

From: [REDACTED]
To: CAPTI@CalSta
Subject: Feedback on Draft CAPTI
Date: Monday, May 17, 2021 3:16:48 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

I agree that it is urgent to aggressively fight climate change, especially since the sky turned blood-red for two weeks amid last October's wildfires.

I agree that VMT reduction is essential to meeting our state's climate goals, and I like the variety of program changes that address this.

I particularly like the Highways to Boulevards pilot program. I lived in a San Francisco neighborhood that suffered until an elevated freeway came down, and then blossomed.

I feel that S1.4 to "Mainstream Zero-Emission Vehicle Infrastructure Within...TCEP" is a little bit tepid. In S1.4's first sentence, it says "...prioritize projects that demonstrate a significant benefit to improving the movement of freight along trade corridors, while also reducing emissions...by creating or improving zero emissions infrastructure..." I feel that a project that adds zero emissions infrastructure should be prioritized over one that does not, even if the zero-emissions project does not move freight any faster.

In S1.4's 2'nd paragraph, "the CTC will consider during TCEP guidelines development allowing projects to include zero-emission vehicle infrastructure within the project study area if they are in adjacent disadvantaged communities..." This suggests to me that the default will be NOT to even CONSIDER allowing ZEV infrastructure. I hope I am misunderstanding this sentence.

Half of medium and heavy-duty trucks sold in California will have to be ZEV by 2035, and all of them will by 2045. ZEV charging infrastructure will be needed for these trucks. We must not let inadequate infrastructure slow down the adoption of large commercial ZEV's.

Mahlon Dormon
[REDACTED]
San Leandro, CA