main areas: the design and development of electric vehicle models, the production of batteries that power them, and the installation and maintenance of charging infrastructure.¹⁵⁷ To ensure a functional and sustainable transition to clean technologies, resources and educational supplies are needed to prepare regional workforce, which includes, but not limited to technicians, drivers, electricians, assemblers and fabricators, urban planners, chemists, software and hardware engineers, etc.
- **Providing funding for student research projects:** This report has emphasized the importance of research and development to technological advancement on multiple occasions. In addition to assisting professionals to better adjust and adapt to the transition, it is also important to secure and provide funding for student research projects that can enhance the sustainable development of the clean technologies and foster technological innovations. For instance, multiple research institutes across Southern California have already been awarded with DOE grants to produce, store, and deploy clean hydrogen, such as a photoelectrochemical hydrogen generator project led by the California Institute of Technology and a high-performing fuel cell MD/HD

¹⁵⁷ Bureau of Labor Statistics, Charging into the Future: the Transition to Electric Vehicles, <https://www.bls.gov/opub/btn/volume-12/charging-into-the-future-the-transition-to-electric-vehicles.htm>

application study conducted by the University of California, Irvine.¹⁵⁸ Expanded funding opportunities can also nurture interests and prepare the young generation to be equipped with the knowledge and the expertise required for successful careers in the ZEV and NZEV industry.

6.8 Lead by Example

Local governments and public agencies can lead by example by converting their own fleets to zero and near-zero transportation technologies. This can serve as a demonstration of the technology's effectiveness and practicality, as well as provide a market for emerging technology providers. In addition, integrating regional or local ZEV or NZEV deployment goals and targets can be developed and integrated into future planning efforts to set and update local clean technology adoption targets. Specific strategies include:

- **Setting targets:** Local and regional governments can set ambitious targets, ahead of the state mandated goals, for the adoption of zero-emission transportation in their own fleets and establish a timeline for achieving these targets. Metrics and methodology to monitor the progress of clean technology adoption and impact of ZEV and NZEV adoption on local air quality can be developed in collaboration with local jurisdictions and air districts.
- **Fleet Transition:** Local jurisdictions can convert their own fleets to ZEVs or NZEVs, demonstrating the technology's effectiveness and practicality, as well as provide a market for emerging technology providers. As part of this, these public agencies can share lessons learned from fleet transition, which may provide valuable insights and facilitate a greater understanding of the benefits and challenges associated with adopting clean technologies.
- **Developing charging and refueling infrastructure:** Local and regional governments can seek grants and funding to develop the necessary infrastructure to support zero-emission transportation, such as charging or refueling stations, in their own facilities and public spaces.

¹⁵⁸ U.S. Department of Energy, Selections for Funding Opportunity in Support of the Hydrogen Shot and a University Research Consortium on Grid Resilience, <https://www.energy.gov/eere/fuelcells/selections-funding-opportunity-support-hydrogen-shot-and-university-research>

Appendix A: Technology Compendium Survey

The technology compendium survey received a total of 23 responses. However, upon careful evaluation, three did not meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in this compendium. In this document, we are providing summaries of 19 out of these 20 acceptable responses. It is noteworthy that Exprolink had initially provided two separate entries, but for the purposes of this summary and to avoid redundancy, we have combined them into a single entry. The information provided in these summaries underscores the diverse range of companies working in the zero- or near-zero emission transportation technology space, each contributing distinct solutions to advance this critical field.

Alternative fueling/charging infrastructure

1. Anonymous Vendor

- Manufactures Level 2 Charging stations and aggregated all of the DCFC manufacturers, also develops the software systems that operate these machines.
- Annual production capacity of 100,000 units.
- Challenges include regulatory hurdles, knowledge gaps, and insufficient public incentives.
- The product retails for \$4200 with an annual software cost of \$450/year/port.
- Annual maintenance costs of \$450, which includes lifetime warranty costs as long as the customer continues using the software
- Compatible with various vehicles and chargers.
- Power system stability: Local load management capabilities, OpenADR certified.

2. Sesame Solar

- Manufactures off-grid, renewable powered nanogrids using solar and green hydrogen.
- Annual production capacity of 500-1000 units.
- Challenges include their primary focus on decarbonizing disaster response.
- Costs range from \$150,000 to \$400,000 depending on design requirements.
- Annual maintenance costs are still under development.
- Compatible with transit buses, commercial vehicles, and residential use.
- Power system stability: Nanogrids can serve as backup energy to facilities.

3. City of Manhattan Beach

- Installs public EV charging stations.
- Faces supply chain issues, regulatory hurdles, and insufficient public incentives.
- Annual maintenance cost includes electric usage costs.

4. GoPowerEV

- Provides scalable and affordable EV charging for multifamily.
- Production capacity is in the thousands.
- Challenges include insufficient public incentives and support programs.
- Total installed cost is typically less than \$2000 per parking space.
- Annual maintenance cost is \$15/month or <\$200 per year.
- Power system stability: Shifts charging to off-peak hours for grid optimization.

5. Hydrogen Fuel Cell Partnership

- Helps all stakeholders advance their collective efforts, but does not manufacture, sell, or regulate specific technology.
- Challenges include supply chain issues, regulatory hurdles, labor constraints, and more.
- Pricing and maintenance cost information is not applicable for this respondent.

6. BayoTech

- Produces hydrogen which can be net-zero with RNG, produces trailers which can transport gaseous H2 to support fuel cell applications.
- Has 2 production units and 75 transports.
- Challenges include supply chain issues, regulatory hurdles, manufacturing constraints.
- Transport costs between 200k - 1.1M and production costs 10-15M.
- Annual maintenance cost for transport is 50k-100k.
- Compatible with transit buses and Fuel Cell fueling station resupply.

7. BP Pulse Fleet North America Inc. (- Charging Solutions

- Provides Level 2 and DC fast chargers, Inrush, mobile and non-permanent charging solutions.
- No maximum capacity limitation.
- Challenges include knowledge gaps and insufficient public incentives.
- Cost and maintenance fees are dependent on the solution selected. More complex solutions result in higher costs and maintenance fees.

8. Core States Energy

- Provides turn-key design-build solutions for zero-emission vehicle infrastructure and distributed energy systems, including DC fast charging stations.
- The annual production capacity is 5000.

- Challenges include supply chain issues, regulatory hurdles, manufacturing constraints, labor constraints, power grid constraints, knowledge gaps, insufficient public incentives, and insufficient support programs.
- Each DCFC dispenser costs \$200,000 and the annual maintenance cost is 5% of the design-build.

Vehicles

9. Proterra

- Manufactures the leading battery electric bus with the highest amount of energy.
- Annual production capacity of 500 to 750 buses.
- Challenges include supply chain issues.
- Costs range from \$900,000 to \$1,000,000 per bus.
- Annual maintenance costs average around \$0.70/mile.
- Buses and chargers work with all types of chargers and buses.
- Power system stability: Buses, charge management, and fleet microgrid solutions enhance stability in power systems.

10. Forum Mobility

- Develops, owns, and operates heavy-duty charging infrastructure for Class 8 electric trucks. They also purchase Class 8 electric trucks and lease them to Owner/Operators, Carriers and other Fleets.
- Developing facilities to charge over 600 Class 8 electric trucks.
- Challenges include supply chain, regulatory hurdles, manufacturing constraints, labor constraints, and more.
- Construction costs between \$10MM to \$20MM.
- Maintenance cost is to be determined.
- Power system stability: Integrating onsite Distributed Energy Resources and Vehicle to Grid capabilities.

11. Exprolink, Inc.

- Offers all electric compact street sweeper and ride-on litter vacuums applicable to municipal, county, private, industrial, and commercial entities
- Can produce 30-50 units annually.
- Challenges include manufacturing constraints.
- Pricing and maintenance cost information is not provided.

12. Volvo Group North America

- Offers medium- and heavy-duty trucks (short-haul), refuse trucks, transit buses, construction equipment, and more.
- Challenges include supply chain issues, regulatory hurdles, manufacturing constraints, and more.
- Pricing and maintenance cost information is not disclosed but refers to HVIP/CORE program documents for products part of the programs.

13. Hyzon Motors USA

- Offers hydrogen fuel cell electric Class 8 trucks for up to 82,000 lbs. GCVWR (Gross Combination Vehicle Weight Rating).
- Large production capacity.
- Challenges include insufficient public incentives.
- Vehicles are priced starting at \$590,000.
- Estimated annual maintenance cost is about \$0.18/mi.

14. Energy, Efficiency & Environment, Inc.

- Offers a prototype semi-tractor for on-road heavy-duty vehicle application, and a transport refrigerated unit/In-field pre-cooling unit with zero emissions.
- In the next two years, they plan to produce 50 units.
- The challenge they face is getting sufficient investment.
- Each 6 cube, 53' trailer costs \$262,000 and the annual maintenance cost per 6 cube chassis is \$5,500 annually.
- Utilizes standard kingpin, compatible with various chassis types.

Supporting Products

15. BorgWarner

- Offers high power (60-360kW) DCFC with V2G/V2X capabilities and options for sequential or parallel charging, compliant with the NEVI program.
- Can produce 6,000 units annually.
- Facing knowledge gaps as a barrier.
- Product costs range from up to \$80,000 with an annual maintenance cost of \$3,500.
- Compatible with passenger vehicles, MD/HD vehicles, as well as school and transit buses.
- Power system stability: V2G/V2X capabilities

16. Anonymous Vendor

- Focused on developing transportation electrification (charging) infrastructure for large institutions' vehicle fleets.
- Effectively unlimited production capacity.
- Unknown in the electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) market segment.
- Comprehensive pricing and maintenance costs table available upon request.
- Can support fleets with light, medium, and heavy-duty vehicles.
- Power system stability: Charging Management Software and Energy Management Software optimize energy demand and supply.

17. The Mobility House

- Offers ChargePilot, a local hardware and cloud-based, interoperable charge management system.
- Can produce over 1000 units annually.
- Challenges include regulatory hurdles and knowledge gaps.
- Pricing depends on several factors including the number of chargers, fleet size, and voltage.
- Maintenance costs are covered under the software subscription model.
- Supports all EVs and chargers using industry standard protocols.
- With respect to limitations, chargers not using OCPP 1.6J or allowing third-party control are not compatible.
- Power system stability: Enhances stability by controlling EV load and responding to changing conditions.

18. BP Pulse Fleet North America Inc. - Omega™ CMS

- Produces a charge management system that optimizes charging, improves reliability of operations, and dynamically responds to events in real-time.
- There's no maximum capacity. It's hardware agnostic and can be added to chargers to improve operations.
- Challenges include power grid constraints, knowledge gaps, and insufficient public incentives and support programs.
- Pricing is based on scope, and no maintenance cost is incurred.
- Hardware agnostic, i.e., supports various charger types and power levels.
- Power system stability: Staggers charging load, optimizes energy demand, and reduces grid impact.

19. Xendee Corporation

- Provides services from feasibility studies through planning, design, and operation of net-zero charging infrastructure, as well as a Software as a Service solution for EV charging solutions modeling.
- Can analyze the potential for EV Fast Charging across thousands of sites in minutes.
- Main challenge is knowledge gaps.
- Planning software is available starting at \$150/month per user. The cost starts at \$150/month/user and requires no ongoing maintenance or IT expenses.
- Supports various vehicles, chargers, and charging infrastructure.
- Power system stability: Managed load growth and balancing, ancillary services, and Demand-Response capabilities.

Appendix B: Emissions Quantification Methodology

To calculate the well-to-wheel greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions benefits associated with the adoption of zero and near-zero emission technologies, the project team relied on three critical pieces of information. Firstly, the annual mileage of the vehicles or the annual activity of the locomotives was taken into account to estimate the extent of the usage of these technologies. Secondly, the average fuel economy of the vehicles, or the brake specific fuel consumption associated with diesel locomotives, was factored in to ascertain the efficiency of the fuel used. Finally, the carbon intensity of both traditional fuels, such as gasoline and diesel, as well as that of alternative fuels, like electricity, hydrogen, and natural gas, was analyzed. The carbon intensity of fuels refers to the amount of carbon (in CO₂ equivalent) released per unit of energy. This measure includes all emissions resulting from the production, processing, distribution, and use of the fuel, which is also known as a "well-to-wheel" analysis. For example, with gasoline, the life cycle carbon intensity would account for emissions from the extraction of crude oil, its transportation to a refinery, the refining process to turn the crude oil into gasoline, the transportation of gasoline to service stations, and the combustion of gasoline in vehicles. For electricity used in electric vehicles, the life cycle carbon intensity would depend on the mix of energy sources used to generate the electricity (e.g., coal, natural gas, nuclear, wind, solar) and would include emissions from the extraction, processing, and combustion of fossil fuels, or the manufacture and installation of renewable energy systems, as well as the transmission and distribution of electricity and its use in vehicles.

Here are the data sources that were used to extract this information:

- Annual mileage as well as the average fuel efficiency of the on-road vehicles was extracted from ANL's AFLEET tool at: <https://afleet.es.anl.gov/home/>
- For locomotives, the project team relied on the CARB's 2022 In Use Locomotive Emission Inventory at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/barcu/regact/2022/locomotive22/appg.pdf>
- Carbon intensity of the gasoline and diesel are based on the CARB's LCFS certified pathways at: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/classic/fuels/lcfs/fuelpathways/current-pathways_all.xlsx (accessed on June 21, 2023). For gasoline, the project team assumed a carbon intensity of 100.82 gCO₂/MJ and for diesel assumed 100.45 gCO₂/MJ
- Carbon intensity of natural gas is based on CARB's LCFS Compliance Calculator at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/fuels/lcfs/2018-0815_illustrative_compliance_scenario_calc.xlsx. For transportation natural gas, the project team assumed a blend of 94 percent landfill gas and 6 percent dairy gas.
- Carbon intensity of the electricity is based on CARB's 2021 Carbon Intensity Values for California Average Grid Electricity Used as a Transportation Fuel in California and Electricity Supplied Under the Smart Charging or Smart Electrolysis Provision: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/classic/fuels/lcfs/fuelpathways/comments/tier2/2021_elec_update.pdf?_ga=2.207245524.611557608.1628272571-476568668.1615315573
- Carbon intensity of hydrogen is based on the CARB's LCFS certified pathways at: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/classic/fuels/lcfs/fuelpathways/current-pathways_all.xlsx (accessed on June 21, 2023). Note that the existing feedstock mix, which is currently responsible for producing a small amount of transportation hydrogen in California, might not accurately reflect the carbon intensity of hydrogen production if demand significantly increases. The increased demand could potentially necessitate the sourcing

of hydrogen from different feedstocks, with potentially varied carbon intensities. In essence, the carbon intensity of the current feedstock mix might not be scalable. This is why in the main document, the project team decided to present the GHG emissions based on the most common feedstock used for hydrogen production today (i.e., hydrogen produced through SMR¹⁵⁹ with fossil natural gas), while here in this appendix, the project team is presenting the GHG emissions over various feedstock. By modeling GHG emissions benefit on a feedstock-by-feedstock basis, the project team is able to assess each potential source of hydrogen individually. This approach provides a more accurate representation of the potential future carbon intensity of large-scale hydrogen production. It takes into account the fact that some feedstocks might be more feasible or efficient at a larger scale or might become more feasible due to technological advancements. It also offers the flexibility to model different scenarios. For instance, one can anticipate the effect on carbon intensity if one feedstock becomes dominant due to cost reductions, policy changes, or other factors.

Using this information, the project team calculated the annual well to wheel GHG emissions reductions associated with replacement of one unit of vehicle/equipment with a near-zero or zero emission technology following the equation below:

$$\text{GHG Emissions Reduction} = \text{Annual Activity (miles or MWh)} \times \text{Average Fuel Efficiency (gallons/mile or gallons/bhp-hr)} \times (\text{Carbon Intensity of Base Fuel (gCO}_2\text{/gallon)} - \text{EER}^{160} \cdot \text{Adjusted Carbon Intensity of Alternative Fuel (gCO}_2\text{/gallon-equivalent)})$$

(Equation 1)

Table 33, Table 34, and Table 35 provides the assumptions that are used to calculate the annual GHG emissions reductions associated with various vehicle categories discussed in this compendium. For PHEVs, the project team assumed that only 40% of the time those vehicles are operating on electricity¹⁶¹ and therefore, their emissions benefits are assumed to be smaller than BEV or FCEVs.

Table 32. Assumptions for On-Road Vehicles

Category	Vehicle by Body Style	Base Fuel	AFLEET Vehicle Category	Annual Miles per Year	Average MPG
LDV	Passenger Car	Gasoline	Car	12,400	30.9
	SUV	Gasoline	SUV	13,000	22.7
	Minivan	Gasoline	SUV ¹⁶²	30,000	22.7
	Light Duty Pickup Truck	Gasoline	Light-Duty Pickup Truck	11,400	18.7
	Utility Van	Gasoline	SUV	27,000 ¹⁶³	22.7
MDV	Medium Duty Pickup	Gasoline	Medium-Duty Pickup Truck	24,000	13.0
	Cargo Van	Gasoline	Utility Cargo Van	27,000	10.0
	Passenger Van	Gasoline	Shuttle/Paratransit Van	30,000	14.5
	Step Van	Diesel	Delivery Step Van	16,500	6.3
	Box Truck	Diesel	Delivery Straight Truck	23,000	5.6

¹⁵⁹ Steam Methane Reforming

¹⁶⁰ The Energy Economy Ratio (EER) is a measure used to compare the energy efficiency of different fuel types, especially when comparing traditional fuels like gasoline or diesel with alternative fuels like electricity or hydrogen. EER is often used in the context of vehicle fuel economy and emissions analysis. The EER is defined as the energy content of a conventional fuel (like gasoline) divided by the energy content of an alternative fuel (like electricity). For example, when comparing an electric vehicle (EV) to a gasoline vehicle, the EER would be the energy content of the gasoline that would be used in an internal combustion engine vehicle divided by the electrical energy used by the EV. This ratio accounts for the fact that electric motors are much more efficient than internal combustion engines. In essence, EER is a way to normalize energy efficiencies across different energy types, allowing for more accurate comparisons when assessing the environmental impact or economic feasibility of various energy sources.

¹⁶¹ Appendix G of the 2017 Advanced Clean Cars Midterm Review. California Air Resources Board. Available at: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-01/appendix_g_pegv_in_use_and_charging_data_analysis_ac.pdf

¹⁶² Assumed the same annual mileage as Shuttle/Paratransit Buses while the fuel economy is similar to SUVs

¹⁶³ Assumed the same annual mileage as cargo van but the fuel economy is similar to SUVs

Category	Vehicle by Body Style	Base Fuel	AFLEET Vehicle Category	Annual Miles per Year	Average MPG
HDV	Cab & Chassis	Diesel	Tow Truck	37,000	7.8
	Straight Truck	Diesel	Delivery Straight Truck	23,000	5.6
	Semi-Tractor	Diesel	Regional Haul Freight Truck	65,000	5.4
	Refuse Vehicles	Diesel	Refuse Truck	23,400	1.5
Buses	Single Deck Bus	Diesel	Transit Bus	45,000	3.8
	Double Decker Bus	Diesel	Transit Bus	45,000	3.8
	Articulated Bus	Diesel	Transit Bus	45,000	3.8
	School Bus	Diesel	School Bus	15,000	7.1
	Cutaway	Diesel	Shuttle/Paratransit Bus	30,000	8.0
	Shuttle Buses	Diesel	Shuttle/Paratransit Bus	30,000	8.0

Table 33. Assumptions for Locomotives

Vehicle by Body Style	Base Fuel	Annual Activity (MWhr)	Annual Fuel Use (gallons)
Passenger - Heavy Rail	Diesel	1827.7	126,692
Freight - Heavy Rail	Diesel	351.3	24,351
Switchers	Diesel	456.9	31,671

Table 34. Carbon Intensity of Base and Alternative Fuels

Fuel Type	Base Fuel	GHG Emissions (gCO2/MJ)	GHG Emissions (gCO2/mmBtu)	Energy Intensity (BTU/gallon)	gCO2/gallon (EER Adjusted)
Gasoline	Gasoline	100.82	106,371	120,238	12,790
Diesel	Diesel	100.45	105,980	137,381	14,560
Electricity - LDV	Gasoline	75.93	80,111	120,238	2,833
Electricity - HDV	Diesel	75.93	80,111	137,381	2,201
California NG	Diesel	22	23,528	137,381	3,232
Hydrogen - LDV - SMR Fossil NG	Gasoline	124	130,385	120,238	6,271
Hydrogen - LDV - SMR LFG	Gasoline	99	104,955	120,238	5,048
Hydrogen - LDV - SMR Dairy	Gasoline	-210	-221,349	120,238	-10,646
Hydrogen - LDV - Green H2	Gasoline	11	11,089	120,238	533
Hydrogen - HDV - SMR Fossil NG	Diesel	124	130,385	137,381	9,428
Hydrogen - HDV - SMR LFG	Diesel	99	104,955	137,381	7,589
Hydrogen - HDV - SMR Dairy	Diesel	-210	-221,349	137,381	-16,005
Hydrogen - HDV - Green H2	Diesel	11	11,089	137,381	802

Table 32 shows the resulting annual GHG emissions benefits (in unit of metric ton CO2 per year) by switching from base fuel to alternative fuels (i.e., BEV, PHEV, FCEV, NGV). Note that for FCEV, the project team has four different emissions benefits depending on the feedstock used for producing hydrogen.

Table 35. Annual GHG Emissions Benefits of Alternative Fuel Technology

Vehicle by Body Style	Technology Type	Annual GHG Emissions Reduction (Metric ton of CO2e per year)
Passenger Car	BEV	3.99
	PHEV	2.40
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	2.61
	FCEV - SMR LFG	3.10

Vehicle by Body Style	Technology Type	Annual GHG Emissions Reduction (Metric ton of CO2e per year)
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	9.40
	FCEV - Green H2	4.91
SUV	BEV	5.71
	PHEV	3.43
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	3.74
	FCEV - SMR LFG	4.44
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	13.45
	FCEV - Green H2	7.03
Minivan	BEV	13.19
	PHEV	7.91
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	8.63
	FCEV - SMR LFG	10.25
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	31.04
	FCEV - Green H2	16.23
Light Duty Pickup Truck	BEV	6.08
	PHEV	3.65
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	3.98
	FCEV - SMR LFG	4.72
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	14.30
	FCEV - Green H2	7.48
Utility Van	BEV	11.87
	PHEV	7.12
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	7.77
	FCEV - SMR LFG	9.23
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	27.94
	FCEV - Green H2	14.61
Medium-Duty Pickup Truck	BEV	18.38
	PHEV	11.03
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	12.03
	FCEV - SMR LFG	14.29
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	43.27
	FCEV - Green H2	22.63
Cargo Van	BEV	26.88
	PHEV	16.13
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	17.60
	NGV	0.00
	FCEV - SMR LFG	20.90
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	63.28
	FCEV - Green H2	33.09
Passenger Van	BEV	20.60
	PHEV	12.36
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	13.49
	NGV	0.00
	FCEV - SMR LFG	16.02
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	48.49
	FCEV - Green H2	25.36
Step Van	BEV	32.51
	PHEV	19.50
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	13.50
	NGV	29.79
	FCEV - SMR LFG	18.34

Vehicle by Body Style	Technology Type	Annual GHG Emissions Reduction (Metric ton of CO2e per year)
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	80.39
	FCEV - Green H2	36.19
Box Truck	BEV	51.08
	PHEV	30.65
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	21.21
	NGV	46.82
	FCEV - SMR LFG	28.81
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	126.33
	FCEV - Green H2	56.86
Cab & Chassis	BEV	58.62
	PHEV	35.17
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	24.34
	NGV	53.73
	FCEV - SMR LFG	33.07
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	144.99
	FCEV - Green H2	65.26
Straight Truck	BEV	51.08
	PHEV	30.65
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	21.21
	NGV	46.82
	FCEV - SMR LFG	28.81
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	126.33
	FCEV - Green H2	56.86
Semi-Tractor	BEV	148.34
	PHEV	89.00
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	61.60
	NGV	135.96
	FCEV - SMR LFG	83.67
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	366.87
	FCEV - Green H2	165.14
Refuse Vehicles	BEV	192.79
	PHEV	115.68
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	80.06
	NGV	176.71
	FCEV - SMR LFG	108.74
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	476.81
	FCEV - Green H2	214.62
Single Deck Bus	BEV	145.88
	PHEV	87.53
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	60.58
	NGV	133.71
	FCEV - SMR LFG	82.28
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	360.78
	FCEV - Green H2	162.40
Double Decker Bus	BEV	145.88
	PHEV	87.53
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	60.58
	NGV	133.71
	FCEV - SMR LFG	82.28
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	360.78
	FCEV - Green H2	162.40

Vehicle by Body Style	Technology Type	Annual GHG Emissions Reduction (Metric ton of CO2e per year)
Articulated Bus	BEV	145.88
	PHEV	87.53
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	60.58
	NGV	133.71
	FCEV - SMR LFG	82.28
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	360.78
	FCEV - Green H2	162.40
School Bus	BEV	26.09
	PHEV	15.66
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	10.84
	NGV	23.91
	FCEV - SMR LFG	14.72
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	64.53
	FCEV - Green H2	29.05
Shuttle Buses	BEV	46.34
	PHEV	27.81
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	19.25
	NGV	42.48
	FCEV - SMR LFG	26.14
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	114.62
	FCEV - Green H2	51.59
Cutaway	BEV	46.34
	PHEV	27.81
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	19.25
	NGV	42.48
	FCEV - SMR LFG	26.14
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	114.62
	FCEV - Green H2	51.59
Passenger - Heavy Rail	BEV	1565.73
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	650.19
	NGV	1435.09
	FCEV - SMR LFG	883.14
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	3872.27
	FCEV - Green H2	1743.01
Freight - Heavy Rail	BEV	300.95
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	124.97
	NGV	275.84
	FCEV - SMR LFG	169.75
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	744.29
	FCEV - Green H2	335.02
Switchers	BEV	391.41
	FCEV - SMR Fossil NG	162.54
	NGV	358.75
	FCEV - SMR LFG	220.77
	FCEV - SMR Dairy	968.02
	FCEV - Green H2	435.73

As noted earlier, while in the main body of the document, the project team decided to focus on GHG emissions benefits of FCEV as they relate to the most prevalent method of hydrogen production presently employed, namely, hydrogen generated through SMR with fossil natural gas, in this appendix, the team expands this scope to include GHG

emissions benefits as they pertain to a variety of feedstocks. The following figures provide a comparative analysis of the GHG emissions benefits that can be realized by transitioning to FCEVs that utilize hydrogen produced from diverse feedstocks.

Figure 28. GHG Emissions Benefits from Transitioning Conventional LDVs to FCEVs




Figure 29. GHG Emissions Benefits from Transitioning Conventional MDVs to FCEVs




Figure 30. GHG Emissions Benefits from Transitioning Conventional HDVs to FCEVs




Figure 31. GHG Emissions Benefits from Transitioning Conventional Buses to FCEVs





Figure 32. GHG Emissions Benefits from Transitioning Conventional Locomotives to FCEVs



Appendix C: Total Cost of Ownership Methodology

Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) refers to the comprehensive assessment of all the costs associated with the purchase, use, and maintenance of a product or system over its entire life cycle. TCO is often used in business decision-making to determine the financial impact of procuring and operating an asset. To calculate the TCO of various clean technology types, the project team leveraged the Argonne National Laboratory' (ANL) Alternative Fuel Life-Cycle Environmental and Economic Transportation (AFLEET) tool. The tool was accessed via downloadable spreadsheet. Both the TCO calculator and the fleet footprint calculator were used in this assessment.

The data from AFLEET was largely comprehensive; however, some modifications were necessary. For instance, AFLEET did not include the initial purchase cost for PHEV utility cargo vans or PHEV tow trucks. To compensate for this data deficit, the project team sourced the initial purchase costs from the PG&E Vehicle Catalog.¹⁶⁴

Aside from capital costs, the project team also updated the fuel cost data in the AFLEET tool to reflect the latest gasoline, diesel, CNG, and electricity prices in California. Fuel costs were checked against data from AFDC fuel pricing report and CNG costs were modified in the AFLEET tool from \$2.66/GGE to \$2.3/GGE¹⁶⁵.

Table 33, Table 34, and Table 35 provide the assumptions used to calculate the TCO saving associated with each vehicle body style and technology type. Please note that not all body styles were represented in the AFLEET tool. For example, Minivan and Cab and Chassis were not represented in the AFLEET tool. To remedy this lack of data, SUV and Tow Truck were used as surrogates respectively, and annual miles per year were adjusted to better reflect actual performance characteristics.

In addition, to ensure consistency across vehicle category comparisons, the project team has chosen to calculate the TCO over a 15-year lifespan. While this assumption may be applicable to most vehicles, certain specific types, such as refuse trucks, may have a shorter lifespan due to excessive wear and tear.

Table 36. Assumptions for On-Road Vehicles TCO Analysis

Category	Vehicle by Body Style	Base Fuel	AFLEET Vehicle Category	Annual Miles per Year	Average MPG
LDV	Passenger Car	Gasoline	Car	12,400	30.9
	SUV	Gasoline	SUV	13,000	22.7
	Minivan	Gasoline	SUV ¹⁶⁶	30,000	22.7
	Light Duty Pickup Truck	Gasoline	Light-Duty Pickup Truck	11,400	18.7
	Utility Van	Gasoline	SUV	27,000 ¹⁶⁷	22.7
MDV	Medium Duty Pickup	Gasoline	Medium-Duty Pickup Truck	24,000	13.0
	Cargo Van	Gasoline	Utility Cargo Van	27,000	10.0
	Passenger Van	Gasoline	Shuttle/Paratransit Van	30,000	14.5
	Step Van	Diesel	Delivery Step Van	16,500	6.3
	Box Truck	Diesel	Delivery Straight Truck	23,000	5.6
	Cab & Chassis	Diesel	Tow Truck	37,000	7.8
HDV	Straight Truck	Diesel	Delivery Straight Truck	23,000	5.6
	Semi-Tractor	Diesel	Regional Haul Freight Truck	65,000	5.4
	Refuse Vehicles	Diesel	Refuse Truck	23,400	1.5
Buses	Single Deck Bus	Diesel	Transit Bus	45,000	3.8

¹⁶⁴ PG&E Fleets: Vehicles. Retrieved June 23, 2023, from <https://fleets.pge.com/vehicle-catalog>

¹⁶⁵ Alternative Fuels Data Center: Fuel Prices. April 2023. Retrieved June 23, 2023, from <https://afdc.energy.gov/fuels/prices.html>

¹⁶⁶ Assumed the same annual mileage as Shuttle/Paratransit Buses while the fuel economy is similar to SUVs

¹⁶⁷ Assumed the same annual mileage as cargo van but the fuel economy is similar to SUVs

Category	Vehicle by Body Style	Base Fuel	AFLEET Vehicle Category	Annual Miles per Year	Average MPG
	Double Decker Bus	Diesel	Transit Bus	45,000	3.8
	Articulated Bus	Diesel	Transit Bus	45,000	3.8
	School Bus	Diesel	School Bus	15,000	7.1
	Cutaway	Diesel	Shuttle/Paratransit Bus	30,000	8.0
	Shuttle Buses	Diesel	Shuttle/Paratransit Bus	30,000	8.0

Table 37. Fuel Price Assumptions Used

Fuel Type	Fuel Unit	Price (\$/fuel unit)
Gasoline	gasoline gallon	\$4.75
Diesel	diesel gallon	\$5.10
Electricity	kWh	\$0.27
G.H2	hydrogen kg	\$17.11 ¹⁶⁸
CNG	CNG GGE	\$2.66

Note that TCO presented in this report is the net present value (NPV) of depreciation, operating and maintenance cost over a 15-year lifespan. A discount factor of 1.24%¹⁶⁹ (default value in AFLEET tool) is used. Also, it is important to note that the costs of charging or fueling stations are not included in the TCO. This is primarily due to the variability of infrastructure prices and the mix of public versus private stations potentially utilized for each category. For instance, a line haul Class 8 semi-tractor may predominantly depend on public charging stations, while a regional haul Class 8 semi-tractor may rely exclusively on depot charging. To avoid subjective assessment of infrastructure needs, the project team decided to leave the cost of infrastructure outside of the TCO analysis. The insurance cost is also directly related to the purchase price of the vehicles. The higher the purchase price, the higher the insurance cost. With respect to registration fee, BEV and FCEVs are assumed to have an additional registration fee of \$100 per year.

Tables 35 through 54 show the TCO outputs for each body style and technology type. For light duty (and some of the medium duty vehicles) the baseline fuel is assumed to be gasoline (i.e., clean technologies are compared against gasoline), while for heavy duty vehicles, the baseline fuel is diesel. Note that for diesel vehicles, in addition to fuel cost, the project team also included the cost of diesel exhaust fluid (DEF) which is an operational cost for diesel vehicles equipped with Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) system.

Table 38. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Sedan

	Gasoline	Gasoline PHEV	EV	G.H2 FCV
Capital Cost ¹⁷⁰	\$20,000	\$27,000	\$37,000	\$50,000
Depreciation	\$17,662	\$23,844	\$32,675	\$44,155
Fuel ¹⁷¹	\$33,511	\$21,234	\$16,482	\$45,022
Maintenance and Repair	\$34,771	\$30,348	\$21,922	\$21,922
Insurance	\$20,600	\$23,038	\$26,522	\$31,051
License and Registration	\$1,837	\$1,837	\$3,215	\$3,215

¹⁶⁸ For the purpose of the TCO analysis presented in this report, the project team used the same fuel price as assumed by the AFLEET tool. While AFDC April 2023 Fuel Report, provide an average hydrogen price of \$23.63/GGE, the report claims that this number is based on a very small sample (21 points) of hydrogen information received. See footnote 4 of https://afdc.energy.gov/files/u/publication/alternative_fuel_price_report_april_2023.pdf.

¹⁶⁹ Based on 5-year average certificate of deposit rates in 2020

¹⁷⁰ Capital Cost is displayed for reference. It is not included in this TCO output calculation.

¹⁷¹ Fuel costs were changed from the original AFLEET tool assumptions to recent data from 2021-2023. Gasoline fuel price was based on the average California gas prices from 2021 and 2022: [California Gasoline and Diesel Retail Prices \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/state/caspr/). Electricity rates were based on California residential rates from 2023: [California Profile \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/state/caspr/)

	Gasoline	Gasoline PHEV	EV	G.H2 FCV
Total Cost of Ownership	\$108,381	\$100,301	\$100,815	\$145,365

Table 39. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Light-Duty SUV

	Gasoline	Gasoline PHEV	EV	G.H2 FCV
Capital Cost	\$29,000	\$38,500	\$46,000	\$59,000
Depreciation	\$25,610	\$34,000	\$40,623	\$52,103
Fuel ¹⁷²	\$47,976	\$28,893	\$26,407	\$71,264
Maintenance and Repair	\$37,592	\$32,811	\$23,701	\$23,701
Insurance	\$23,735	\$27,045	\$29,658	\$34,186
License and Registration	\$5,214	\$5,214	\$6,592	\$6,592
Total Cost of Ownership	\$140,127	\$127,962	\$126,980	\$187,847

Table 40. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Minivan

	Gasoline	Gasoline PHEV	EV
Capital Cost	\$29,000	\$38,500	\$46,000
Depreciation	\$25,610	\$34,000	\$40,623
Fuel ¹⁷³	\$110,714	\$64,850	\$60,938
Maintenance and Repair	\$86,751	\$75,718	\$54,694
Insurance	\$23,735	\$27,045	\$29,658
License and Registration	\$5,214	\$5,214	\$6,592
Total Cost of Ownership	\$252,024	\$206,826	\$192,504

Table 41. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Light-Duty Pickup Truck

	Gasoline	Gasoline PHEV	EV
Capital Cost	\$37,000	\$58,000	\$77,000
Depreciation	\$32,675	\$51,220	\$67,999
Fuel ¹⁷⁴	\$51,013	\$33,594	\$28,078
Maintenance and Repair	\$37,960	\$33,132	\$23,933
Insurance	\$26,522	\$33,838	\$40,457
License and Registration	\$5,214	\$5,214	\$6,592
Total Cost of Ownership	\$153,384	\$156,998	\$167,059

¹⁷² Fuel costs were changed from the original AFLEET tool assumptions to recent data from 2021-2023. Gasoline fuel price was based on the average California gas prices from 2021 and 2022: [California Gasoline and Diesel Retail Prices \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/energy/briefing/california-gasoline-diesel-retail-prices). Electricity rates were based on California residential rates from 2023: [California Profile \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/energy/briefing/california-profile)

¹⁷³ Fuel costs were changed from the original AFLEET tool assumptions to recent data from 2021-2023. Gasoline and diesel fuel price was based on the average California gas prices from 2021 and 2022: [California Gasoline and Diesel Retail Prices \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/energy/briefing/california-gasoline-diesel-retail-prices). Electricity rates were based on California residential rates from 2023: [California Profile \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/energy/briefing/california-profile)

¹⁷⁴ Fuel costs were changed from the original AFLEET tool assumptions to recent data from 2021-2023. Gasoline fuel price was based on the average California gas prices from 2021 and 2022: [California Gasoline and Diesel Retail Prices \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/energy/briefing/california-gasoline-diesel-retail-prices). Electricity rates were based on California residential rates from 2023: [California Profile \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/energy/briefing/california-profile)

Table 42. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Utility Van

	Gasoline	EV
Capital Cost	\$29,000	\$46,000
Depreciation	\$25,610	\$40,623
Fuel ¹⁷⁵	\$99,643	\$54,845
Maintenance and Repair	\$78,076	\$49,224
Insurance	\$23,735	\$29,658
License and Registration	\$5,214	\$6,592
Total Cost of Ownership	\$232,278	\$180,941

Table 43. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Medium-Duty Pickup Truck

	Gasoline	Gasoline PHEV	EV	G.H2 FCV	CNG
Capital Cost	\$42,000	\$67,000	\$93,000	\$93,000 ¹⁷⁶	\$50,000
Depreciation	\$37,090	\$59,168	\$82,129	\$82,129	\$44,155
Fuel ¹⁷⁷	\$154,319	\$96,003	\$89,658	\$235,924	\$80,614
Maintenance and Repair	\$114,616	\$100,040	\$72,262	\$72,262	\$114,616
Insurance	\$28,264	\$36,974	\$46,031	\$46,031	\$31,051
License and Registration	\$675	\$675	\$2,053	\$2,053	\$675
Total Cost of Ownership	\$334,965	\$292,859	\$292,133	\$438,399	\$271,112

Table 44. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Cargo Van

	Gasoline	EV	G.H2 FCV	CNG
Capital Cost	\$33,000	\$68,000	\$68,000	\$49,000
Depreciation	\$29,143	\$60,051	\$0	\$43,272
Fuel ¹⁷⁸	\$225,691	\$131,124	\$345,038	\$117,898
Maintenance and Repair	\$120,663	\$76,074	\$76,074	\$120,663
Insurance	\$25,129	\$37,322	\$13,632	\$30,703
License and Registration	\$675	\$2,053	\$2,053	\$675
Total Cost of Ownership	\$401,300	\$306,625	\$436,798	\$313,211

¹⁷⁵ Fuel costs were changed from the original AFLEET tool assumptions to recent data from 2021-2023. Gasoline fuel price was based on the average California gas prices from 2021 and 2022: [California Gasoline and Diesel Retail Prices \(eia.gov\)](#). Electricity rates were based on California residential rates from 2023: [California Profile \(eia.gov\)](#)

¹⁷⁶ Assumed the same as BEV

¹⁷⁷ Fuel costs were changed from the original AFLEET tool assumptions to recent data from 2021-2023. Gasoline fuel price was based on the average California gas prices from 2021 and 2022: [California Gasoline and Diesel Retail Prices \(eia.gov\)](#). Electricity rates were based on California residential rates from 2023: [California Profile \(eia.gov\)](#)

¹⁷⁸ Fuel costs were changed from the original AFLEET tool assumptions to recent data from 2021-2023. Gasoline fuel price was based on the average California gas prices from 2021 and 2022: [California Gasoline and Diesel Retail Prices \(eia.gov\)](#). Electricity rates were based on California residential rates from 2023: [California Profile \(eia.gov\)](#)

Table 45. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Passenger Van

	Gasoline	EV	G.H2 FCV
Capital Cost	\$38,000	\$68,000 ¹⁷⁹	\$68,000
Depreciation	\$33,558	\$60,051	\$60,051
Fuel	\$172,943	\$100,478	\$264,397
Maintenance and Repair	\$110,410	\$69,610	\$69,610
Insurance	\$26,871	\$37,322	\$37,322
License and Registration	\$675	\$2,053	\$2,053
Total Cost of Ownership	\$344,457	\$269,515	\$433,434

Table 46. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Step Van

	Diesel	EV	G.H2 FCV	CNG
Capital Cost	\$70,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$110,000
Depreciation	\$55,685	\$119,325	\$119,325	\$87,505
Fuel ¹⁸⁰	\$205,717	\$105,780	\$320,477	\$128,367
Diesel Exhaust Fluid	\$2,297	\$0	\$0	\$0
Maintenance and Repair	\$73,718	\$51,246	\$51,246	\$78,119
Insurance	\$101,460	\$149,597	\$149,597	\$125,529
License and Registration	\$18,258	\$18,258	\$18,258	\$18,258
Total Cost of Ownership	\$457,135	\$444,207	\$658,904	\$437,778

Table 47. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Box Truck

	Diesel	EV	CNG
Capital Cost	\$75,000	\$185,000	\$115,000
Depreciation	\$59,663	\$147,168	\$91,483
Fuel ¹⁸¹	\$323,253	\$166,217	\$190,503
Diesel Exhaust Fluid	\$3,610	\$0	\$0
Maintenance and Repair	\$104,316	\$84,780	\$114,695
Insurance	\$120,285	\$176,740	\$140,814
License and Registration	\$18,258	\$18,258	\$18,258
Total Cost of Ownership	\$629,384	\$593,163	\$555,754

¹⁷⁹ Same assumption as cargo vans

¹⁸⁰ Fuel costs were changed from the original AFLEET tool assumptions to recent data from 2021-2023. Gasoline fuel price was based on the average California gas prices from 2021 and 2022: [California Gasoline and Diesel Retail Prices \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/bulletin/california-gasoline-and-diesel-retail-prices). Electricity rates were based on California residential rates from 2023: [California Profile \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/bulletin/california-profile)

¹⁸¹ Fuel costs were changed from the original AFLEET tool assumptions to recent data from 2021-2023. Gasoline fuel price was based on the average California gas prices from 2021 and 2022: [California Gasoline and Diesel Retail Prices \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/bulletin/california-gasoline-and-diesel-retail-prices). Electricity rates were based on California residential rates from 2023: [California Profile \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/bulletin/california-profile)

Table 48. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Cab and Chassis

	Diesel	Gasoline PHEV	EV	G.H2 FCV	CNG
Capital Cost	\$72,000	\$72,000 ¹⁸²	\$100,000	\$100,000 ¹⁸³	\$69,000
Depreciation	\$63,584	\$63,584	\$88,311	\$88,311	\$60,934
Fuel ¹⁸⁴	\$370,997	\$296,815	\$276,445	\$727,431	\$248,560
Diesel Exhaust Fluid	\$4,143	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Maintenance and Repair	\$261,319	\$154,228	\$111,404	\$111,404	\$176,700
Insurance	\$38,715	\$38,715	\$48,470	\$48,470	\$37,670
License and Registration	\$675	\$675	\$2,053	\$2,053	\$675
Total Cost of Ownership	\$739,433	\$554,017	\$526,682	\$977,669	\$524,540

Table 49. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Straight Truck

	Diesel	EV	G.H2 FCV	CNG
Capital Cost	\$75,000	\$185,000	\$185,000 ¹⁸⁵	\$115,000
Depreciation	\$59,663	\$147,168	\$147,168	\$91,483
Fuel ¹⁸⁶	\$323,253	\$166,217	\$503,581	\$190,503
Diesel Exhaust Fluid	\$3,610	\$0	\$0	\$0
Maintenance and Repair	\$104,316	\$84,780	\$84,780	\$114,695
Insurance	\$120,285	\$176,740	\$176,740	\$140,814
License and Registration	\$18,258	\$18,258	\$18,258	\$18,258
Total Cost of Ownership	\$629,384	\$593,163	\$930,527	\$555,754

Table 50. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Semi-Tractor

	Diesel	EV	G.H2 FCV	CNG
Capital Cost	\$130,000	\$480,000	\$360,000	\$170,000
Depreciation	\$103,415	\$381,841	\$286,380	\$135,235
Fuel	\$938,766	\$1,032,959	\$3,079,607	\$553,245
Diesel Exhaust Fluid	\$10,483	\$0	\$0	\$0
Maintenance and Repair	\$262,538	\$228,133	\$228,133	\$271,681
Insurance	\$198,948	\$324,379	\$281,374	\$213,283
License and Registration	\$29,199	\$29,199	\$29,199	\$29,199
Total Cost of Ownership	\$1,543,349	\$1,996,511	\$3,904,694	\$1,202,644

¹⁸² Assumed to be the same as diesel¹⁸³ Assumed the same purchase price as BEV Cab and Chassis.¹⁸⁴ Fuel costs were changed from the original AFLEET tool assumptions to recent data from 2021-2023. Gasoline fuel price was based on the average California gas prices from 2021 and 2022: [California Gasoline and Diesel Retail Prices \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/energy/briefings/2023/california-gasoline-and-diesel-retail-prices/). Electricity rates were based on California residential rates from 2023: [California Profile \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/energy/briefings/2023/california-profile/)¹⁸⁵ Assumed the same price as BEV Straight Truck.¹⁸⁶ Fuel costs were changed from the original AFLEET tool assumptions to recent data from 2021-2023. Gasoline fuel price was based on the average California gas prices from 2021 and 2022: [California Gasoline and Diesel Retail Prices \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/energy/briefings/2023/california-gasoline-and-diesel-retail-prices/). Electricity rates were based on California residential rates from 2023: [California Profile \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/energy/briefings/2023/california-profile/)

Table 51. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Refuse Vehicles

	Diesel	EV	CNG
Capital Cost	\$300,000	\$500,000	\$335,000
Depreciation	\$238,650	\$397,751	\$266,493
Fuel	\$1,220,078	\$683,646	\$761,327
Diesel Exhaust Fluid	\$13,624	-	-
Maintenance and Repair	\$1,622,045	\$1,111,001	\$1,735,023
Insurance	\$253,732	\$311,692	\$263,875
License and Registration	\$18,258	\$18,258	\$18,258
Total Cost of Ownership	\$3,366,387	\$2,522,347	\$3,044,976

Table 52. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Single Deck Bus

	Diesel	EV	G.H2 FCV	CNG
Capital Cost	\$500,000	\$900,000	\$1,125,000	\$540,000
Depreciation	\$397,751	\$715,951	\$894,939	\$429,571
Fuel ¹⁸⁷	\$923,175	\$563,362	\$1,852,705	\$576,060
Diesel Exhaust Fluid	\$10,308	\$0	\$0	\$0
Maintenance and Repair	\$1,015,402	\$625,940	\$1,358,691	\$1,015,402
Insurance	\$291,952	\$460,079	\$554,650	\$308,764
License and Registration	\$18,258	\$18,258	\$18,258	\$18,258
Total Cost of Ownership	\$2,656,846	\$2,383,590	\$4,679,243	\$2,348,056

Table 53. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Double Deck Bus

	Diesel	EV	CNG
Capital Cost	\$500,000	\$1,050,000	\$540,000
Depreciation	\$397,751	\$835,276	\$429,571
Fuel ¹⁸⁸	\$923,175	\$563,362	\$576,060
Diesel Exhaust Fluid	\$10,308	\$0	\$0
Maintenance and Repair	\$1,015,402	\$625,940	\$1,015,402
Insurance	\$291,952	\$523,127	\$308,764
License and Registration	\$18,258	\$18,258	\$18,258
Total Cost of Ownership	\$2,656,846	\$2,565,963	\$2,348,056

¹⁸⁷ Fuel costs were changed from the original AFLEET tool assumptions to recent data from 2021-2023. Gasoline fuel price was based on the average California gas prices from 2021 and 2022: [California Gasoline and Diesel Retail Prices \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/bulletin/CaliforniaGasolineandDieselRetailPrices). Electricity rates were based on California residential rates from 2023: [California Profile \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/bulletin/CaliforniaProfile)

¹⁸⁸ Fuel costs were changed from the original AFLEET tool assumptions to recent data from 2021-2023. Gasoline fuel price was based on the average California gas prices from 2021 and 2022: [California Gasoline and Diesel Retail Prices \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/bulletin/CaliforniaGasolineandDieselRetailPrices). Electricity rates were based on California residential rates from 2023: [California Profile \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/bulletin/CaliforniaProfile)

Table 54. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Articulated Bus

	Diesel	EV	G.H2 FCV	CNG
Capital Cost	\$500,000	\$1,050,000	\$1,125,000	\$540,000
Depreciation	\$397,751	\$835,276	\$894,939	\$429,571
Fuel ¹⁸⁹	\$923,175	\$563,362	\$1,852,705	\$576,060
Diesel Exhaust Fluid	\$10,308	-	-	-
Maintenance and Repair	\$1,015,402	\$625,940	\$1,358,691	\$1,015,402
Insurance	\$291,952	\$523,127	\$554,650	\$308,764
License and Registration	\$18,258	\$18,258	\$18,258	\$18,258
Total Cost of Ownership	\$2,656,846	\$2,565,963	\$4,679,243	\$2,348,056

Table 55. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- School Bus

	Diesel	EV	CNG
Capital Cost	\$100,000	\$300,000	\$130,000
Depreciation	\$79,550	\$238,650	\$103,415
Fuel ¹⁹⁰	\$165,121	\$101,640	\$103,035
Diesel Exhaust Fluid	\$1,844	\$0	-
Maintenance and Repair	\$316,431	\$195,062	\$316,431
Insurance	\$97,666	\$171,111	\$108,683
License and Registration	\$18,258	\$18,258	\$18,258
Total Cost of Ownership	\$678,870	\$724,722	\$649,822

Table 56. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs - Shuttle Bus

	Diesel	EV	G.H2 FCV	CNG
Capital Cost	\$65,000	\$265,000	\$265,000 ¹⁹¹	\$90,000
Depreciation	\$51,708	\$210,808	\$210,808	\$71,595
Fuel ¹⁹²	\$293,288	\$180,534	\$725,081	\$183,011
Diesel Exhaust Fluid	\$3,275	\$0	\$0	\$0
Maintenance and Repair	\$676,935	\$417,293	\$417,293	\$676,935
Insurance	\$84,813	\$158,258	\$158,258	\$93,994
License and Registration	\$18,258	\$18,258	\$18,258	\$18,258
Total Cost of Ownership	\$1,128,277	\$985,151	\$1,529,698	\$1,043,793

¹⁸⁹ Fuel costs were changed from the original AFLEET tool assumptions to recent data from 2021-2023. Gasoline fuel price was based on the average California gas prices from 2021 and 2022: [California Gasoline and Diesel Retail Prices \(eia.gov\)](#). Electricity rates were based on California residential rates from 2023: [California Profile \(eia.gov\)](#)

¹⁹⁰ Fuel costs were changed from the original AFLEET tool assumptions to recent data from 2021-2023. Gasoline fuel price was based on the average California gas prices from 2021 and 2022: [California Gasoline and Diesel Retail Prices \(eia.gov\)](#). Electricity rates were based on California residential rates from 2023: [California Profile \(eia.gov\)](#)

¹⁹¹ Assumed the same purchase price as BEV Shuttle Bus.

¹⁹² Fuel costs were changed from the original AFLEET tool assumptions to recent data from 2021-2023. Gasoline fuel price was based on the average California gas prices from 2021 and 2022: [California Gasoline and Diesel Retail Prices \(eia.gov\)](#). Electricity rates were based on California residential rates from 2023: [California Profile \(eia.gov\)](#)

Table 57. Lifetime Cost of Ownership Outputs- Cutaway¹⁹³

	Diesel	EV	G.H2 FCV	CNG
Capital Cost	\$65,000	\$265,000	\$265,000 ¹⁹⁴	\$90,000
Depreciation	\$51,708	\$210,808	\$210,808	\$71,595
Fuel ¹⁹⁵	\$293,288	\$180,534	\$725,081	\$183,011
Diesel Exhaust Fluid	\$3,275	\$0	\$0	\$0
Maintenance and Repair	\$676,935	\$417,293	\$417,293	\$676,935
Insurance	\$84,813	\$158,258	\$158,258	\$93,994
License and Registration	\$18,258	\$18,258	\$18,258	\$18,258
Total Cost of Ownership	\$1,128,277	\$985,151	\$1,529,698	\$1,043,793

Rail: To estimate the TCO for various rail technologies, the project team used inputs provided through CARB's in-use diesel locomotive regulation economic analysis.¹⁹⁶ To calculate TCO, we incorporated three financial parameters, including the estimated purchase price, projected fuel cost, and anticipated maintenance expenses. These components were considered over an extended timeline of a 15-year period.

Table 58. TCO Calculation for Rail

Locomotive Type	Technology Type	Purchase Price	Fuel Cost	Annual Maintenance Cost	Fuel Economy (fuel per MWh)	Fuel Cost	Maintenance Cost	Total Co Owners
Passenger Locomotive	Diesel	\$7,500,000	\$5.10 / gallons	\$79,000	64.5 gal/MWh	\$8,183,223	\$1,075,268	\$16,758,
	BEV	\$11,000,000	\$0.19 / kWh	\$71,100	1385 kWh/MWh	\$9,302,679	\$967,741	\$21,270,
	FCEV	\$4,250,000	\$16.23 / kg	\$79,000	52.97 kg H2/MWh	\$22,546,259	\$1,075,268	\$27,871,
Freight Locomotive	Diesel	\$3,100,000	\$5.10 / gallons	\$79,000	64.5 gal/MWh	\$1,572,887	\$1,075,268	\$5,748,
	BEV	\$6,250,000	\$0.19 kWh	\$71,100	1385 kWh/MWh	\$1,788,057	\$967,741	\$9,005,7
	FCEV	\$13,000,000	\$16.23 / kg	\$79,000	55.82 kg H2/MWh	\$4,566,754	\$1,075,268	\$18,642,
Switchers	Diesel	\$2,700,000	\$5.10 / gallons	\$79,000	73.7 gal/MWh	\$2,337,483	\$1,075,268	\$6,112,7
	BEV	\$4,000,000	\$0.19 / kWh	\$71,100	1385 kWh/MWh	\$2,325,543	\$967,741	\$7,293,2
	FCEV	\$2,875,000	\$16.23 / kg	\$79,000	63.78 kg H2/MWh	\$6,786,491	\$1,075,268	\$10,736,

¹⁹³ Assumed to be the same as Shuttle buses

¹⁹⁴ Assumed the same purchase price as BEV Shuttle Bus.

¹⁹⁵ Fuel costs were changed from the original AFLEET tool assumptions to recent data from 2021-2023. Gasoline fuel price was based on the average California gas prices from 2021 and 2022: [California Gasoline and Diesel Retail Prices \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/energy/briefing/california-gasoline-diesel-retail-prices). Electricity rates were based on California residential rates from 2023: [California Profile \(eia.gov\)](https://www.eia.gov/energy/briefing/california-profile)

¹⁹⁶ <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/barcu/regact/2022/locomotive22/appb.pdf>

Appendix D: Survey Questionnaire

<<<Survey Prompt>>>

Thank you for responding to the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) Clean Technology Compendium survey. This survey aims to collect the necessary data to guarantee that the Compendium is as exhaustive and precise as possible.

Please answer each survey question to the best of your ability. **Survey responses should focus on your company or organization's primary product or service offering.** Alternatively, you may complete more than one survey response in cases where multiple types of technology are proposed for inclusion in the SCAG Clean Technology Compendium. These steps will help ensure that each response applies directly to the technology under consideration.

Contact alinder@scag.ca.gov with questions related to this survey or the Clean Technology Compendium.

<<<Multiple Choice Questions>>>

1. Please provide the following information:
 - a. Your name _____
 - b. Your email address _____
 - c. Name of your organization _____

2. Which roles does your organization play in furthering a zero-emission transportation system? Select all that apply
 - a. Produce zero- or near-zero emission transportation technology
 - b. Research and development of zero- or near-zero emission transportation technology
 - c. Sell zero- or near-zero emission transportation technology
 - d. Produce or sell a product that supports or facilitates zero- or near-zero emission transportation technology
 - e. Other _____ [50-word limit]

Note: Near-zero emission transportation technology refers to vehicles and related infrastructure that emit extremely low levels of pollutants and may be used as bridging technologies where fully zero emission technologies are not feasible or commercially available; near zero implies a significant reduction compared to commonly used technologies.

Screen out if None is selected and move to wrap up questions

3. Does your product or service directly reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions or facilitate the reduction of GHG emissions regardless of how it is used?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

Note: For example, while public charging infrastructure does not directly reduce emissions, it plays a critical role in facilitating the adoption of electric vehicles, which can significantly reduce emissions and help achieve long-term climate and air quality goals.

Screen out if no and move to wrap up questions

4. Which of the following categories applies to your zero or near-zero emission technology? Select one.
 - a. On-road light-duty vehicle (<8,500 lbs.)
 - b. On-road medium-duty vehicle (8,501 – 26,000 lbs.)
 - c. On-road heavy-duty vehicle (>26,001 lbs.)
 - d. Locomotive
 - e. Alternative fueling/charging infrastructure
 - f. Alternative fuel provider
 - g. Supporting Products (see definition below)
 - h. None of the above

Note: Zero and near-zero emissions supporting products refer to products or systems that facilitate the use of zero- and near-zero emission technologies. This may include hardware or software solutions, or services to deploy, maintain or efficiently operate zero and near zero emission vehicles and their infrastructure. Examples of zero- and near-zero emissions supporting products may include charging management solutions that enable the efficient, equitable and sustainable operation of these technologies. The goal of zero- and near-zero emission supporting products is to provide a comprehensive solution to support the deployment and adoption of clean transportation technologies while reducing or eliminating associated environmental impacts and improving the user experience.

Screen out if "h (none of the above)" is selected and move to wrap up questions

5. **(if a – e are selected in question 4)** Indicate which type of alternative fuel your zero- or near-zero emission technology uses or delivers? Select one.
 - a. Electricity
 - b. Hydrogen
 - c. Other fuels, please indicate

Screen out if 5d – h are selected and move to wrap up questions

6. **(if 4a is selected)** Which body style applies to your light-duty vehicle technology? Select one.
 - a. Passenger car
 - b. Minivan
 - c. Pickup Truck
 - d. SUV
 - e. Utility Van
 - f. Other, please indicate_____
7. **(If 4b is selected)** Which body style applies to your medium-duty vehicle technology? Select one.
 - a. SUV
 - b. Pickup truck
 - c. Cargo van
 - d. Passenger van
 - e. Step van
 - f. Box truck
 - g. Cab and chassis
 - h. School Bus
 - i. Cutaway
 - j. Other, please indicate_____
8. **(If 4c is selected)** Which body style applies to your heavy-duty vehicle technology? Select one. (if you offer multiple, you will have an opportunity to submit a second entry)
 - a. Straight trucks

- b. Semi-tractor
 - c. Refuse trucks
 - d. Transit bus
 - e. School bus
 - f. Shuttle bus
 - g. Other, please indicate_____
9. **(If 4e is selected)** Which category applies to your alternative fuel or charging infrastructure? Select one.
- a. Hydrogen fueling system
 - b. Compressed natural gas fueling system
 - c. Level 2 charging station
 - d. DC fast charging station
 - e. Wireless electric vehicle charging system
 - f. Pantograph charging system
 - g. Other, please indicate_____
10. **(If 9a is selected)** Which category applies to your hydrogen fueling infrastructure? Select all that applies.
- a. Fast fill (700 bar – H70)
 - b. Slow fill (350 bar – H35)
 - c. Combined fill
 - d. Other, please indicate_____
11. **(If 9a is selected)** What method does your hydrogen station utilize for hydrogen production?
- a. On-site electrolysis using grid electricity
 - b. On-site electrolysis using renewable energy sources (e.g., solar, wind)
 - c. On-site steam methane reforming (SMR) from natural gas
 - d. Off-site electrolysis with grid electricity, delivered via tube trailers or liquid hydrogen trucks
 - e. Off-site electrolysis with renewable energy sources, delivered via tube trailers or liquid hydrogen trucks
 - f. Off-site steam methane reforming (SMR) from natural gas, delivered via tube trailers or liquid hydrogen trucks
 - g. Off-site hydrogen production from other sources (e.g., biomass, waste, or industrial byproducts), delivered via tube trailers or liquid hydrogen trucks
 - h. Other, please indicate_____
12. **(If 9d is selected)** Which power level applies to your DC fast charging station technology? Select one.
- a. Low power (50 – 100kW)
 - b. Medium power (>100 – 250kW)
 - c. High Power (>250 – 350kW)
 - d. Ultra-high power (> 350 kW)
 - e. Other, please indicate_____
13. **(If 4f is selected)** Which of the following best describes the product technology you offer as a provider of zero and near-zero emission supporting solutions?
- a. Hardware
 - b. Software
 - c. Services, please describe_____
 - d. Other, please indicate_____
14. **(If 4f is selected)** What primary function does your supporting product serve in the zero-emission transportation ecosystem?

- a. Optimizing vehicle performance, range, and durability
 - b. Enhancing charging or refueling speed and efficiency
 - c. Providing secure and user-friendly payment solutions
 - d. Improving energy storage capacity and performance
 - e. Facilitating seamless integration with existing infrastructure
 - f. Streamlining fleet operations and management
 - g. Encouraging sustainable manufacturing and recycling practices
 - h. Increasing user convenience and accessibility
 - i. Other, please indicate_____
15. What phase of product development or deployment applies to your zero or near-zero emissions technology? Select one.
- a. Full-scale commercial availability
 - b. Limited commercial availability
 - c. Pilot / demonstration phase
 - d. Prototype phase
 - e. Research and development phase
 - f. Conceptual phase
 - g. Other, please indicate_____

Screen out if d - f and move to wrap up questions

<<<Specific Questions >>>

16. Provide a concise overview of your zero- or near-zero emission technology, including its primary applications and unique features [100-words limit]
17. If your product is still under development (i.e., not commercially available), indicate the estimated timeline for when it will become commercially available? Select one.
- a. Within the next six months
 - b. Within the next year
 - c. Within the next two years
 - d. Within the next five years
 - e. Five years or more
18. What is your current capacity to produce this product? Enter the number of units you can deliver per year.
19. What specific challenges or barriers are you facing in broadening the commercial accessibility of your product? Select all that apply.
- a. Supply chain issues
 - b. Regulatory hurdles
 - c. Manufacturing constraints
 - d. Labor constraints
 - e. Power grid constraints
 - f. Knowledge gaps
 - g. Insufficient public incentives
 - h. Insufficient support programs
 - i. Other, please indicate_____ [200-word limit]

20. What would be the estimated cost of obtaining your technology, including the cost of purchasing your software or acquiring your hardware? [Please include per unit cost and be clear on what's included] [100-word limit]
21. Please provide the best estimate of the annual maintenance cost for your technology, including ongoing maintenance, subscription fees, and any other related expenses. [Please specify the cost per unit] [100-word limit]
22. Does your product include a no-cost warranty?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Other, please indicate _____ [25-word limit]
23. **[If 22a is selected]** What type of no-cost warranty is provided?
 - a. Full
 - b. Limited
 - c. Other, please indicate _____ [25-word limit]
24. **[If 22a is selected]** What is the duration of the no-cost warranty?
 - a. Six months or less
 - b. One year or less
 - c. Two years or less
 - d. Five years or less
 - e. Ten years or less
 - f. Lifetime warranty
 - g. Other, please indicate _____ [25-word limit]
25. **[If 21b is selected]** Is a warranty offered for purchase? If yes, please describe what is offered.
 - a. Yes, please indicate _____ [25-word limit]
 - b. No
 - c. Other, please indicate _____ [25-word limit]
26. Please explain whether your technology is designed for compatibility with equipment or vehicles across various modes (e.g., transit buses and commercial vehicles), or if it is specifically intended for use with a particular mode. If this does not apply, please respond with "N/A." [100-word limit]
27. Please describe if your technology is designed to be compatible with equipment or vehicles from different manufacturers, or if it is specifically designed for use with a particular product. If this does not apply, please respond with "N/A." [100-words limit]
28. Could you provide specific details on the redundancy or resource diversity that your product offers? In other words, how can your product adapt to unforeseen events, or system shocks and stressors? If this does not apply, please respond with "N/A." [100 words limit]
29. Does your product contribute to enhancing stability in power systems? If so, how? If this does not apply, please respond with "N/A." [100 words limit]
30. SCAG defines accessibility as providing equal access to mobility, employment and economic opportunity, education, health, and other quality of life opportunities through infrastructure and technologies. Could you describe how your product meets this definition? If this does not apply, please respond with "N/A." [100 words limit]
31. Does your company have any programs in place to support and retain the local workforce? Select all that apply.
 - a. Local hire programs
 - b. Providing access to training and education
 - c. Offering industry-recognized certifications

- d. Developing customized training programs, such as pre-employment training
- e. Connecting to apprenticeships programs with a mix of instruction and on-the-job training.
- f. Supporting employee retention by offering services such as transportation, childcare assistance, and mentoring programs to individuals engaged in training
- g. Other, please indicate _____
- h. None of the above

<<<Wrap up>>>

- 32. Is there anything else you would like to tell us? _____. [100-words limit]
- 33. Would you like your company's name to be listed as a participant in our survey within the final report?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
- 34. Would you like to select another product to provide information about?
 - c. Yes
 - d. No

If the respondent chooses "yes," a new survey should be initiated

Appendix E: Other Clean Technology Adoption Considerations

As discussed in the report, the project team and SCAG initially contemplated a broader set of clean technology specifications that addressed goals such as equity, accessibility, and resiliency. While criteria such as these are important ones, they are difficult to measure categorically. For instance, the ability of disadvantaged communities to access EV charging stations cannot be measured by the qualities of the charging stations themselves. Instead, these outcomes are likely to be determined by contextual factors like grid connectivity, cost, and policies addressing the just distribution of investments. Similarly, the presence or lack of accessibility features for a given clean technology deployment is likely to be determined by a unique set of variables including vendor or client design specifications or accessibility requirements attached to a particular funding source. Goals such as resiliency that are broadly defined and resist easy measurement posed further challenges and were ultimately removed from the list of specifications.

While challenging to measure categorically, these criteria are nevertheless critical ones for SCAG and its member jurisdictions to consider when making policies, plans, or investment decisions. The table that follows provides some of these additional criteria that were excluded from the list of specifications for practical reasons. While not exhaustive, this list of criteria, as illustrated in Table 60, can provide a valuable supplement to the specifications presented earlier in the report. It is recommended that readers prioritize their needs and investigate the characteristics described below as applicable. As noted, some of these criteria were individually discussed within each section of the report.

Table 59. Additional Clean Transportation Technology Adoption Criteria.

Criteria	Description
Physical Accessibility	The measure of physical accessibility refers to whether the technology can be operated and used by individuals with disabilities. This includes, but is not limited to, individuals with mobility impairments, visual impairments, and auditory impairments. Accessibility in technology not only promotes inclusion but also adheres to principles of universal design.
Spatial Accessibility/Equity	Spatial accessibility evaluates whether the technology can be deployed within and primarily benefit disadvantaged communities. It takes into account the geographical distribution of the technology, with a focus on ensuring that marginalized or underserved areas are not left behind in the transition to more sustainable and advanced transportation solutions.
Support for Unbanked Users	This criterion assesses whether the technology provides payment options for users who do not have access to traditional banking services, including debit or credit cards. It ensures that the technology can cater to the financially excluded population.
Safe Systems	This criterion pertains to whether the technology maintains or improves upon the prevailing safety conditions. It's vital that the implementation of new technologies does not compromise user safety.
Public Perception of Safety	The public's perception of safety refers to the degree to which the general public considers the technology to be safe. Acceptance and widespread adoption of new technology often hinge on its perceived safety.
Safety Testing and Standards	This measures whether the technology has passed all applicable safety tests and adheres to industry safety standards. Compliance with established safety standards is crucial to ensuring the technology's safety and reliability. It is recommended that users verify this before making a purchase.
Shared Use Potential	This criterion evaluates whether the technology has the potential for transit and/or shared-use applications, contributing to a more efficient and sustainable use of resources.
Intelligent Transportation Systems	This evaluates whether the technology can contribute to the efficient use of existing transportation systems, such as reducing congestion, improving traffic management, or facilitating better route planning.
Resilience	This measures whether the technology enhances the overall resilience of the transportation and power system, including its ability to withstand and adapt to various disruptions.
State of Good Repair	This refers to whether the technology supports the ongoing maintenance and operation of transportation infrastructure in a condition that allows it to function as intended.

Criteria	Description
Scalability	This criterion evaluates whether the technology can be scaled up or down to suit various use cases or geographical contexts. Scalability is critical for the widespread adoption of the technology.
Versatility	This measures whether the technology supports diverse uses, which can enhance its value and applicability across a range of scenarios.
Reliability	This criterion evaluates whether the technology is generally regarded as reliable. Reliable technologies perform consistently under various conditions, maintain their functionality over time, and seldom malfunction, thereby promoting user trust and satisfaction.
Integration	This criterion measures whether the technology is interoperable and uses prevailing industry standards. Interoperability ensures that the technology can seamlessly function with other systems, enhancing user convenience and facilitating smoother operations across various platforms and devices.
Adaptability	This evaluates whether the technology is seen as reasonably future proof. Future-proof technologies are designed with an eye toward future developments, meaning they can adapt to changes in user needs, technological advances, and regulatory shifts without becoming obsolete.
Commercialization	This criterion is relevant for technologies that are still in development or prototype phases. It evaluates whether the technology has significant commercial potential, meaning it could become a successful product or service in the market once fully developed and launched.
Incentivization	This criterion assesses whether the technology is incentivized by the public sector. Public incentives can accelerate the adoption of new technologies by reducing costs, mitigating risks, and providing supportive regulatory frameworks.
Job Creation	This measures whether the technology is likely to create new jobs in SCAG region. Job creation contributes to economic development and is often a key consideration in public policy and investment decisions.
Locality	This criterion evaluates whether the technology sector or vendor has a significant presence in SCAG region. A strong local presence can contribute to regional economic development, provide local job opportunities, and facilitate coordination with local stakeholders.
Workforce Retention	This criterion assesses whether the technology enables the retention of the existing workforce. Workforce retention refers to the capacity of technology to maintain current jobs, either directly (through jobs in the same industry) or indirectly (through creating demand for jobs in related industries).


Appendix F: Technology Compendium Two-Pagers

Single Occupant Vehicles

The landscape of passenger zero emission vehicles (ZEV) is primarily divided into two categories: Plug-In Electric Vehicles (PEVs) and Hydrogen Fuel Cell Electric Vehicles (FCEVs). Currently PEVs, which include both Battery Electric Vehicles (BEV) and Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicles (PHEV), continue to lead the charge in the clean technology revolution, bolstered by continuous improvements in battery technology. On the other hand, FCEVs, although fewer in model diversity, present an alternative for longer journeys where quick refueling is paramount. Several auto manufacturers are investing in this technology to expand their offerings. The production of green hydrogen, primarily through renewable energy-powered electrolysis, is slowly gaining traction. However, the hydrogen refueling infrastructure remains less developed compared to the electric charging network, which impacts market adoption. As of December 2022, consumers in California had a broad range of options with 50 passenger BEV models, 51 PHEV models, and 3 FCEV models commercially available for sale¹⁹⁷. It should also be noted that while PHEVs are considered a ZEV, they are only truly zero emission when operating solely on battery power. Once the battery is depleted, they operate similarly to a conventional hybrid vehicle, utilizing a gasoline engine. The average electric range of PHEVs has steadily increased from 20.5 miles in 2012 to 38.5 miles as of 2021.¹⁹⁸

The adoption of passenger ZEVs in the SCAG region has steadily increased over the years. ZEV adoption started gaining momentum around 2010 and was initially concentrated in high populous areas and regions with higher socioeconomic status. In the SCAG region, the majority of ZEVs are found in Los Angeles and Orange counties, with Los Angeles County having more than 50 percent and Orange County having more than 25 percent of the total ZEVs in the region. Prior to 2010, the SCAG region had only 122 ZEVs. Since then, the number has surged to approximately 525,000, representing about 3.9 percent of the total light-duty vehicle fleet in the region by the end of 2022. Sales trends indicate that ZEVs are becoming an increasingly significant portion of the market, composing roughly 25% of light-duty vehicle sales as of the second quarter of 2023. BEVs and PHEVs represent the majority of ZEVs in the region, with FCEVs lagging significantly behind, only representing 0.06 percent of ZEVs in the region. It is worth noting that the majority of the BEVs (88 percent) in the region have battery electric ranges over 200 miles. Given the current adoption rates, the region is making significant progress toward the targets set by the state to require 100% ZEV sales by 2035.

Despite the rapid increase in ZEV adoption, the upfront cost of ZEVs is still higher than their counterpart internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles. The latest report from Kelley Blue Book¹⁹⁹, reveals that the average cost for a passenger ZEV is \$18,000 more than that of an average ICE vehicle. The high price of ZEV, along with limited access to charging and fueling infrastructure, represent significant barriers to the adoption of ZEVs, particularly in low- and moderate-income communities. To counteract these challenges, the SCAG region should employ a comprehensive,



¹⁹⁷ <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/zero-emission-vehicle-and-infrastructure-statistics>

¹⁹⁸ <https://www.iea.org/data-and-statistics/charts/evolution-of-average-range-of-electric-vehicles-by-powertrain-2010-2021>

¹⁹⁹ <https://mediaroom.kbb.com/2022-05-10-Luxury-Share-Increases-in-April.-Pushing-New-Vehicle-Average-Transaction-Prices-Higher.-according-to-Kelley-Blue-Book>

multi-faceted approach that includes both demand and supply side strategies. On the demand side, financial incentives such as rebates, and grants are vital. Not only do they make new ZEVs more affordable for the average consumer, but they are particularly crucial in ensuring that ZEVs are accessible to low- and moderate-income communities. Alongside these incentives, awareness campaigns and education about the benefits of ZEVs can help overcome knowledge gaps that potential buyers may face. Moreover, the region should also actively leverage and promote the pre-owned ZEV market. Pre-owned ZEVs provide a more affordable entry point for low- and moderate-income communities, helping to overcome affordability issues and boost adoption rates. Therefore, it is important for the region to thoughtfully design and implement incentive programs that encourage the purchase of these pre-owned ZEVs. Such incentives could range from direct financial benefits, like grants or rebates, to non-monetary incentives such as extended warranties or battery certifications, aimed specifically at making pre-owned ZEVs an attractive and viable choice for these communities.


On the supply side, the region should advocate for the development of accessible charging and hydrogen refueling infrastructure. Given that many residents in low- and moderate-income communities may not have access to home charging, public and shared charging infrastructure becomes vital. This can be achieved through partnerships with utilities, local businesses, and real estate developers, as well as leveraging federal and state funding opportunities. In tandem, the region should support building codes that require new constructions and major renovations to be EV-ready, ensuring infrastructure readiness keeps pace with increasing ZEV adoption. To further enhance equity outcomes of this transition, the region could consider establishing a ZEV infrastructure grant program specifically targeted at underserved communities. The program could offer funding to local businesses, nonprofits, and community organizations to install charging or refueling stations in areas that need them the most. The region should also take measures to ensure that the transition to ZEVs is inclusive. This could involve providing workforce development programs focused on ZEV and charging infrastructure maintenance and installation, thereby creating employment opportunities in the clean technology sector for residents of these communities.

Commercial Medium & Heavy-Duty Vehicles

The clean technology landscape for commercial medium and heavy-duty vehicles (MHDV) is currently in a transformative phase, with an increasing shift away from traditional fossil fuel-based technologies toward cleaner, more sustainable alternatives. This shift is being mainly driven by advancements in battery electric, and hydrogen fuel cell technologies that have shown great potential in reducing greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) and improving air quality specifically reducing nitrogen oxides and diesel particulate matter emissions. Several leading manufacturers are now offering electric or hydrogen-powered models for medium and heavy-duty applications, including delivery trucks, semi-tractors, etc. According to the CALSTART’s Zero Emission Technology Inventory²⁰⁰, there are currently 134 models of zero emission MHDVs available in North American market of which 9 of them are FCEVs and the rest are BEVs. The adoption of MHDVs in SCAG region is still in its early stages. Currently, there are only 178 MHDVs (58 heavy duty and 120 medium duty vehicles) in the region, indicating that the use of MHDVs powered by zero-emission technology is not yet widespread. Moreover, the concentration of MHDVs is not evenly distributed across SCAG region. The majority of these vehicles are concentrated in Los Angeles and Orange counties, which are two of the most densely populated and heavily trafficked areas in the region. This concentration of MHD ZEVs in certain areas may be due to the availability of charging infrastructure as well as operational and logistical considerations that make it more financially viable for businesses to adopt MHD ZEVs.

The types of MHD ZEVs currently being used in SCAG region are mainly tractor trucks, terminal tractor and step vans. Tractor trucks, also known as semi-trucks, are primarily used for hauling large quantities of goods by attaching various types of trailers. Terminal tractors, also known as yard trucks, are primarily used in ports, warehouses, and freight terminals for the purpose of quickly moving trailers and containers short distances within these confined areas. Step vans are also typically used for deliveries in urban areas due to their ease of entry and exit, ample cargo space, and maneuverability in tight spaces.

Figure 33. Number of Medium- and Heavy-Duty ZEVs by Vehicle Type and County²⁰¹



²⁰⁰ <https://globaldrivetozero.org/tools/zeti-data-explorer/>

²⁰¹ <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/zero-emission-vehicle-and-infrastructure-statistics/medium-and-heavy> (Accessed: July 7, 2023)

Despite these advances, challenges remain, including the high upfront costs, lack of available charging and fueling infrastructure, as well as the payload capacity constraints posed by these vehicles. For example, while a diesel semi-tractor is priced around \$130,000, the cost of a battery electric semi-tractor is considerably higher, standing at approximately \$480,000, making the latter nearly four times as expensive as its diesel counterpart. The lack of widespread and accessible charging and fueling infrastructure also presents a significant challenge to the adoption of zero-emission MHDVs. The current limited availability of charging and refueling stations not only impacts the operational range of these vehicles but also creates uncertainty for fleet operators and drivers, hindering the full-scale transition to cleaner transportation technologies. Payload capacity is also a crucial concern in the transition to zero-emission MHDVs. Due to the weight of the batteries, the battery electric MHDVs often have reduced payload capacity compared to their conventional counterparts, which can limit their functionality in certain industries. As the payload directly correlates to profitability in commercial transport, this reduction can deter businesses from adopting these cleaner, yet potentially less economically efficient, vehicles.

Despite these challenges, the region can play a pivotal role in addressing some of these major barriers that impede the adoption of zero-emission MHDV. Addressing the high upfront cost of zero-emission MHDVs, particularly for owner-operators who may struggle with financial viability, is a critical area where the region can have a significant impact. Firstly, the region should advocate for and support the expansion of federal, state, and local financial incentives that reduce the initial purchase cost of zero-emission MHDVs. These incentives could include grants, tax credits, or rebate programs specifically targeted at owner-operators and small businesses. The region could also partner with financial institutions to develop favorable loan or leasing programs that make it easier for these operators to finance the transition to zero-emission vehicles. Additionally, the region could foster partnerships between owner-operators and larger fleet operators or freight companies to leverage economies of scale in purchasing zero-emission vehicles. By buying in bulk, these groups could negotiate better pricing from manufacturers, making these advanced vehicles more accessible to individual owner-operators.

The region can also play a vital role in accelerating the deployment of zero-emission infrastructure, such as charging stations and hydrogen fueling centers. Leveraging its expertise in regional planning and coordination, SCAG can undertake comprehensive infrastructure planning specifically tailored for MHDVs. This planning process should involve identifying strategic locations for charging and hydrogen refueling infrastructure, factoring in variables such as vehicle routes, parking and dwelling times, proximity to the electrical grid or hydrogen supply, and zoning regulations. In addition to planning, the region can take a proactive role in promoting the construction of charging and refueling stations. Working in collaboration with local jurisdictions, private partners, and utility companies, the region can incentivize infrastructure development through various financial mechanisms, such as grants, low-interest loans, or public-private partnerships. Furthermore, the region can play an instrumental role in streamlining the permitting and approval process for infrastructure installation. By working with local governments to simplify these procedures, SCAG can reduce administrative barriers, making it quicker and easier for businesses and property owners to install charging and refueling infrastructure.


Workforce development and education campaigns are crucial tools that the region can employ to stimulate the transition to zero-emission MHDVs. By partnering with community colleges, trade schools, and universities, the region can aid in the development and expansion of training programs focused on clean transportation technologies. The creation of apprenticeship or internship programs that provide hands-on experience and job placement opportunities in the emerging field of zero-emission transportation could also be facilitated through such collaborations.

Transit Buses

The clean technology landscape for transit buses has evolved significantly over the past few years, experiencing rapid advancements and adoption rates across the globe. The primary clean technology solutions that have gained traction are battery electric buses (BEBs) and fuel cell electric buses (FCEBs). Both technologies are proven to significantly reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) and criteria pollutant emissions compared to traditional diesel- and natural-gas powered buses, thereby playing a crucial role in decarbonizing public transit. Among the two major zero emission transit bus technologies, battery electric buses have become more prevalent, thanks to continued advancements in battery technology that have led to improved energy density, lower costs, and longer lifespans. On the other hand, FCEBs, powered by hydrogen, offer another clean alternative. While FCEBs are currently less widespread than BEBs, they provide a promising solution, particularly for long-range transit applications, due to their quick refueling times and longer-range capabilities. According to the CALSTART's Zero Emission Technology Inventory²⁰², there are currently more than 25 models of zero emission transit buses available in the North American market of which 23 are BEBs and 2 are FCEBs.

Currently zero emission transit s buses make up the largest number of heavy-duty ZEVs in the SCAG region. When looking at the number of ZE transit vehicles by operator in the SCAG region, LA Metro and the Antelope Valley Transit Authority have the largest fleets, with the latter having the most ZE transit vehicles in the region. The Anaheim Transportation Network, City of Los Angeles, and Foothill Transit also have a considerable number of ZE transit vehicles, although to a lesser extent. Other operators in the region have a much smaller number of ZEBs or none at all (Figure 33).

Figure 34. Zero Emission Transit Vehicles by Operator²⁰³



²⁰² <https://globaldrivetozero.org/tools/zeti-data-explorer/>

²⁰³ <https://www.transit.dot.gov/ntd/data-product/2021-data-tables>

Transitioning transit buses in the region to zero-emission technology is not only a crucial strategy for reducing GHG emissions but also a necessary measure with profound implications for public health. Diesel-powered buses emit pollutants, including particulate matter and nitrogen oxides, which contribute to air pollution and associated health issues such as respiratory diseases, heart disease, and premature death. A transition to zero-emission buses would, therefore, result in significant public health improvements, particularly in low-income and disadvantaged communities. These communities are often disproportionately affected by the adverse health effects of air pollution due to their proximity to major transportation corridors and industrial areas. Hence, it is imperative for the region to take a proactive and strategic approach in accelerating the transition of their transit bus fleet to zero emissions. Even though the California Innovative Clean Transit (ICT) regulation has established mandates for transit agencies to make the shift to zero emissions, a complete transition to ZEB is not expected until 2040. To this end, all the regional partners should collaborate to develop a comprehensive, long-term electrification plan - akin to the ZEB Rollout Plans created in response to the ICT regulations. This plan should outline key milestones, pinpoint potential challenges, and propose solutions, taking into consideration factors such as fleet size, route characteristics, bus depot infrastructure, and potential requirements for fast-charging stations or on-route charging facilities.

Establishing partnerships with industry stakeholders, such as bus manufacturers, charging infrastructure providers, utilities, and funding agencies, is crucial for the region. Collaborative efforts between these entities can play a pivotal role in streamlining the transition to clean technology, lowering overall costs, and guaranteeing reliable service. Zero emission infrastructure, and its availability, plays a pivotal role in the transition to ZEB technology. For example, reliable and strategically placed charging and hydrogen fueling stations are critical to successful transition of transit buses in the SCAG region to zero emission technology. Implementing this infrastructure necessitates a robust power grid that can handle the increased energy demand. This is where close coordination with utilities becomes crucial. The transformation of the transit fleet to zero-emission technology will inevitably increase the demand for electricity, thus potentially challenging the local grid's capacity. The region must work together with utility providers to understand the timing and scale of this additional demand, and to identify any grid enhancements required to support this transition.

The transition to zero-emission bus technology is a significant undertaking, made particularly challenging by the higher upfront costs of these clean transit options and their respective infrastructure. This transition would not be possible without substantial support from local, state, and federal funding. To offset initial expenses such as bus procurement and charging infrastructure installation, the regional partners should actively seek federal and state funding opportunities. Launching pilot projects can also provide hands-on experience and highlight potential challenges before a full-scale deployment is undertaken. Furthermore, equipping staff with necessary training on the operation and maintenance of zero-emission buses and related infrastructure is critical. This initiative will enhance internal capabilities and ensure that transit agencies are prepared to manage and optimize the performance of their zero-emission fleets effectively.

Passenger Rail

Adoption of zero-emission technologies in the rail sector is still in its early stages; however, these technologies are relatively mature and have been deployed elsewhere – particularly outside of North America, such as many European and Asian countries – but not yet in the SCAG region. Due to the predictable nature of passenger locomotive operations in terms of routes and schedules, there is a potential opportunity to employ battery-electric technology for shorter routes that allow for convenient charging. Alternatively, fuel cell technology offers more flexibility for passenger rail agencies, enabling them to operate longer routes with faster and less frequent refueling. Caltrans has identified hydrogen locomotives as the most suitable zero-emission (ZE) technology for Amtrak intercity operations²⁰⁴ and has devised a strategy to transition its rail fleet to 100 percent ZE by 2035. As advancements in zero-emission switch locomotives have shown promise, it is estimated that commercially available zero-emission passenger locomotives will be developed by 2030, building upon these technological successes.

Within SCAG region, zero emission rail have not been fully realized, however a number of agencies have plans to implement these technologies over the coming decade. For example, Metrolink, which serves five of the six counties (all but Imperial County) outlines in its Climate Action Plan that it plans to develop and implement the necessary steps to achieve widespread electrification across its rail fleet fully by 2028. This process will occur in stages, with the Antelope Valley Line expected to be fully electrified by 2025. The plan notes that this will be accomplished by replacing diesel locomotives with electric locomotives. Additional steps described in the plan include the expansion of on-board energy storage systems that can capture and reuse regenerative braking energy. For lines where electrification is not feasible in the short term the plan lays out a program to replace or retrofit older locomotives with more energy efficient models that meet the latest emissions standards.²⁰⁵ In San Bernardino County, the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA) has laid out plans to debut its hydrogen locomotives in 2024. The project will be funded by the California Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program and expected to begin testing in late 2023.²⁰⁶

The first hydrogen-powered passenger train will debut in 2024, running between San Bernardino



Source: SBCTA

In addition to these initiatives, the California High-Speed Rail (CA HSR) project²⁰⁷ also aims to connect major urban centers in California, from San Francisco to Los Angeles and eventually extending to Sacramento and San Diego using all-electric trains. Once completed, it will significantly reduce travel times between these cities and serve as a more sustainable transportation alternative to driving or flying. According to CA HSR, this rail will run on electricity supplied entirely from renewable sources.²⁰⁸ In addition to CA HSR, Brightline West²⁰⁹ is another anticipated high-speed rail service aiming to connect Southern California with Las Vegas, Nevada. This project will offer a much-needed alternative

²⁰⁴ Caltrans, Caltrans Intercity Passenger Rail, Our strategy toward zero emission (Draft), October 28, 2022. (weblink: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-10/Day%201%20Ext%205%20Caltrans%2020201026.pdf>).

²⁰⁵ <https://metrolinktrains.com/globalassets/about/agency/sustainability/climate-action-plan.pdf>

²⁰⁶ <https://www.gosbcta.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/ZEMU-Technology-Fact-Sheet-ENG-120522.pdf>

²⁰⁷ <https://hsr.ca.gov/about/>

²⁰⁸ <https://hsr.ca.gov/communications-outreach/info-center/get-the-facts/>

²⁰⁹ <https://www.brightlinewest.com/>

to the heavily trafficked I-15 corridor, providing faster and more efficient travel options for tourists and business travelers alike. Just like the CA HSR, the Brightline West will be operating all-electric, high-speed trains.

Furthermore, in April 2023, California Air Resources Board (CARB) adopted the In-Use Locomotive Regulation which mandates passenger locomotives manufactured in 2030 and onwards must operate in a zero-emission configuration within California. While this regulation provides a strong policy framework, the region must proactively prepare for the required infrastructure, whether it be hydrogen or battery charging, and focus on technology demonstrations to expedite the adoption of zero-emission solutions in the passenger rail system within the SCAG region.


Transitioning a passenger rail system to zero emissions requires a concerted effort and strategic actions at various levels. To achieve a successful transition, the region should *undertake* pilot projects, similar to the initiatives led by the SBCTA, to systematically test and evaluate diverse zero-emission technologies, including hydrogen and battery-electric systems. These pilot projects will provide invaluable insights into the feasibility, performance, and scalability of various clean technologies, enabling informed decision-making and effective implementation strategies. Partnerships with manufacturers of zero-emission rail vehicles are crucial for the region's transition, as exemplified by the Zero Emission Heavy Transport (ZEHTRANS) working group led by CARB. Collaborating with these manufacturers can ensure that the passenger rail system receives state-of-the-art, reliable, and efficient zero-emission locomotives. Additionally, partnerships with charging and fueling infrastructure providers will be essential to establish a robust network of charging or refueling stations to support the operation of electric or hydrogen-powered locomotives. Utilities will also play a critical role in providing the necessary energy supply, grid integration, and charging infrastructure for passenger rail systems, especially considering the significantly high-power needs for charging the battery electric locomotives. Close coordination with utility will ensure a reliable and uninterrupted power source for electric trains or support the deployment of charging stations. Securing funding for demonstrations and implementation is also a vital aspect of the transition process too. The region should actively seek funding opportunities from federal, state, and local sources to support technology demonstrations, infrastructure development, and fleet electrification.

EV Charging Infrastructure

The shift to clean technologies requires access to charging infrastructure. This can be particularly challenging for people who live in apartments or other multi-unit dwellings, where installing personal charging stations (i.e., home charging) might not be possible. Public charging stations are an alternative, but they require investment in infrastructure that may be lacking in low and moderate-income neighborhoods. Even with the significant investments made at the federal and state levels, those investments alone cannot close the gap. According to California Energy Commission’s (CEC) AB 2127 report²¹⁰, to meet the ambitious goals set by Executive Order N-79-20, nearly 2 million public and shared-private charging facilities will be needed by 2035 to support light-duty vehicles across the state. Within the SCAG region alone, the report indicates the requirement for 1 million of these charging points (by 2035). Notably, out of these, 689,000 chargers should be publicly accessible stations, while the remaining chargers are anticipated to meet the needs of workplaces and multi-unit dwellings.

As of now, according to the CEC’s Zero Emission Vehicle and Infrastructure Statistics²¹¹, the region hosts approximately 33,000 Level 2 and 3,700 Direct Current Fast Charging (DCFC) chargers. Los Angeles County leads the region in this regard, holding 76 percent of all Level 2 chargers and 50 percent of all DC fast chargers, reflecting the large population and EV adoption rates in the county. San Bernardino and Riverside counties have comparable numbers of chargers, highlighting their efforts in expanding the charging infrastructure as well. Unfortunately, the more rural Imperial County lags behind, possessing the fewest chargers in the region. This disparity underscores the need for a more equitable distribution of resources to support widespread ZEV adoption. For a detailed visual representation of the charging infrastructure distribution across the SCAG region, please refer to Figure 35 below.

Figure 35. Number of Public EVSE by County



When the current number of chargers deployed in the region are compared with the future projections outlined in the AB 2127 report, it is evident that the existing infrastructure falls significantly short of the projected demand. To address the infrastructure deficit, there is a significant need for an increased pace of charger installation from between 2023

²¹⁰ <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/reports/electric-vehicle-charging-infrastructure-assessment-ab-2127>
²¹¹ <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/zero-emission-vehicle-and-infrastructure-statistics>

and 2035. Specifically, each week during this period, around 1,500 chargers for light-duty vehicles should be constructed and commissioned in the SCAG region. This clearly shows why it is important for regional agencies such as SCAG and their regional partners to intensify their efforts in deploying clean fueling and charging infrastructure throughout their jurisdictions.


Closing this substantial gap in the SCAG region's charging infrastructure will require a multi-pronged strategy. First and foremost, a significant increase in investment from both the public and private sectors is vital. Infrastructure development should be included as a key component in local planning, as well as incentivized in the private sector through programs such as grants, rebates, or subsidies. Public-private partnerships could be an effective means for accelerating the development of the charging infrastructure. In the context of EV charging infrastructure, such partnerships can expedite the expansion process by leveraging private investment, operational expertise, and technology innovations. Governments can provide incentives such as tax benefits, subsidies, or preferential policies to attract private players, while private companies can contribute with advanced technologies, efficient management practices, and significant capital investment. In addition to the necessary financial investment, the region should also focus on strategic deployment of charging stations. This involves identifying and prioritizing areas where charging infrastructure is lacking, especially in underserved and rural areas like Imperial County. The integration of charging infrastructure with urban planning, such as the inclusion of charging stations in new residential, commercial, and public buildings, will also be critical.

Making necessary adjustments to zoning codes can also accelerate the installation of charging stations in existing buildings by minimizing constraints and restrictions. For example, modifying parking requirements for buildings with EV charging points to be more lenient can act as a motivating factor for property owners to install charging infrastructure. The region shall also consider adopting building codes that surpass state requirements for EV charging infrastructure to ensure new residential, commercial, and public buildings as well as buildings undergoing major renovations are equipped with charging stations, or at the very least, are designed to be 'EV-ready'. Streamlining permitting processes can also play a crucial role in expediting charging infrastructure development. By simplifying the application process, reducing wait times, and perhaps even offering expedited or 'over-the-counter' permit approval for charging stations, local governments can encourage more widespread installation of EV charging infrastructure. Furthermore, the region should prioritize investment in innovative technologies and solutions to enhance the versatility and convenience of the charging infrastructure, ultimately catering to a wider array of EV types and user needs.

Hydrogen Fueling Infrastructure

In terms of hydrogen fueling infrastructure, Southern California is one of the few regions in the world with a significant network of hydrogen fueling stations. SCAG region is gradually increasing its hydrogen fueling infrastructure with a total of 39 fueling stations available as of January 2023. The majority of these stations are concentrated in Los Angeles and Orange County, with only five, four, and three stations located in San Bernardino, Riverside, and Ventura counties, respectively. This lack of infrastructure, and particularly the concentration of fueling stations in high populations centers, speaks to the nascent nature of this technology. While there are currently 34 light-duty retail stations open, 20 additional stations are planned to open soon. For heavy-duty hydrogen fueling stations, there are five currently operating, with one planned to open in the near future (Figure 36).

Figure 36. Number and Type of Hydrogen Fueling Stations Within the SCAG Region, by County²¹²



The deployment of hydrogen fueling stations brings with it a distinctive set of difficulties that set it apart from traditional fuel or EV charging infrastructure. To begin with, the processes involved in the production, transportation, and storage of hydrogen fuel are both technically complex and financially demanding. Hydrogen is generally derived from natural gas through a method called steam methane reforming (SMR) or from water through electrolysis, both procedures needing considerable energy inputs. Additionally, due to hydrogen's low energy density and high flammability, its transportation and storage present significant logistical and safety issues. Secondly, the initial investment required for setting up a hydrogen fueling station is considerably high, often acting as a barrier for private sector involvement without substantial financial incentives or subsidies. In addition, there are regulatory complexities to navigate, including

²¹² <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/zero-emission-vehicle-and-infrastructure-statistics/hydrogen-refueling>

obtaining necessary permits and compliance with safety regulations, which can be time-consuming and costly. In addition to these barriers, creating a hydrogen infrastructure is a classic 'chicken-and-egg' problem. Consumers are hesitant to buy hydrogen fuel cell vehicles due to the lack of widespread infrastructure, while providers are reluctant to invest heavily in building out infrastructure until there is a large enough fleet of hydrogen vehicles to justify the investment.

To overcome these barriers, the region can adopt a multi-faceted strategy. One key approach is leveraging public-private partnerships (PPPs) to stimulate investment in hydrogen infrastructure. Governments can provide incentives such as subsidies, grants, or favorable regulations to attract private sector involvement, while businesses can contribute their financial resources, technical expertise, and innovative capabilities. The synergy of public regulation and private sector efficiency can accelerate the establishment and operation of hydrogen fueling stations. Streamlining the regulatory process can also be crucial in overcoming these hurdles. Governments can simplify and expedite permitting procedures, provide clear guidelines for compliance with safety regulations, and offer support to navigate through the bureaucratic process. This not only eases the pathway for station developers but also reduces the time and cost associated with bringing a station into operation.

Furthermore, the region can invest in research and development to drive down the costs associated with hydrogen production, transportation, and storage. Technological innovations can make these processes more efficient, safer, and economically viable. The region could also explore alternative, localized production methods, such as on-site electrolysis powered by renewable energy, which could potentially eliminate transportation and storage issues. Finally, education and awareness campaigns can play a significant role in overcoming the 'chicken-and-egg' problem. By informing the public about the benefits of hydrogen fuel cell vehicles, including their fast-refueling times and long ranges, governments can stimulate consumer demand, thus incentivizing providers to invest in infrastructure. Similarly, providing information about the potential profitability of hydrogen fueling stations to potential investors can help to encourage private sector involvement.

Clean Transportation Technology Compendium

November 2, 2023

Transportation Committee

WWW.SCAG.CA.GOV

Clean Transportation Technology

- Clean transportation technology encompasses zero- and near-zero emission vehicles (ZEVs and NZEVs), related infrastructure, and their supporting products that minimize environmental impact throughout their life cycle.



Project Goals & Objectives

- Laying out available zero- and near-zero emissions technologies.
- Provide information on each technology with respect to:
 - Emissions benefits
 - Technology readiness level
 - Status of implementation
 - Cost
 - Market conditions
 - Ability to scale

Four Modes of Interest:

Light Duty Vehicles



Medium & Heavy Duty Vehicles

Buses

Rail

Mobile Sources Are Significant Contributor to Air Quality Issues in the South Coast Air Basin

- 81% of nitrogen oxides (NOx) emissions and 25% of fine particulate matter (PM2.5) emissions in the South Coast Air Basin



California's Zero Emission Goals



 **100% ZEV sales** by 2035

Full transition to **ZEV short-haul/drayage trucks** by 2035 

Full transition to **ZEV buses & heavy-duty long-haul trucks** by 2045*  

Full transition to **ZE off-road equipment** by 2035*  *where feasible

Three Types of Technologies Considered



Technology Specifications



GHG Emissions Reduction



Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions Reductions



Range




Cost (Capex, Opex)



Longevity



Technical Assistance



Technology Adoption



Total Cost of Ownership

Tools



Desk Research



SCAG Clean Technology Survey




On-on-One Interview

Light Duty Vehicles

- In 2022, more than 175,000 light-duty ZEVs were sold in the SCAG region.
- As of December 2022, there were 50 BEV models, 51 PHEV models, and 3 FCEV models commercially available for sale.
- Current BEVs have EV ranges of 100 – 500 miles.
- Despite a higher upfront cost of ~\$18,000, electric cars and SUVs offer savings over 15 years due to reduced operational and maintenance expenses

ZEV POPULATION		
Total Light-Duty Vehicles end of 2022		
	524,892	
Battery Electric (BEV)	Plug-in Hybrid (PHEV)	Fuel Cell (FCEV)
2.60%	1.19%	0.06%
354,725	162,645	7,522




Zero Emission Medium & Heavy-Duty Vehicles (MHDV)

- Currently 134 models of zero emission MHDVs available in North American market of which 9 of them are FCEVs and the rest are BEVs
- Only 178 Zero Emission MHDVs in region
- Capital cost significantly higher than their counterpart diesel (~3x)
- Up to 500 miles EV range



Buses

Number of ZEBs in SCAG Region



Almost 500 ZEBs in SCAG

- Buses constitute the majority of heavy-duty ZEVs in the SCAG region, with the most being transit buses, followed by school buses and coach buses
- Significantly higher capital cost (~\$1M vs. \$500k for diesel)
- Up to 350 miles range

Rail

- Zero-emission technologies in the rail sector are still in early stages
- Metrolink plans to achieve widespread electrification across its rail fleet fully by 2028, starting with the Antelope Valley Line in 2025
- San Bernardino County Transportation Authority plans to debut its first battery electric and hydrogen locomotives in 2024
- BNSF Railway will repower a diesel line-haul locomotive with a zero-emission battery-powered locomotive, reducing diesel emissions in disadvantaged communities
- California Department of Transportation aims to achieve a fully zero-emission intercity rail by 2035

METROLINK

Caltrans

AMTRAK

sb cta San Bernardino County Transportation Authority

BNSF RAILWAY



Different Types of Charging Infrastructure



Level 2 Charging Stations



Direct Current Fast Chargers (DCFC)



Pantograph




Wireless



Canopy Charging


Charging Infrastructure

- EV charging infrastructure in SCAG has made progress, but more growth is needed to support ZEVs
- Approx. 3,700 DC fast chargers and 33,000 level 2 chargers in the region
- The AB 2127 report estimates that by 2035, 2 million charging stations will be needed in California (MUD + Public), with 1 million in the SCAG region alone.
- Cost for charging infrastructure varies from \$2,500 for L2 chargers to \$500k for 800 kW chargers




Hydrogen Fueling Infrastructure

- Southern California has a significant network of hydrogen fueling stations
- SCAG region has 39 operating hydrogen fueling stations with 21 being planned to open soon
- 5 of these operating hydrogen station are for heavy duty vehicles
- A typical H2 station cost between \$4 – \$8M



Natural Gas


- Natural gas fueling infrastructure is spread relatively evenly across four of the six counties within the region.
- Los Angeles has the most natural gas stations with 34.
- A typical large station (1,500+ GGE per day) cost around \$1.2M – \$1.8M



Supporting Products



Battery Energy Storage



Battery Management System



Vehicle to Grid/Building



Charging Management Solution



Fleet Telematics

Regional Adoption Barriers

- High upfront cost of vehicles
- Difficulties to comply with various regulations and standards.

Cost



- Limited model availability
- Charging time and duty cycles
- Industry sustainability and business profitability

Technology Readiness



- Insufficient public ZEV infrastructure
- Limited space for depot charging
- Infrastructure and real estate constraints

Infrastructure and Fueling Access



- Limited knowledge of new technology and incentives
- Lack of technology confidence

Consumer Awareness



- Lack of vehicle and equipment performance standards
- Inconsistent infrastructure design and standard protocols
- Limited incentives and funding support
- Permitting delays

Regulatory Support




Policy Gaps



Lack of Affordability for Low- & Moderate-Income Communities

The average cost for a passenger ZEV is \$18,000 more than that of an average ICE vehicle



Lack of Investment in Charging & Fueling Infrastructure

To bridge the current infrastructure gap, from 2023 to 2030, there's a need to install approximately 3,000 chargers weekly for light-duty vehicles and 430 chargers for heavy-duty vehicles statewide

A Suite of Strategies Needed



Targeted Incentive Programs



Public Education and Community Outreach



Building Codes



Land Use & Zoning



Promote Public-Private Partnership



Technical Assistance



Workforce Development



Lead by Example



THANK YOU!

For more information, please visit:

scag.ca.gov



AGENDA ITEM 10
REPORT

Southern California Association of Governments
November 2, 2023

To: Transportation Committee (TC)
From: Jaimee Lederman, Senior Regional Planner
(213) 236-1948, lederman@scag.ca.gov

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S
APPROVAL

Subject: Federal Transportation Funding in the SCAG Region: The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Information Only – No Action Required

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians. 7: Secure funding to support agency priorities to effectively and efficiently deliver work products.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) is the current federal surface transportation funding bill and appropriates funding for various transportation programs through fiscal year (FY) 2026. Like preceding federal surface transportation funding bills, IIJA continues many federal programs and changes a few to reflect current federal priorities. IIJA is touted as a once-in-a-generation investment in the nation's infrastructure, and SCAG forecasts a return to pre-IIJA trends beginning in FY 2027. The majority of federal transportation funding passes first through the state, and the majority is used to fund state priorities. Only a minority portion of federal funding is distributed as flexible funding to the region, allowing SCAG, county transportation commissions (CTCs), transit operators, and other local recipients to prioritize local needs.

Staff is presenting this report to provide more information on the resources IIJA has supplied for our region, and to provide background on how federal funding flows to our region more generally. This report also aims to correct inaccurate information that has been distributed to several cities and counties in the region and responds to a request made at the last TC meeting. Finally, this report provides an update on IIJA following a presentation to TC in February 2023 by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on Federal Funding and Policy Direction for Transportation.

BACKGROUND:Federal Transportation Funding Generally

IJA is the most recent federal surface transportation funding reauthorization bill. Congress authorizes the federal government to spend its transportation revenue on programs that support public policy interests for a given amount of time—typically a five- to six-year period. The Act provides for the maximum amount of funding that can be appropriated to transportation funding programs each fiscal year during the term of the act. Each surface transportation act is a new bill, and though each act generally continues the majority of funding programs and formulas for state allocation, the passing of a bill is an opportunity to reflect current congressional priorities. Changes from one act to the next typically include changes in the overall funding level and the relative funding levels between programs, the addition of new funding programs that reflect current policy and strategies, and the removal or revision of outdated funding programs. Each transportation act can also amend how funding is distributed for specific programs, who is an eligible recipient of funding, and what the funds can be used for. While there is a wide array of federal funding programs, specific programs are typically limited to narrowly-tailored uses (for example, limited to a specific mode, or to capital spending only).

IJA is the most recent surface transportation funding bill, signed into law in November 2021. The bill includes \$1.2 trillion in investments over five years, from FY 2022 through FY 2026, including \$550 billion in new spending on transportation, water and power infrastructure, and pollution cleanup, in addition to regular annual spending on infrastructure projects. It has been billed as a “once-in-a-generation” investment in the nation’s transportation infrastructure.

Most FHWA federal funding does not flow directly to the region, and instead flows through the state. Most federal funding for non-transit modes flow through the state. Depending on the program the state typically chooses how funding is used and distributed. Traditionally in California, 60 percent of federal funding is used at the discretion of the State and is primarily used to build and maintain the state highway system. For example, federal funding is mixed with funding from the State Highway Account to fund state programs including the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). California’s Active Transportation Program (ATP) is also funded with a combination of funding from the Federal Transportation Alternative Funding Program and revenues from the State Highway Account.

About 40 percent of federal funding is available for regional/local agencies within the limits of the specific program. Roughly 40 percent of the amount available to regional/local agencies are selected by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) through competitive project selection processes. An example includes the Highway Bridge Program.

SCAG is required to select projects to be funded with certain FHWA federal formula funding. The specific federal funding sources that “flow” through SCAG are certain Federal Transit Administration

programs (described in the following section) and three FHWA programs. SCAG, as the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization, is required to select projects to be funded with the following FHWA federal funding sources:

- The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program provides funds to areas that do not meet National Ambient Air Quality Standards. CMAQ funding can be used for transportation projects designed to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality. The CMAQ program has been a key funding mechanism for helping urban areas meet air quality goals and supporting investments that encourage alternatives to driving alone and improve traffic flow.
- The Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) program provides flexible funding that may be used for projects to preserve and improve the conditions and performance on Federal-aid highways, bridges and tunnel projects on public roads, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and transit capital projects, including intercity bus terminals. STBG is the largest flexible federal funding source, established to promote flexibility in state and local transportation decisions and provides flexible funding to best address state and local transportation needs.
- IIJA established the Carbon Reduction Program (CRP), which provides funds for projects designed to reduce transportation emissions, defined as carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from on-road highway sources. Of the funding allocated to California, 65 percent is apportioned directly to Metropolitan Planning Organizations. Within California, eligible uses include transit and passenger rail, active transportation, zero emission vehicles and infrastructure, and conversion of existing highway lanes to price managed lanes.

CMAQ, STBG, and CRP funds cannot be suballocated through a percentage or formula, nor can SCAG delegate the project selection of these funds to a different agency or entity. SCAG program guidelines for the selection of projects to be funded with CMAQ, STBG, and CRP have been provided to the TC.

SCAG is required to determine the allocation of annual apportionments available from Federal Transit Administration (FTA) formula funding. SCAG determines the allocation for FTA Section 5307, 5337 and 5339 programs to the CTCs and certain transit operators (e.g., Antelope Valley Transit Authority and Santa Clarita Transit). The CTCs then suballocate to the applicable transit operators. Transit operators then apply the suballocated values for submitting grant requests to FTA.

Transit funding had the largest percentage increase under IIJA compared to previous surface transportation funding bills. Nationally, IIJA provides about \$18 billion annually for public transportation programs from FY 2022 to FY 2026, 42 percent more than the amount provided from FY 2016 to FY 2021.

- FTA Section 5307 is a federal program that provides funding for transit capital and operating assistance in urbanized areas (UZAs) and for transportation-related planning. **Funding for this program is distributed to the CTCs based on an Urbanized Area (UZA) formula.**
- FTA Section 5337 State of Good Repair Formula Program assists transit agencies that operate rail fixed-guideway and high-intensity motorbus systems for replacement, maintenance, and rehabilitation of capital assets, along with the development and implementation of transit asset management plans. **Funding for this program is distributed to the CTCs based on formulas for high-intensity motorbus and high-intensity fixed guideway.**
- FTA Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities Formula Program provides funding to replace, rehabilitate and purchase buses and related equipment, or to build bus-related facilities. **Funding for this program is distributed to the CTCs based on formula.**

Federal funding is typically used in combination with other transportation funding sources. Transportation projects are often funded using an amalgamation of diverse funding sources. Typically, the more expensive the project and the longer the construction schedule, the more funding streams that contribute to the project. Particularly for federal funding sources, many require a local funding “match”. For example, a federal non-interstate highway can use up to 80 percent federal funding, requiring a remaining 20 percent local (non-federal) match.

Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act by the Numbers

The chart below shows the total projected funding by federal transportation agency under IIJA. The chart also provides a comparison to actual funding in FY 2021, the last year of funding before IIJA.

Figure 1: Projected IIJA Funding by Federal Transportation Agency


AGENCY	In \$ billions							
	2021 ACTUAL	202	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL	AVG
HIGHWAYS/FHWA	49.0	67.7	69.0	70.3	71.5	72.9	351.3	70.3
TRANSIT/FTA	12.8	17.6	17.9	18.2	18.5	18.9	91.2	18.2
RAIL/FRA	2.5	13.2	13.2	13.2	13.2	13.2	66.0	13.2
SAFETY/NHTSA	1.0	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4	6.7	1.3
SAFETY/FMCSA	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	5.1	1.0

Source: American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials

California receives federal infrastructure funding based on formula and discretionary grants. Formula is guaranteed funding based on statutory formulas, whereas discretionary grants are

awarded to states or projects through a competitive selection process. Based on formula funding alone, California has received \$7.53 billion in formula funds to date, and IIJA is projected to bring California an estimated \$41.9 billion over five years from FY 2022 through FY 2026. It is important to note that while federal funding programs may be allocated to states via formula, the state can in some cases choose how to distribute funding, including through a competitive grant program (for example, the PROTECT program created by the IIJA and federal freight formula funding distributed through the Trade Corridor Enhancement Program).

Figure 2: Formula-Based IIJA Funding for California by Category through FY 2022



Source: *Rebuilding California*

To date, California has received almost \$2.68 billion in transportation discretionary grants for 423 projects. This represents 10.3 percent of the national total.

More information on the distribution of federal transportation funding under IIJA can be found here at: https://www.whitehouse.gov/invest/?utm_source=invest.gov. Additional information on projects in the SCAG region funded at least in part by IIJA dollars can be found at <https://rebuildingca.ca.gov/map/>.

IIJA also contains provisions that support strategies integral to Connect SoCal 2024. Select provisions are highlighted in the list below.

- Creates a new \$27.5 billion formula-based FHWA bridge program for highway bridge replacement, rehabilitation, preservation, protection, or construction projects on public

roads. Of that funding, 75 percent is distributed by state share of total cost of replacing “all bridges classified as poor”, and 25 percent distributed by state share of total cost of rehabilitating “all bridges classified in fair condition”.

- Creates a new \$5 billion EV charging infrastructure formula program (NEVI). Provided to states to “strategically deploy electric vehicle charging infrastructure and to establish an interconnected network to facilitate data collection, access, and reliability”. California’s share from the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) Formula Program is estimated at \$384 million over 5 years. California agencies and communities will also be eligible to apply for additional funding as part of the \$2.5 billion discretionary Charging and Fueling Infrastructure grant program.
- Continues to support development of alternative user fees at the state level through the Strategic Innovation for Revenue Collection program, previously known as the Surface Transportation System Funding Alternatives Program; also calls for a National Motor Vehicle Per-Mile User Fee Pilot Program. Expands eligibility beyond previous programs to include MPOs for the first time.
- Establishes the Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Grant Program to provide a total of \$5 billion in grants to prevent roadway deaths and serious injuries. Specifically, the SS4A program supports the development of comprehensive safety action plans that identify the most significant roadway safety concerns in a community and the implementation of projects and strategies to address roadway safety issues.
- Establishes the Reconnecting Communities Pilot grant program, the first-ever federal program dedicated to reconnecting communities that were cut off from opportunity and burdened by past transportation infrastructure decisions, funded with \$1 billion over the next 5 years. The program funds removing, retrofitting, or mitigating transportation facilities like highways or rail lines that create barriers to mobility, access, or economic development through technical assistance and grant funding for planning and capital construction projects that reconnect communities and improve peoples’ lives.
- In addition to formula funding under FTA Section 5339, the IIJA greatly expanded the FTA Low or No (Low-No) Emission Vehicle Grant and Bus and Bus Facilities Competitive Grant Programs. The IIJA made available \$5.6 billion over the next five years in funding for its Low-No Emission Bus Grants and \$2 billion for its Bus and Bus Facilities Competitive Grant Programs, more than five times greater than the previous funding levels for these grant programs. The Low-No Program supports the transition of transit fleets to the lowest polluting and most energy efficient transit vehicles while the Bus and Bus Facilities Competitive Grant Program complements the Low-No Program by funding the construction and rehabilitation of transit bus facilities.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Work associated with this item is included in the Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Overall Work Program (015.0159.01: RTP Financial Planning).



ATTACHMENT(S):

1. PowerPoint Presentation - IJJA and How Federal Transportation Funding Flows to the SCAG Region



IIJA & How Federal Transportation Funding Flows to the SCAG Region

November 2, 2023

WWW.SCAG.CA.GOV

IIJA & How Federal Transportation Funding Flows to the SCAG Region

What is the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA)?

- IIJA is the most recent federal surface transportation funding reauthorization bill.
 - Each surface transportation act is a new bill, and though each act generally continues most prior funding programs and formulas for allocation.
 - Specific programs are typically limited to narrowly-tailored uses (e.g., limited to a specific travel mode, or to capital spending only).
- IIJA includes \$1.2 trillion in infrastructure investments over 5 years (FY2022-FY2026), with roughly half going to surface transportation.

Federal Transportation Funding to California

- California receives federal infrastructure funding based on formula and discretionary grants.
 - Based on formula funding alone, IJA is projected to bring California an estimated \$42 billion over 5 years from FY2022 through FY2026.
 - To date, California has received almost \$2.7 billion in transportation discretionary grants for 423 projects.
- Federal funding is typically used in combination with other transportation funding sources.

3

Most Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Formula Funding Flows Through the State

- Traditionally in California, around 60 percent of FHWA dollars are at Caltrans' discretion and primarily support the state highway system.
 - E.g., FHWA dollars mixed with State Highway Account to fund state programs including the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP).
- About 40 percent of FHWA dollars targeted to regional/local needs.
 - With about 40 percent of which available to regional/local agencies through competitive project selection processes conducted by Caltrans (e.g., Highway Bridge Program).

No federal highway formula funding flows directly to cities or counties.

4

SCAG Selects Projects to be Funded with Certain FHWA Formula Funding

- SCAG, as region's designated Metropolitan Planning Organization, is required to select projects to be funded with FHWA formula funding:
 - Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ).
 - Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG).
 - Carbon Reduction Program (CRP).
- CMAQ, STBG, and CRP funds cannot be suballocated through a percentage or formula, nor can SCAG delegate the project selection of these funds to a different agency or entity.
- TC and RC consider program guidelines and projects selected for CMAQ, STBG, and CRP funding.

5


SCAG Distributes Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Formula Funding

- SCAG is the designated recipient of FTA formula funding.
- SCAG determines the allocation of annual apportionments available under the FTA Sections 5307, 5337, and 5339 programs.
- Transit funding had the largest percentage increase under IJA compared to previous surface transportation funding bills.

Federal transit funding flows to transit operators.

6

Find Transportation Projects in Your Area: <https://rebuildingca.ca.gov/map/>



THANK YOU!



AGENDA ITEM 11
REPORT

Southern California Association of Governments
November 2, 2023

To: Transportation Committee (TC)
Regional Council (RC)

From: Alina Borja, Community Engagement Specialist
(213) 630-1449, borja@scag.ca.gov

Subject: 2023 Go Human Safety Strategies Outcomes

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S
APPROVAL

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Information Only – No Action Required

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians. 2: Advance Southern California’s policy interests and planning priorities through regional, statewide, and national engagement and advocacy. 4: Provide innovative information and value-added services to enhance member agencies’ planning and operations and promote regional collaboration. 6: Deploy strategic communications to further agency priorities and foster public understanding of long-range regional planning.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

On May 1, 2014, the General Assembly adopted Resolution No. GA 2014-2 titled “Regional Effort to Promote Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Initiative.” To pursue this effort, SCAG launched Go Human, a Regional Active Transportation Safety and Encouragement Campaign, with funding from the Active Transportation Program (ATP). To extend campaign efforts, SCAG has secured Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety funds from the California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) annually. SCAG secured a grant in the amount of \$1,188,005 to conduct a seventh round of Go Human safety programming and engagement across the region, approved by the Regional Council on October 5, 2023. SCAG, in coordination with its local and regional partners, has since completed and exceeded OTS grant activities and deliverables.

This report provides an update on accomplishments of the Go Human program over the course of the last completed grant period, ending September 30, 2023, focusing on outcomes from a \$1,188,005 grant received from OTS that culminated in a series of traffic safety community engagement events and projects.

These activities align with Resolution No. 23-655-2, which authorized SCAG to sign onto the U.S. Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) National Roadway Safety Strategy (NRSS) Call to Action.

BACKGROUND:

Introduction

The SCAG region, like California and the nation, experienced a period of annual declines in traffic-related fatalities and serious injuries until 2012 when they began to steadily rise. Each year in Southern California, an average of 1,600 people are killed, 7,000 are seriously injured, and 140,000 are injured in traffic collisions. Pedestrians and bicyclists constitute approximately 36 percent of all fatal victims, disproportionate to their mode share of just under 5 percent of the daily trips.

Created through a collaboration between SCAG, County Transportation Commissions, and Public Health Departments, SCAG *Go Human* is an award-winning community engagement program with the goals of reducing traffic collisions and encouraging people to walk and bike more in the SCAG region. The program has been funded annually through the California Office of Traffic Safety for the past six years. During the most recent grant period, ending September 30, 2023, with \$1,188,005 in funding, *Go Human* implemented multiple strategies to improve the safety of residents walking and biking across the region.

This item is being presented to inform SCAG Policy Members of the highlights and outcomes of *Go Human's* recent grant activities, including the *Go Human* Community Hubs grant program, temporary safety demonstrations using the Kit of Parts, distribution of co-branded safety advertisements, and the Storytelling Campaign.

Strategies

1. *Go Human Community Hubs Grant Program*

In April 2023, SCAG launched the Go Human Community Hubs Program. This program funds community-based organizations, non-profits, and social enterprises to implement innovative traffic safety and community engagement projects. The program aims to support street-level community resiliency and increase the safety of people most harmed by traffic injuries and fatalities, including without limitation Black, Indigenous and People of Color; people with disabilities; and frontline workers, particularly those walking and biking.

SCAG *Go Human* awarded \$367,085 to 11 projects across the region through a competitive Call for Projects. Projects included demonstrations of safety infrastructure, walk audits, safety rodeos, community murals, zine workshop, safety material distribution and education, bike repair workshops, traffic safety clinics, advocacy guides, charettes, and media campaigns.

Table 1. Go Human Community Hubs Awards by County

County	Number of Awards	Total Amount Distributed
Imperial	0	\$0.00
Los Angeles	4	\$125,341.28
Orange	2	\$77,550.17
San Bernardino	1	\$39,999.65
Riverside	2	\$67,377.13
Ventura	2	\$56,817.31
Total	11	\$367,085.54

SCAG provided technical assistance to awardees throughout the project implementation period. One awardee demonstrated safety infrastructure using the Kit of Parts, two awardees utilized Co-Branded safety messaging material, and eight awardees received bicycle helmets and fitting guides to distribute to community members.

2. Temporary Safety Demonstrations with the Kit of Parts Lending Library

Go Human’s Kit of Parts Lending Library is an engagement tool provided at no-cost to jurisdictions to temporarily demonstrate safety infrastructure. Designed with modular elements, the Kit supports planning efforts by showcasing potential and planned street design treatments that support public space, improve equity, and enhance community resiliency. SCAG supported partners with 17 temporary demonstration projects across the region, providing in-depth technical assistance to 5 partners.

Table 2. Temporary Safety Demonstrations with the Kit of Parts by County

County	Number of Demonstrations	Jurisdictions
Imperial	3	Cities of Westmorland, Heber, and Imperial
Los Angeles	5	Cities of Glendora, Montebello, Duarte, Altadena, Lancaster
Orange	3	Cities of Santa Ana, Irvine, and Buena Park
San Bernardino	0	
Riverside	2	Cities of Banning and Jurupa Valley
Ventura	1	City of Port Hueneme
Total	14	

In addition to supporting partners in the region with Kit of Parts and demonstration resources, SCAG entered into a pilot partnership program with the Active Transportation Resource Center (ATRC) from Caltrans to expand the reach of the Kit of Parts statewide. Positioning SCAG as an

innovative leader in planning and community engagement best practices, SCAG partnered with ATRC to bring the Kit of Parts to three communities across the state: the City of Los Banos, the City of Paradise, and the County of Fresno. California Walks (Cal Walks), the selected consultant supporting this program, identified local CBOs in each pilot community to lead robust local engagement and tailored technical support at the local-level. The pilot program resulted in a reach of 290 people, 216 collected surveys, greatly increased capacity for local advocacy, and an ongoing interest to continue traffic safety efforts.

3. *Co-Branding & Traffic Safety Advertising Strategies*

SCAG *Go Human* supported local traffic safety advertisement campaigns by providing print and digital material to jurisdictions and community organizations. SCAG designed, co-branded, printed, and shipped advertisements to partners at no cost. SCAG *Go Human* provided 7,257 materials to 21 partners across the region.

Table 3. Distribution of Co-Branded Advertisements by County

County	Number of Local Partner Requestors	Number of Materials	Associated Value
Imperial	0	0	\$0.00
Los Angeles	8	1,942	\$17,122.63
Orange	5	3,933	\$12,966.64
San Bernardino	6	1,068	\$12,350.63
Riverside	1	152	\$3,539.03
Ventura	1	162	\$2,082.00
Total	21	7,257	\$49,272.93

4. *Communications and Storytelling Campaign*

The Communications and Storytelling Campaign provided resources and funding to *Go Human* partners and their communities to tell their stories about the impacts of traffic violence and their work to make change. The campaign comprised three strategies, including the creation of oral histories, the development of training materials, and engaging jurisdictions through the traffic safety pledge drive.

Strategy	Outcomes
<u>Oral Histories Video Spotlights</u> <i>Local narratives developed with community-based organizations that center mobility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 video produced spotlighting community-based partners 6 counties represented

justice efforts.

Community Expert Education Services

Provided resources for local experts to develop and present traffic safety educational materials

- 8 community experts engaged
- 262 participants engaged
- Materials presented in regional, statewide, and national platforms.

Traffic Safety Pledge Drive

Outreach to encourage local jurisdictions to sign the pledge, with incentives to support traffic safety activities.

- 11 new jurisdiction signatories
- \$14,000 in local event support
- \$8,248 provided in co-branded materials and digital advertising support

FISCAL IMPACT:

All costs associated with this item are included in the FY 2023-24 Overall Work Program (OWP) under project number 225.3564.18 and funded by a Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Program Grant from the California Office of Traffic Safety.

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. PowerPoint Presentation - 2023 SCAG Go Human Office of Traffic Safety Grant Outcomes



2023 *Go Human* Office of Traffic Safety Grant Outcomes

November 2, 2023

WWW.SCAG.CA.GOV

Go Human Program Background

- SCAG launched its community engagement and traffic safety program, *Go Human*, in 2015 to reduce traffic collisions and encourage people to walk and bike more.

Regional Traffic Safety Data Snapshot



*from SCAG's 2024 Draft Connect SoCal Performance Monitoring Technical Report



2023 Community Hubs awardee Koreatown Youth & Community Center conducting a walk audit.

Presentation Contents

- 1 Program Background
- 2 Go Human Safety Strategies
 - Community Hubs
 - Kit of Parts
 - Co-Branded Materials
 - Storytelling Campaign
- 3 Upcoming Safety Strategies

11 Community Hubs funded with over **\$360,000+**

6 Video-captured Oral Histories

6,800+ Co-Branded Safety Materials

11 new Jurisdiction Safety Pledge Signatories

5 Kit of Parts deployments supported with technical assistance.

Funding Summary by County

- **2 Hubs, 1 demo**
- **162 materials** distributed
- **1 new Safety Pledge signatory**
- **\$66,424** estimated investment

- **2 Hubs**
- **1,068 materials** distributed
- **2 new Safety Pledge signatories**
- **\$91,693** estimated investment



- **2 Hubs, 2 demos**
- **152 materials** distributed
- **1 new Safety Pledge signatory**
- **\$77,241** estimated investment

- **4 Hubs, 5 demos**
- **1,942 materials** distributed
- **4 new Safety Pledge signatories**
- **\$247,963** estimated investment

- **2 Hubs, 3 demos**
- **3,938 materials** distributed
- **3 new Safety Pledge signatories**
- **\$96,016** estimated investment

- **3 demonstrations**
- **\$1,000** estimated investment

2023 Community Hubs

- *Go Human* Community Hubs Grant Program is SCAG's funding opportunity for community organizations to lead traffic safety projects.
- Projects were supported with *Go Human* resources and technical assistance

Eligible Applicants	Community-based organizations, non-profits, social enterprises
Max. Funding Amount	\$40,000
Total Projects Awardees	11 projects




2023 Community Hubs Project Spotlights



**People for
Mobility Justice**



**Highlanders
Boxing Club**



**Youth
Leadership
Institute**



**Bike Ventura
County**

Attachment: PowerPoint Presentation - 2023 SCAG Go Human Office of Traffic Safety Grant Outcomes (2023 Go Human Safety Strategies

7

2023 Community Hubs by the numbers

\$367,085

total funds awarded in 2023

\$1.2M+

Go Human grant funds
distributed to date

HUB SPOTLIGHT:

2,449 SAFETY MATERIALS
DISTRIBUTED, INCLUDING:



8

Congratulations to the APA Award Winners!

Los Angeles Walks

Promotores for Safe Streets

Los Angeles Section

- Public Outreach
- Award of Merit



City of Laguna Niguel

Niguel Hills Middle School

Safety Improvements

Orange County Section

- Implementation
- Award of Excellence

Congratulations to the APA Award Winners!

The ArtLands

Revitalizing Public Transit

Through Bus Bench Art

Inland Empire Section

- Grassroots Initiative
- Award of Excellence



Congratulations to the APA CA Award Winners!

Santa Ana Active Streets

Willard Safe Streets
Orange County Section
& **California Chapter**

- Grassroots Initiative
- Award of Excellence



Public Matters

How East Los Moves
Los Angeles Section
& **California Chapter**

- Grassroots Initiative
- Award of Merit

Go Human Kit of Parts



The **Kit of Parts** is a no-cost engagement tool for jurisdictions to temporarily demonstrate safety infrastructure.

17 Demonstrations used the Kit of Parts in 2023

3 Demonstrations occurred in partnership with Caltrans ATRC statewide pilot

8,260 Participants engaged

Kit of Parts + Technical Assistance

- Technical assistance to host a Kit of Parts activations was provided in:
 - Port Hueneme
 - Santa Ana
 - Lancaster
 - Altadena
 - Jurupa Valley
- Technical assistance included event ideation, site planning, permitting, logistics, staffing, promotion, data collection, documentation, and more.



Go Human reached **1050+** people and collected **121** surveys at **5** Kit of Parts demonstrations supported by technical assistance

13

Co-branded Safety Messaging Materials

SCAG designs, co-brands, prints, and ships safety advertisements in multiple languages at no cost to partner agencies and CBOs.

Ads include:


- Lawn Signs
- Banners
- Postcards
- Digital Media
- Custom Requests

7,257 Co-Branded traffic safety materials, with a total value of **\$35,000+**, were distributed to **25** partners, reaching **200,000+** people.

Type Of Materials Distributed:

1,261 Lawn Signs	97 Banners
4 Transit Shelter Ads	5 Billboards
5,850 Fliers and Postcards	2 Newsletters
29 Digital Ads	6 Photo Booth Backdrops
3 Instagram Frames	

14



15

Safety Strategies – Storytelling Campaign

Storytelling Campaign

Storytelling campaign provided resources for partners to tell their stories about the impacts of traffic violence and their work to make change.

Included:

- **6** Oral History videos
- **8** Community Expert Education Services
- **11** new Safety Pledge signatories

Go Human facilitated **6** video Oral History Projects, across **6** counties

	The Bicycle Tree, Orange		Jose Richard Aviles, Los Angeles
	Bike Ventura County, Ventura		Los Amigos de la Comunidad, Imperial
	Youth leadership Institute, Riverside		People's Collective for Environmental Justice, San Bernardino

16



17

Go Human Safety Pledge



- A tool to encourage local jurisdictions to create change.
- People can sign on behalf of a jurisdiction, an organization, or themselves.
- Sign the Safety Pledge at <https://scag.ca.gov/scag-safety-pledge>



18

Go Human Safety Pledge

This year, new signatories gained access to print and digital ad support as well as event sponsorship funds.

\$8,246 provided in co-branded materials and digital advertising support

\$14,000 provided in local event support



19

Outlook of 2024 Safety Strategies

- SCAG will provide technical assistance for Complete Streets demonstrations using the **Kit of Parts**.
- SCAG will offer the **Community Streets** grant funding opportunity for community-based partners.
- SCAG Go Human will continue production and distribution of **co-branded advertisements**.



20



THANK YOU!

For more information, please visit:

scag.ca.gov/go-human



AGENDA ITEM 12
REPORT

Southern California Association of Governments
November 2, 2023

To: Transportation Committee (TC)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S
APPROVAL

From: Scott Strolecki, Planning Supervisor
(213) 236-1893, strolecki@scag.ca.gov

Subject: SB 671 Clean Freight Corridor Efficiency Assessment Update

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Information Only – No Action Required

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this staff report and presentation is to provide an update on the Senate Bill No. 671 (SB 671) Clean Freight Corridor Efficiency Assessment. Senate Bill 671 was approved by the Governor of California on October 9, 2021. The bill establishes the Clean Freight Corridor Efficiency Assessment, to be developed by the California Transportation Commission (CTC), in coordination with other state agencies. In developing the assessment, the bill requires the CTC to identify freight corridors, or segments of corridors, throughout the state that would be priority candidates for the deployment of zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles.

On September 27, 2023, the CTC released the Draft SB 671 Clean Freight Corridor Efficiency Assessment (Draft SB 671 Assessment) for a 30-day review comment period. SCAG has provided a comment letter response which was due October 26, 2023. Additionally, the CTC met on October 18, 2023, where CTC staff provided a discussion item on the Draft SB 671 Assessment.

The CTC has identified the "Top 6" freight corridors using a data-driven methodology consistent with the SB 671 requirement to identify "the top five freight corridors, or segments of freight corridors, with the heaviest freight volume and near-source exposure to diesel exhaust and other contaminants." Four of the "Top 6" freight corridors are included within the SCAG region; Interstate 5 (I-5), Interstate 15 (I-15), Interstate 10 (I-10), and Interstate 40 (I-40) with the Interstate 710 (I-710) corridor reflecting a critical artery connecting the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach (San Pedro Bay Ports or SPBPs) to major east-west freight corridors. The "Top 6" freight corridors provide a concrete and achievable first step for the state through the establishment of an initial viable network (IVN) that is the focal point throughout the Draft SB 671 Assessment.

Based on the Draft SB 671 Assessment, the estimated total capital costs to build the IVN in 2025 and 2035 is projected to be between \$505 million to \$950 million (not including electric grid upgrade costs) and \$10 billion to \$15 billion respectively.

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has been supporting the region across the SB 671 effort since its beginning in December 2021. SCAG has served a leading role across its regional partners to identify freight corridors for the region, to develop background information and identify barriers and recommended solutions, and to support the region's interests, priorities, and needs throughout the process. Monthly meetings and coordination meetings with both the CTC and SCAG regional partners have occurred through the summer of 2023. As part of this process, SCAG is positioned to continue to leverage its Zero-Emission Truck Infrastructure Study (ZETI) and Last Mile Freight Program (LMFP) work to compliment the recommendations and outcomes from the Draft SB 671 Assessment as well as to continue coordinating and collaborating with many of the same state agencies involved in this effort across the region's core freight zero emission planning efforts and programs.

BACKGROUND:

Senate Bill No. 671 (SB 671) was approved by the Governor of California on October 9, 2021. The bill establishes the Clean Freight Corridor Efficiency Assessment, to be developed by the California Transportation Commission (CTC), in coordination with other state agencies. In developing the assessment, the bill requires the CTC to identify freight corridors, or segments of corridors, throughout the state that would be priority candidates for the deployment of zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles. The bill requires the CTC to submit a report containing the assessment's findings and recommendations to certain committees of the Legislature by December 1, 2023. The bill requires the assessment's findings and recommendations to be incorporated into the development of the California Transportation Plan. The bill requires the state freight plan to include a description of needed infrastructure, projects, and operations for the deployment of zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles and the development of freight corridors identified in the assessment.

Existing law requires the CTC, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to allocate certain revenues deposited in the Trade Corridor Enhancement Account and certain federal funds for eligible infrastructure projects, including truck corridor improvements to mitigate emissions from trucks, located on or along specified transportation corridors. This bill would make projects that employ advanced and innovative technology to improve the flow of freight and also environmental and community mitigation or efforts to reduce environmental impacts of freight movement eligible for this funding.

Key statutory requirements of SB 671 are as follows:

- The CTC, in coordination with the State Air Resources Board, Public Utilities Commission, State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, and Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development, shall develop the Clean Freight Corridor Efficiency Assessment.
 - The goal of the assessment is to identify freight corridors, or segments of freight corridors, and infrastructure needed to support the deployment of zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles. The CTC shall consider the potential for emission-reductions, infrastructure needed for charging and alternative fueling, including parking facilities, congestion reduction, improved road safety and resiliency, and impacts to neighboring communities.
 - The CTC shall consult with the department, local governments, metropolitan planning organizations, regional transportation planning agencies, and other stakeholders, including, but not limited to, the freight industry, stakeholders from low-income and disadvantaged communities, environmental organizations, public health representatives, and academia, to develop the assessment.
 - In developing the assessment, the CTC shall consult with the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission pertaining to its work assessing deployment of vehicle charging stations pursuant to Section 25229 of the Public Resources Code.
- In developing the assessment, the CTC shall identify all of the following:
 - Freight corridors, or segments of freight corridors, throughout the state that would be priority candidates for the deployment of zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles.
 - The top five freight corridors, or segments of freight corridors, with the heaviest freight volume and near-source exposure to diesel exhaust and other contaminants.
 - Projects that would achieve the goals of the assessment, including, but not limited to, all of the following projects:
 - Medium- and heavy-duty vehicle charging and fueling infrastructure.
 - Highway improvements needed to accommodate charging and fueling infrastructure, including parking facilities.
 - Highway improvements on the corridor to increase safety and throughput, such as dedicated truck lanes.
 - Improvements to local or connector streets and roads to support the corridor.
 - An identification of areas where micro-grids or similar technologies could be deployed for zero-emission vehicle charging or fueling.

- Potential sponsors of projects to achieve the goals of the assessment, including, but not limited to, the department, regional transportation agencies, local governments, the freight industry, and nonprofit organizations.
 - Barriers and potential solutions to achieving the goals of the assessment and the deployment of zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles.
 - The impact on roads and bridges due to the increased weight of zero-emission vehicles.
 - Methods to avoid displacement of residents and businesses on the freight corridor when considering projects that achieve the goals of the assessment.
 - Potential funding opportunities for project types.
 - Benefits from the deployment of zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles, including, but not limited to, environmental, air quality, public health, and highway safety benefits, and economic competitiveness.
- The CTC shall submit a report detailing the assessment and its recommendations for the deployment of zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles to the relevant policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature on or before December 1, 2023.
 - The CTC, State Air Resources Board, and State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission shall incorporate, to the extent feasible and applicable, the Clean Freight Corridor Efficiency Assessment's findings and recommendations into those entities' programs and guideline documents related to freight infrastructure and technology. This subdivision shall not limit the ability to award freight infrastructure and technology program funds on a competitive basis.

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has been supporting the region for the SB 671 effort since its beginning in December 2021. SCAG has served a leading role across its regional partners to identify freight corridors for the region, to develop background information and identify barriers and recommended solutions for the region, and to support the region's interests, priorities, and needs throughout the process. Monthly meetings and coordination meetings with both the CTC and SCAG regional partners have occurred through the summer of 2023.

SCAG is currently focused on the Zero Emission Truck Infrastructure Study (ZETI) and Last Mile Freight Program (LMFP). Per the ZETI, SCAG is performing significant stakeholder outreach and engagement to inform planning, analysis, and development of a regional roadmap that will support publicly accessible zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty trucking infrastructure needs. The LMFP is a partnership with the Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee (MSRC) that is focused on advancing near-zero and zero emission technologies through the commercial deployment of medium- and heavy-duty vehicles. While the ZETI serves as a regional roadmap for

new technologies, SCAG is also working closely with a variety of companies implementing these technologies across the region.

SCAG will continue to coordinate with the CTC on the work at the State level as the CTC is a part of the ZETI Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Many of the same state agencies that were a part of the SB 671 process including the California Air Resources Board (CARB), California Energy Commission (CEC), California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), among others are represented on the ZETI TAC. SCAG has been coordinating with the CPUC on their Freight Investment Plan (FIP) in addition to efforts with the CTC as a direct example of the need to remain highly engaged with state agencies as zero-emission infrastructure initiatives continue to evolve. SCAG will continue to leverage its position to support the region through partnerships, coordination and collaboration, and dialogue as these zero-emission freight initiatives move forward.

Draft Senate Bill 671 Clean Freight Corridor Efficiency Assessment:

On September 27, 2023, the CTC released the Draft SB 671 Clean Freight Corridor Efficiency Assessment (Draft SB 671 Assessment) for a 30-day review comment period. SCAG staff has provided a comment letter response which was due October 26, 2023. Additionally, the CTC met on October 18, 2023, where CTC staff provided a discussion item on the draft SB 671 Assessment.

The Draft SB 671 Assessment is organized into seven parts including:

- Part 1: Identifying and Defining Clean Freight Corridors
- Part 2: Estimating Clean Freight Infrastructure Needs
- Part 3: Funding Outlook
- Part 4: Barriers and Solutions
- Part 5: Additional Implications
- Part 6: Engagement
- Part 7: Summary of Key Recommendations

Exhibit 1: Map & List of 34 "Priority Freight Corridors"



SCAG’s key freight corridors were developed and organized through a complimentary regional process and are represented as part of the 34 “Priority Freight Corridors” as depicted in Exhibit 1 of Part 1: Identifying and Defining Clean Freight Corridors of the Draft SB 671 Assessment.

“Top 6” Corridors

Based on the methodology outlined in this section, the Assessment has identified the following “Top 6” corridors for emissions and truck volume:

Exhibit 6: “Top 6” freight corridors identified

Priority corridors identified


-  I-5 from California’s Southern border with Mexico to its Northern border with Oregon
-  I-15 from San Diego to California’s Southeast border with Nevada
-  Route 99 from Red Bluff to Bakersfield
-  I-10/I-710 from the San Pedro Bay Ports to Los Angeles to California’s Southeast border with Arizona
-  I-40 from its intersection with I-15 to California’s Southeast border with Arizona
-  I-80/I-580 and I-880 from the Port of Oakland to San Francisco to California’s northeast border with Nevada



Freight Analysis Framework version 5 data, 2022 projection

The CTC has further identified the “Top 6” freight corridors using a data-driven methodology consistent with the Draft SB 671 requirement to identify “the top five freight corridors, or segments of freight corridors, with the heaviest freight volume and near-source exposure to diesel exhaust and other contaminants.” Four of the “Top 6” freight corridors are included within the SCAG region; Interstate 5 (I-5), Interstate 15 (I-15), Interstate 10 (I-10), and Interstate 40 (I-40), with the Interstate 710 (I-710) corridor reflecting a critical artery connecting the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach (San Pedro Bay Ports or SPBPs) to major east-west freight corridors.

Exhibit 7: Initial Viable Network



The Draft SB 671 Assessment has stated that focusing on the “Top 6” freight corridors provides a concrete and achievable first step for the state through the establishment of an initial viable network (IVN) as depicted in Exhibit 7 of Part 2: Estimating Clean Freight Infrastructure Needs of the Draft SB 671 Assessment. The IVN is the focal point throughout the subsequent areas of the Draft SB 671 Assessment.

Three potential scenarios of infrastructure needs were assessed due to the uncertainty surrounding which type of technologies are likely to be adopted by fleets in the future. The Draft SB 671 Assessment studied four years that are benchmarks in the Advanced Clean Fleets (ACFs) regulation – 2025, 2030, 2035, and 2040.

Input from the workgroup, including private companies and state agencies such as the CEC and CARB, was used to shape the estimated powertrain adoption in each scenario. The estimated powertrain adoption is the estimated percentage split between battery electric trucks and hydrogen fuel cell electric trucks used in each scenario.

Exhibit 8: Key scenario assumptions

Key assumptions behind the three scenarios			
			
	Accelerated battery electric (BEV) adoption	Balanced adoption	Accelerated hydrogen fuel cell (FCEV) adoption
Cost of ownership	Battery electric trucks become more cost effective over time accelerating incorporation into commercial fleets	Balanced adoption of zero-emissions technologies over time	Fuel cell trucks become more cost effective over time accelerating incorporation into commercial fleets
Technology choice	BEV trucks and charging become viable for long haul trips	No predominantly used technology across use cases; BEV continues to be used mostly for medium-duty short and regional trips, FCEV for heavy-duty and long-haul	FCEV trucks and refueling become a viable choice for short haul trips

The Draft SB 671 Assessment considered the estimated cost of vehicle ownership, and how well different technology choices fit different truck use cases to estimate how many trucks would be battery electric and how many trucks would be hydrogen per scenario. CARB vehicle estimates disaggregated by vehicle class type were used to associate different truck vehicle class types with typical use cases and cost. Exhibit 8 from the Draft SB 671 Assessment summarizes the key scenario assumptions.

Developing scenarios for zero-emission freight infrastructure needs included the following factors:

- Total number of zero-emission medium-duty and heavy-duty vehicles on the road (assumptions are held constant across all three scenarios).
- Annual medium-duty and heavy-duty annual average statewide vehicle miles traveled by vehicle class type (assumptions are held constant across all three scenarios).
- Fuel efficiency of battery electric and hydrogen trucks (assumptions are held constant across all three scenarios).
- Mix of power train adoptions. For example, what percent of the total trucks will be battery electric? What percent will be hydrogen? The three scenarios are:
 - Accelerated battery electric adoption: Tests a higher and faster adoption of battery electric trucks.
 - Accelerated hydrogen fuel cell adoption: Tests a higher and faster adoption of hydrogen fuel cell trucks.
 - Balanced adoption: Tests adoption driven by information about decisions fleets have made in the past about what types of zero-emission trucks to purchase, as well as the likely total cost of ownership parity with combustion engines (based on information about truck sales and a study from the McKinsey Center for Future Mobility, called, “Why the Economics of Electrification Make This Decarbonization Transition Different),”

and the resulting powertrain choice by vehicle class and primary trip type, given expected commodity growth resulting trip types.

- Characteristics of battery electric charging stations, such as the number of public versus private stations, charging efficiency, capacity factors, and utilization (assumptions around these characteristics are held constant across all three scenarios).
- Characteristics of hydrogen fuel stations, such as the split of public versus private ownership, annual fuel capacity per station, and utilization (assumptions are held constant across all three scenarios).
- Maximum distance between charging stations and hydrogen fuel stations to form an initial viable network (assumptions are held constant across all three scenarios but differ based on the rate and mix of zero-emission truck power train adoption included in each scenario).

A zero-emission infrastructure needs assessment was generated for both state-wide and “Top 6” freight corridors including the three scenarios and 2025 and 2040 future years. Additionally, the assessment has determined that additional topics that were required to be considered as part of SB 671 will need further review once specific zero-emission station locations are identified. These include:

- Truck parking,
- Increased maintenance and operation needs resulting from heavier trucks,
- Safety and,
- Throughput improvements on segments, and “Top 6” corridor connections.

Based on the Draft SB 671 Assessment’s Part 3: Funding Outlook, the total capital costs to build the IVN in 2025 is estimated to be between \$505 million to \$950 million (not including electric grid upgrade costs). Estimates identify more than \$1 billion available through 2025 for zero-emission freight infrastructure. Most of these funds are limited term and set to expire in 2025. Together with private funding, the Draft SB 671 Assessment states that it is possible there are sufficient funds available to build the public stations required for the 2025 IVN.

The total capital costs for a publicly available IVN in 2035 is estimated to be approximately \$10 billion to \$15 billion. It is recommended this funding need be shared between private and public funding sources to deliver the IVN by 2035. Public funds are anticipated to come from all sources, including federal, state, and local. Per the Draft SB 671 Assessment it is anticipated that beyond 2025, it is reasonable to assume some level of funding will continue for zero-emission medium-duty and heavy-duty infrastructure from the CEC, CARB, and CTC programs.

Exhibit 17: Key barriers and solutions to clean freight infrastructure development:

Key Barriers

Time and sequencing of corridor station development



Economic viability of ZEV transition for fleet owners



Complex ecosystem of potential stations and stakeholder s



Key Solutions

Streamline clean freight infrastructure development


Support fleet owners with the costs of transition

Create a central delivery team and a corridor -first approach

Three key barriers and corresponding solutions were identified as depicted in Exhibit 17 of Part 4: Barriers and Solutions of the Draft SB 671 Assessment. These three barriers and solutions fall into three main categories: time, cost, and a complex ecosystem of stakeholders. Other potential implications assessed included:

- An estimated \$18.6 billion in savings in statewide health spending from criteria emission reductions through 2040 as a result of the Advanced Clean Fleets regulation, and an estimated 1,720 lives saved as a result of less emissions concurrently.
- Impact on roads and bridges from heavier axle loads and potential use of more trucks.
- Avoiding resident and business displacement.
- Potential workforce challenges resulting from the transition to zero-emission technologies.

Exhibit 23: SB 671 Workgroup Participation



The CTC developed the Draft SB 671 Assessment in collaboration with the SB 671 workgroup and with several other state agencies, including the CARB, the CEC, the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development (GO-Biz), the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA), and the CPUC. Beginning in December of 2021, the CTC led 14 workgroup meetings (a meeting was held approximately every 5 weeks) to discuss the development of the SB 671 Assessment. The CTC held bi-weekly meetings with the state agencies mentioned above to coordinate Draft SB 671 Assessment work. The workgroup was public, and anyone interested in participating was encouraged to join.

Key Draft SB 671 Assessment Recommendations:

Through the assessment process, key recommendations were provided including:

- **Public Funding:** Allocate available public funds, where feasible, to support the build out of the 2035 initial viable network cost. The total cost of \$10 to \$15 billion will need to be shared between private and public funding and come from all available fund sources.
- **Streamlining Zero-Emission Station Development:** To shorten the station delivery timeframe, a central delivery team should be created to coordinate state and local stakeholders to implement the recommendations noted in this list. This central delivery team should function as part of or in coordination with the Executive Order N-8-23 Strike Team. The central delivery team should work to create a set of standardized station development model(s) (zoning and building permits) that can be replicated for each station across a priority corridor, based on affected local municipality guidelines, among other complimentary efforts.
- **Supporting Fleet-Truck Owners Through Zero-Emission Vehicle Transition:** The Legislature should create a new limited-term (five-year) zero-emission truck incentive program to assist fleets with purchasing zero-emission trucks. Program development should take place with input from communities, and fleets of all sizes including those who will be impacted by regulations and should be flexible to ensure support in a way that is considerate of their needs.
- **Central Delivery Team:** The Administration should consider designating one lead group or agency to carry out the functions of the central delivery team outlined within the assessment. This could be an agency that is currently part of the Executive Order N-8-23 strike team or the Administration could direct the Executive Order N-8-23 strike team to identify and designate such a group.
 - The intent of the central delivery team would be to act as a lead in coordinating zero-emission freight infrastructure planning and implementation, including carrying out the actions included in this Assessment where feasible.
 - The central delivery team should function as a cross-agency team including the CEC, Caltrans, CalSTA, GO-Biz, CARB, CPUC, CTC, and any other state agencies or entities determined necessary.

- Increased Weight of Zero-Emission Trucks on Roads-Bridges: Caltrans should evaluate the impacts of heavier zero-emission trucks on the state highway system and develop solutions to address them.
- Microgrids: The state or central delivery team should assess where additional microgrids may be installed as a transportation system resiliency feature.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Work associated with this item is included in the FY 2023-24 Overall Work Program (OWP) budget under project number 130.0162.18, Goods Movement Planning.

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. PowerPoint Presentation - SB 671 Clean Freight Corridor Efficiency Assessment



Senate Bill 671 Clean Freight Corridor Efficiency Assessment

November 2, 2023

WWW.SCAG.CA.GOV



SENATE BILL 671

Clean Freight Corridor Efficiency Assessment Overview

Senate Bill 671

- Establishes the **Clean Freight Corridor Efficiency Assessment**, to be developed by the California Transportation Commission (CTC)
- Assessment goal: "To identify **corridors, or segments of corridors**, and infrastructure needed to support the **deployment of zero-emission medium-duty and heavy-duty vehicles.**"

SB 671 Clean Freight Corridor Efficiency Assessment



Senate Bill 671

- Seven areas required by Legislation:
 - Freight Corridors
 - Top Five Freight Corridors
 - Projects
 - Barriers and Potential Solutions
 - Impact on Roads and Bridges
 - Methods to Avoid Displacement
 - Benefits





SCAG

SB 671 Role and Participation

SB 671 Role and Participation

SCAG

- Established Working Relationships with State Agencies
- Early Involvement and Coordination
- Complimentary Regional Process to Inform State Level Efforts
- Strong Synergies Across Zero-Emission Studies and Programs
 - Zero Emission Truck Infrastructure Study (ZETI)
 - Last Mile Freight Program (LMFP)





SENATE BILL 671

Draft SB 671 Clean Freight Corridor Efficiency Assessment

Identifying and Defining Clean Freight Corridors

Exhibit 1: Map & List of 34 "Priority Freight Corridors"



"Top 6" Corridors

Based on the methodology outlined in this section, the Assessment has identified the following "Top 6" corridors for emissions and truck volume:

Exhibit 6: "Top 6" freight corridors identified

Priority corridors identified

-  I-5 from California's Southern border with Mexico to its Northern border with Oregon
-  I-15 from San Diego to California's Southeast border with Nevada
-  Route 99 from Red Bluff to Bakersfield
-  I-10/I-710 from the San Pedro Bay Ports to Los Angeles to California's Southeast border with Arizona
-  I-40 from its intersection with I-15 to California's Southeast border with Arizona
-  I-80/I-580 and I-880 from the Port of Oakland to San Francisco to California's northeast border with Nevada



Freight Analysis Framework version 5 data, 2022 projection

Estimating Clean Freight Infrastructure Needs

Exhibit 11: Results of the zero-emission infrastructure needs assessment (state-wide and for "Top 6" corridors)




Exhibit 8: Key scenario assumptions





Exhibit 9: Approach for Estimating Energy Required



Funding Outlook

- Total Cost Estimates
 - 2025 - \$505-\$950 million
 - 2035 - \$10-\$15 billion
- Timing of Needed Funding
 - Public and private investment
- Available Public Funding
 - Allocation where feasible

Exhibit 16: Breakdown of total estimated capital expenditure costs for station development

Cost category	BEV cost estimate (USD, millions)	FCEV cost estimate (USD, millions)
Permitting and design costs	PA&ED	\$1.6
	Design & engineering	\$0.3
Construction costs	Right of way	\$1-3
	Hardware & installation	\$0.9
	Site construction (building, roof, periphery, signage)	\$2-3
Currently not included in adjustment	Grid upgrades /capacity	\$2-7
Updated per station cost estimate		~\$5-9 million
Updated total IVN (2025+) cost range		~\$375-765+million
		~\$8.6-12.6 million
		~\$130-190+million

BEV = battery electric vehicle, FCEV = fuel cell electric vehicle, IVN = initial viable network, USD = United States dollars, PA&ED = Planning and Environmental Documents phase, TCEP = Trade Corridor Enhancement Program

Barriers and Solutions

Exhibit 17: Key barriers and solutions to clean freight infrastructure development:

Key Barriers

Time and sequencing of corridor station development

Economic viability of ZEV transition for fleet owners

Complex ecosystem of potential stations and stakeholders

Key Solutions

Streamline clean freight infrastructure development

Support fleet owners with the costs of transition

Create a central delivery team and a corridor -first approach

Additional Implications and Engagement

- Benefits of the Transition to Zero-Emission Freight
- Potential Weight Impacts on Roads and Bridges
- Methods to Avoid Resident and Business Displacement
- Potential Workforce Impacts
- Potential Uses for Microgrids

Exhibit 23: SB 671 Workgroup Participation

Sector	Number of participants	Number of organizations
Government / State or local agencies	124	41
Industry/Private Sector	54	32
Electricity, Energy & Utilities	39	15
Consulting	21	18
Association	16	11
Advocacy	15	13
Ports	15	5
Academia	9	5
Total	293	140



SENATE BILL 671

Draft SB 671 Assessment Recommendations

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

13

Draft SB 671 Assessment Recommendations

Senate Bill 671 Recommendations

- Recommendation for Public Funding
- Recommendations for Streamlining Zero-Emission Station Development
- Recommendations for Supporting Fleet and Truck Owners through the Zero-Emission Vehicle Transition
- Recommendations for a Central Delivery Team
- Recommendation Related to the Increased Weight of Zero-Emission Trucks on Roads and Bridges
- Recommendation Related to Microgrids

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

14



THANK YOU!

For more information, please visit:

<https://scag.ca.gov/freightworks>