

AB 617 Stockton Community Steering Committee

November 4, 2020

Discussion Document regarding potential INCENTIVE CERP measures

VEGETATIVE BARRIERS

Incentive program for the installation of vegetative barriers (and sound walls) around/near sources of concern (Interstate 5, schools, truck routes, near Port of Stockton, rail routes, Charter Way, Boggs Tract and El Dorado). Leverage with city, county, state funds given significant scale and infrastructure costs.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- A >High priority in combination with physical barrier as most effective, wherever possible, especially along Interstate 5.
- R >For this to be sustainable will require some kind of maintenance trust. I think more may be necessary to involve veg barrier associated with rail routes.
- B >Vegetative barriers should also include walls at the Highway
- R >Trees and plants are much needed
- R >This is an area of high priority for the community for the long term benefits. Interstate 5 is where I would recommend.
- R >Very high priority in combination with physical barriers as most effective, wherever possible, especially along Interstate 5.
- A >High priority in combination with physical barrier as most effective, especially along Interstate 5 and crosstown freeway. Where residential homes are less than 1000 ft. away.
- Need clarity on where this would be on Charter Way since most of Charter Way is occupied by business fronts.
- G >High, Seems like several vegetation barriers could be provided for \$500,000. I am suggesting here that we consider up to 10 new barriers. I don't suggest that we spend \$5 million on these barriers. If possible, perhaps \$1 million and not more than \$3 million here. Sound walls help with noise but not air. I would suggest not funding that and merge line item 25 with this one which appear to be duplicate.
- A/R/A/A/R >Highest priority: Add more \$\$\$
- R > Very high priority for VEGETATIVE BARRIERS, not for sound walls. Vegetative barriers should dampen sound, beautify, and provide environmental benefits of cooling, absorbing pollutants, and producing oxygen for the air. Sounds walls partially dampen sound, and do little else, except to become ugly and attract graffiti. Benefits may not be completely quantifiable but the public will like this and agree with vegetative barriers and this use of money to improve the environment.
- R > incentive program for installation of vegetative barriers should be a very high priority. With a \$35 million budget, the allocation to this number one priority should be significantly higher than \$1 million, perhaps 25% of the total budget or \$8.8 million.
- R > High Priority, Work together and plan with other community groups working on this. Include an ongoing maintenance trust with the city.
- R > Highest priority: This needs to include rail lines particularly relating to sound wall for the low income neighborhoods most impacted by sound and train exhaust.
- R > There is an area of I-5 by Smith Canal that could use some new trees and around Monte Diablo. I-5 is much more needy for trees than 99

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$1,000,000

Units: n/a

Today's Comments

-

TREES AND URBAN GREENING

Increased urban greening and forestry to improve air quality. The goal is to identify and support efforts to increase urban greening and forestry to improve air quality and overall quality of life for residents in the community while keeping in mind water and maintenance issues. Focus areas include Charter Way, Boggs Tract and El Dorado. Leverage with city, county, state funds given significant scale and infrastructure costs.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- R >For this to be sustainable will require some kind of maintenance trust. I think more may be necessary to involve veg barrier associated with rail routes. Include Hazelton Ave
- B >Potential long term reductions and development of a more pleasing environment
- R >Cost can be reduced by growing trees instead of buying trees...example: from seeds like avocados and from trimmings. Pine cones are everywhere
- R >Urban greenery - much needed
- R > Very High Priority
- G > Increasing the number from 1 site up to 5. Is there any data that shows whether vegetative barriers are as effective as tree canopy? Might help reduce ongoing maintenance costs.
- A/R/A/A/R >Highest priority: Add more \$\$\$
- R > Very High Priority. To be a vibrant urban area, there must be urban greening to beautify, reduce GHG & heat, and to provide oxygen to our air. Careful and detailed analysis should quantify benefits both materially and economically.
- R > increased urban greening, should be a very high priority. The budget should be much higher than \$600,000, again perhaps 25% of the total budget or \$8.8 million.
- R > High Priority, Include an ongoing maintenance trust Also connect with CalTrans and rail for increased sound walls. For areas that don't have them along freeways and rail.
- R > Highest priority: Urban greening is necessary for our community healing:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IYhuiP43lp0&feature=emb_logo, Develop conservancy organization for long term maintenance perhaps a special district?
- R > We need to identify trees that don't take mistletoe, and fit this area. Give trees to residents to plant only in front yards. If put along streets also, city must agree to care for them with add'l employee if necessary funded for first year by this.

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$600,000

Units: n/a

Today's Comments

-

TRUCK ROUTES

Work with City and County to assess current truck routes (potential impact of speed bumps). CSC suggested Boggs Tract as an area of concern.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- R >This is the Port of Stockton's response to an inquiry that the Commissioners deemed worthy of a response: When will the Port conduct a traffic study to help with idling trucks and traffic in the residential neighborhoods related to Port operations or the operations of their leaseholders? The Port has completed several Port-wide traffic improvement projects to reduce congestion both in the Port and in adjacent areas. Over the past few years, the Port has pursued a program of improvements to facilitate a more direct connection to the West Complex from the new Crosstown Freeway ramps. The Port has recently replaced the Navy Drive Bridge and completed widening of Navy Drive to improve traffic flow, avoid neighborhood impacts, decrease idle times, and improve safety between the SR-4 Crosstown Freeway extension and the Port's West Complex. Construction of a grade separation and signalized intersection to improve traffic flow onto the West Complex is also planned. The Port has also undertaken other traffic improvements on West Washington Street to improve traffic flow, and installed signage throughout its property to instruct trucks on which routes to travel and to convey requirements for minimizing idling. In addition, traffic studies have been undertaken for specific Port-led CEQA documents on both the East and West Complexes when required per City of Stockton traffic impact assessment guidelines. The Port will continue to comply with City and San Joaquin Council of Governments requirements related to traffic management and vehicle miles traveled assessments in its role as CEQA lead agency. Recent CEQA documents prepared by the Port have included requirements for minimizing idling of trucks on terminal and use of clean trucks. These types of requirements encourage the development of truck management systems to reduce truck queuing at the gates, which has the potential for spilling over to area neighborhoods. And an FYI there is a major transportant project up for a categorical exemption - Monday 10.20.2020
- B >Very Important
- R >Very High
- R >It is an area of concern. No question about it.
- R >High Priority
- G >Would be helpful to line up our air monitoring results with this strategy. The City of Stockton will be ready and available to work with the air district or other stakeholders as needed. Any supporting information is appreciated.
- A/R/A/A/R > What is "assess" current truck routes? Is a technical study required, or can the city and county develop and implement a plan? What is the timeframe? (1 year?) CLARIFY to establish what the money is needed for. For example, could this money be used to actually add speed bumps and signs directing trucks rather than just studying? Traffic signals could be adjusted to improve traffic flow. Study should be comprehensive. Dollar amount should change based on this information.
- R > Very High Priority. Port operations can be more efficient, less polluting, and economically beneficial.
- R > Work with the city and County to assess current truck routes. I am not sure what that means. For any budget amount, there should be a specific goal of reducing truck traffic that results in direct and measurable reduction in air pollution to Boggs Tract. AB 6 1 7 funds should not be used to pay for another study as opposed to implementing steps to move more truck traffic away from the Boggs Tract neighborhood.

- R > What is "assess" current truck routes? Is a technical study required, or can the city and county develop and implement a plan? What is the timeframe? (1 year?) CLARIFY to establish what the money is needed for. For example, could this money be used to actually add speed bumps and signs directing trucks rather than just studying? Traffic signals could be adjusted to improve traffic flow. Study should be comprehensive. Targeted truck routes that are enforced will enable the community to focus appropriate mitigation measures. Please ask the county's consultant to give an update on the Boggs Tract Sustainability Plan. AECOM is contracted by San Joaquin County to develop the Boggs Tract Sustainability Plan for the areas in Boggs Tract within the County's jurisdiction.
- R > Concerned, but also worried about the Port's actions on this.

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$1,000,000

Units: n/a

Today's Comments

-

AIR FILTRATION IN SCHOOLS

Incentive program to install advanced air filtration systems in 33 community schools.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- R > This should be done with health studies to determine actual health benefits
- R > I think there should be some monitoring data to show that 33 schools are in need. What are these schools?
- B > For schools near transportation corridors
- R > Very High
- R > High Priority
- A/R/A/A/R > Clarify: Are these schools in the boundaries? Is this upgrading the system plus a supply of filters? Needs more detail on where the money goes.
- R > This program should begin as a pilot on selected campuses, carefully studied, and expanded when data justifies it.
- R > I strongly support this measure especially if it can be joined with health studies so to determine the actual health benefits of advanced air filters. There is a high incidence of childhood asthma, and it is possible that air filtration systems in the schools may help address that problem. Again it should be done in conjunction with high-quality health studies. Given a \$35 million budget, the allocation should be far more funds than \$2,640,000. Again, 25% or \$8.8 million.
- R > Highest priority. Should cover full cost for schools to transition. As well as support for ongoing maintenance. Should start this implementation as soon as approved.
- R > Clarify: Are these schools in the boundaries? Is this upgrading the system plus a supply of filters? Needs more detail on where the money goes. These schools must be identified before final budget approval and should include public and private schools and daycare facilities within the AB617 boundary.
- R > I think all schools could use this, but only those built oldest should get it first.

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$2,640,000

Units: 33 Schools

Today's Comments

-

BIKE PATHS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Work with City, County, and San Joaquin Council of Governments to assess current bike path infrastructure (including bike racks) and look for matching funding to make community more bike and walk friendly.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- R >Please do not let this money get sucked up with planning. You have no idea how many plans have yielded zero fruit because it is not a priority.
- B >OK
- R >Have you considered Van Buskirk Golf Course. Plenty of room, needs tree, plants, etc.
- R >If this is done which is great, it should be promoted often to encourage the community to ride a bike. Also this is south side so then it'd be something else, but we have to ensure the community's safety.
- R >Low Priority
- R >I am not in favor of electric bikes - conflicts with pedestrians and interfere with traffic flow having seen some used by Stockton residents.
- G >These are great one-time investments that serve communities for years. Just as a thought, taking this number up to 10 as we have a very large city and a significant need for zero-emission strategies. Cycling and trails is awesome.
- A/R/A/A/R > Safety first: Where is this realistic? How far out are infrastructure changes to make this safe? If several years
- R > Funding should be applied directly to construction recommended by most recent study and not used for planning!
- R > These funds should not be used solely for planning. If there is \$500,000 allocated, there should be a tangible proposal that will show significant benefit and use by residents of the AB 6 1 7 area. 500k is 1.41% of the total budget which is OK.
- R > I like the idea of focusing on Van Buskirk--it's a beautiful area. Should also connect with the city and surrounding areas and connect with other organizations working on this. Don't want SW Stockton to stay an "island".
- R > Safety first: Where is this realistic? How far out are infrastructure changes to make this safe? If several years out, money should be reduced or go to items above. Also need to assess overlap with other efforts like Transformative Climate Communities, etc. This money can be used for matching funds relating to safe routes to school, bicycle helmets, bicycle safety education, bicycle physical projects not to "assess" with another plan. In consultation with the City of Stockton and Council of Governments develop a list of projects prior to final budget approval.
- R > What has previous plans said? If previous plans have been done, it wasn't done for some reason. Why? If run out of money, then

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$500,000

Units: n/a

Today's Comments

-

TRUCKS

Incentive program for heavy-duty truck replacement with zero and to a lesser extent near zero emission technology.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- A >Use existing funds. These trucks will likely travel well outside the boundary.
- R >Make a fixed proportional commitment say 60% zero and 40% near zero. Any money can be spent on zero infrastructure.
- B >Electric grid not supportive yet for all electric. We have some vehicles but poor charging options
- R >Very High
- R >High Priority
- G > This strategy is quite significant. I'm interested to learn how we designate the 50 trucks, and ensure they are part of the local solution.
- A/R/A/A/R > Too much \$\$\$: Should be ONLY Zero Emissions. Do NOT support "near" zero. Large operators should pay this cost or apply to other funding sources. IF incentive funding is used, it should only go to low income independent owner operators.
- R > Should be implemented at this level only with robust charging infrastructure.
- R > incentive program for heavy duty truck replacement. \$10 million is outrageous. Not one dollar of AB 617 funds should be used for this strategy. There are other programs available and issues relating to mobile source pollution arising from diesel trucks and other transportation is a responsibility of car. AB 617 community fund should not be used for this strategy, not one dollar.
- R > Very high priority. If used for trucks that are to be used in within the boundaries. Also need to incorporate more charging areas.
- R > Too much \$\$\$: Should be ONLY Zero Emissions. Do NOT support "near" zero. Large operators should pay this cost or apply to other funding sources. IF incentive funding is used, it should only go to low income independent owner operators. Additionally, this money could be spent on charging infrastructure if low income independent owner operators obtain funding for truck replacement elsewhere.

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$10,000,000

Units: 50 Trucks

Today's Comments

-

CHARGING STATIONS FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLES

Incentive program for the installation of charging stations for electric vehicles in public spaces.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- A >Especially for electric upgrade for residents if necessary
- R >More money
- B > Important part of long term solutions
- R > High
- R > High Priority
- G > Made a modest increase to charging stations, as we likely need dozens more in the next 3-5 years.
- A/R/A/A/R > Where is VW settlement funding being spent? Fees and fines from local facilities? Other sources of money?
- R > Money should be transferred from # 18 to # 19 (this measure). Reliable and comprehensive charging is necessary for ZEVs.
- R > There should be no funding for this strategy. There other sources of funding. We should be concerned about strategies that resulted direct and material benefits to the AB 617 residence.
- R > Very high Priority. More money. Outreach to business that would install stations. Assistance with accessing incentives especially with households that receive vehicle incentives.
- R > Where is VW settlement funding being spent? Fees and fines from local facilities? Other sources of money? This should be an ongoing program as we transition from fossil fuels to electrification.
- R > Very important part of an updated community! Help low income residents with a proven need first. Also help some small businesses to make an upgrade.

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$375,000

Units: 15 Stations

Today's Comments

-

TRAINING FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLE MECHANICS

Incentive program for educational training for electric vehicle mechanics.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- R >This type of job training should be emphasized and encouraged and implemented soon.
- A >Two Mechanics training is not enough to keep up with growth in EVs, it seems cost efficient to invest more here and bring green jobs to the AB 617 community
- R >Triple at least
- B >Connect with Delta College vocational training
- R >Very High
- R > High Priority
- A/R/A/A >This should be increased.
- A/R/A/A/R >What would this money be used for? (Scholarships, hiring staff, etc.) Is it enough? A laudable goal that lacks concrete details. Add \$\$\$ to provide a foundation for this program to be comprehensive and sustainable.
- R > Electric and Zero Emission Vehicles must have trained mechanics in order to convert a critical mass of vehicles to produce quantifiable results.
- R > Very high priority. Should check on feasibility at SJDC or find the nearest opportunity to be available for potential residents of our area.
- R >What would this money be used for? (Scholarships, hiring staff, etc.) Is it enough? A laudable goal that lacks concrete details. Add \$\$\$ to provide a foundation for this program to be comprehensive and sustainable. Our community could become a training hub with an expansion of Delta College's electrical technical program. I think this money should be spent on a "graduate" stipend including tuition for Delta College electrical technical program (\$1800/mo) for the training program and a commitment to work in the community for three years
- R > High! I would give those mechanics whose business does not include electric vehicles first. Work w/Delta to offer?

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$150,000

Units: 10 Students

Today's Comments

-

SCHOOL BUSES

Incentive program for replacing older diesel school buses with zero or to a lesser extent near zero emission buses.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- A >How much are school buses still used?
- R >Less money only 7 and commitment that these 7 will be dedicated to AB617 area only
- B >School dists. Need emergency charging opportunities
- R > High
- R >Low Priority
- G >Buses are great, however, due to COVID-19 I might suggest we invest these dollars in more immediate
- A/R/A/A/R >Still wondering how many of these buses are in use in the community. Be clear on need before earmarking so much money.
- R > Nice program, but more bang for buck can be derived in other programs of heavy equipment.
- R > High priority. Are there other grants to access?
- R > Still wondering how many of these buses are in use in the community. Be clear on need before earmarking so much money. A list of the educational transportation companies and routes must be included in the final budget before approval
- R > Low priority to half as much, as they don't use busses much any more. Maybe check on disabled busses.

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$2,800,000

Units: 7 Buses

Today's Comments

-

LARGE CLEAN FUEL INFRASTRUCTURE

Incentives for planning and implementation of clean fuel infrastructure such as large-scale electric, hydrogen and other clean fuels.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- A >What is "clean fuel" here? Need to clearly define.
- R> Not quite sure again don't spend it all on planning pick a smaller footprint to plan in. Recall the goals of the TCC are not the same as the City of Stockton - I heard with my own ears.
- B >this should blended into HD.1
- R >High
- R >Need More Information
- G >In general, seems appropriate. Require additional information to assess what else can be done in this strategy
- A/R/A/A/R > What are "other" clean fuels? We need to ensure we're not incentivizing dirty forms of upstream energy, like biomass/biogas/biomethane. Difficult to support money going here unless we know exactly what it will be spent on. Only in support of funding for electric infrastructure.
- R > Program is vague and hydrogen is very expensive to develop and years away to be developed on a large scale.
- R > Large scale options are important Hydrogen could be an important option for confined businesses such as the Port.
- R > For Electric only What are "other" clean fuels? We need to ensure we're not incentivizing dirty forms of upstream energy, like biomass/biogas/biomethane. Difficult to support money going here unless we know exactly what it will be spent on. Only in support of funding for electric infrastructure. Already large facilities under construction and development to support importation of renewable diesel. The use of food crops for fuel development is not sustainable. Planning here should include partnering with the City of Stockton to update the Climate Action Plan with an assessment of progress of implementation. Particularly relating to their existing housing stock retrofit and transportation related emissions.
- R > I don't know if this is for "planning" or actually planning and doing.

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$1,000,000

Units: n/a

Today's Comments

-

NEW ELECTRIC VEHICLES, PLUG-IN EVs, AND HOME CHARGERS FOR RESIDENTS

Incentive program for the replacement of passenger vehicles with battery electric or plug-in electric hybrid vehicle with an additional rebate option for those residents installing a Level 2 charger in their home.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- A >And include assistance to facilitate homeowners in finding the rebates and being able to utilize.
- B >very important in the initial growth of electrical
- R >High
- R >Low Priority
- A >This should be increased
- G >Throwing some interest to see more local investment into this area.
- A/R/A/A > Metrics: In what timeframe? Who implements this program?
- R > Good program to encourage households to add an electric car. Plug-in is the immediate future to near-term electric car usage.
- R > High Priority. This amount should be doubled or tripled. Must include assistance to seek these incentives and how to utilize.
- R >Low Priority
- R > Metrics: In what timeframe? Who implements this program? Outreach must be targeted to residents living within the boundary of AB617.
- R > High! I would take more money for this! We need people to either purchase and install charging, or just purchase

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$800,000

Units: 100 Cars and Chargers

Today's Comments

-

TRAINS AND OTHER RAIL EQUIPMENT OPERATING IN THE COMMUNITY

Incentive program for replacing older diesel railcar movers, switcher locomotives and diesel locomotives primarily operating in the community with new clean-engine technology.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- R >too much money the port has to do some of this by regulatory decree I believe. This is really hard when we don't have the ability to hide cells
- B >opportunity to reduce rail emissions immediately
- R >High
- R >Low Priority
- G >No change
- A/R/A/A > In what timeframe? This is a lot of money - What are the estimated emission reductions?
- R > High Priority. This category is more than just the port, it includes all of the mainline railroad switching and intermodal yards that operate locally 24/7. Incentives will nudge railroads towards this technology.
- R > High priority because this will affect local air quality. But should first be using all other grant options.
- R >Very Low Priority
- R > In what timeframe? This is a lot of money - What are the estimated emission reductions?
- R > Low priority if at Port, as they may have to do it themselves.

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$8,000,000

Units: N/A

Today's Comments

-

TRUCKS AND OTHER HEAVY DUTY EQUIPMENT OPERATING AT THE PORT

Incentive program for heavy-duty vehicle with zero, and where zero emissions technology is not available, near zero emission technology, including Transport Refrigeration Units (TRUs), Drayage Trucks, etc. with a focus on equipment in Port.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- A >Only zero emission, not "near zero" Only if limited to equipment primarily used within Stockton.
- R >too much money the port has to do some of this by regulatory decree I believe. This is really hard when we don't have the ability to hide cells
- B >good opportunity
- R >High
- R >Low Priority
- G >Modest increase here.
- A/R/A/A > How many? In what timeframe? This is a lot of money - What are the estimated emission reductions? Only zero, not near zero. Large operators should pay this cost or apply to other funding sources. IF incentive funding is used, it should only go to low income independent owner operators.
- R > High Priority. The TRUs are very numerous and often operate 24/7 while sitting in rail yards, loading terminals, and ports.
- R > Important, for vehicles that will be in area >75% of time.
- R >Only Zero emission technology used primarily within Stockton
- R > How many? In what timeframe? This is a lot of money - What are the estimated emission reductions? Only zero, not near zero. Large operators should pay this cost or apply to other funding sources. IF incentive funding is used, it should only go to low income independent owner operators.
- R > Only zero emission, not "near zero" . I would like to see the Port more involved in this issue. If they really want the money.

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$8,000,000

Units: N/A

Today's Comments

-

REPAIR CARS TO PASS SMOG CHECK

Incentive program to host a local Tune In Tune Up event to reduce emissions from older, high polluting cars through providing an incentive for individuals to get their cars repaired to pass smog check.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- C >Would like to see these events allow for the replacement of vehicles newer than 1999.
- R >Would like to see these events hosting in smaller communities such as Boggs tract or Conway Homes
- A >Use existing funds
- R >More money
- R >i received \$500 for repairs so my car can pass smog repair cost was higher. Did not help. limited to certain mechanics also not good
- B >needed support for the community
- R >Isn't existing program adequate?
- R > High
- R > Low Priority
- G> Increased this since not all residents can support 100% electric.
- A/R/A/A > Metrics: How many events? What timeframe? How many cars, how many emission reductions? Existing District program. Would rather fund new approaches and immediate protections.
- R > Very High Priority. Auto use is universal, cars are often in use that are not properly tuned and are polluting. The public neglects to and/or cannot afford tune ups. Programs that provide benefits directly to the public and are beneficial & quantifiable will be popular. Increase funding and incentives.
- R > Important. Increase the amounts of incentives.
- R >Very Low Priority
- R > Mixed reviews – please provide summaries of existing programs with as much detail as possible regarding effectiveness and public reviews of the program collected.
- R > More money for this to possibly expand mechanics/program. Double?

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$120,000

Units: 2 Events

Today's Comments

-

CAR SHARE PROGRAM

Incentive program to launch a car share program to help residents share clean electric cars in community.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- C >Housing Authority of San Joaquin is currently applying for EV car share through Clean Mobility Option grant.
- A >What does this cost cover? Wouldn't the company want to come in to get more customers?
- R >I think this a really good idea but probably transit could be harmed.
- B >OK
- R >High
- R >Low Priority
- R >Include the ability to rent a 4wd to go to winter sports opportunities
- A/R/A/A > Still not clear what this money is going toward or when emission reductions are likely to result. Hard to assess
- R > Medium Priority. Car share programs are useful and feel good. Ultimately they must, however, be profitable on their own.
- R > Interesting. An update on programs that are already in place, how it works. (Interesting idea to offer for specialty outings such as 4W drive.) And would it be strictly for residents in the area?
- R >Very Low Priority
- R > Still not clear what this money is going toward or when emission reductions are likely to result. Hard to assess the value. Five neighborhood car pilot study to gauge impact on transit, trip reductions, and community benefits including sustainable funding sources to expand the program if successful.
- R > I think the vehicles should be a truck, as everyone needs a truck at some time or another and it may reach more people that way. Very High priority

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$1,000,000

Units: Additional Cars and Chargers

Today's Comments

-

TUG BOATS

Incentive program for tug boat replacement/repower.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- R >I think the port should let us know what their options are--perhaps other grants or opportunities.
- A >Port and operators should pay these costs.
- R >too much money the port has to do some of this by regulatory decree I believe. This is really hard when we don't have the ability to hide cells
- B >Let's see how Omnibus changes emissions
- R >High
- R >Very Low Priority
- A/R/A/A > Not in support of incentives for the port. Reallocate money elsewhere.
- R > Medium Priority. Tugboat use at the port should be compared to larger benefits of other programs such as TRUs.
- R > Important. Port should seek all options for grants. And Port should cover most costs if it is already a regulation.
- R > Not in support of incentives for the Post. Reallocate money elsewhere
- R > Not in support of incentives for the Post. Reallocate money elsewhere
- R > Not sure we should be determining what the PORT needs. I think more investigation must be done IF we want to give them all this \$

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$1,000,000

Units: 1 Boat

Today's Comments

-

REPLACE WOOD BURNING FIREPLACE, STOVES AND INSERTS

Incentive program for the replacement of existing residential wood burning devices (fireplaces, stoves and inserts) and pellet stoves with natural gas or electric technologies.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- A >Use existing funds.
- B >OK
- R >Very High
- R >Low Priority
- A/R/A/A > In what timeframe? What are the reductions per device replaced? NOT in support of "cleaner" devices that use natural gas and pellets. Should be all electric; heat pumps. If all electric is not an option, use money elsewhere.
- R > Low Priority. Good idea, however, many residents will never convert from wood and will resent and fight mandates.
- R > High Priority. Enforcement should focus on assistance with options to replace.
- R > Low Priority
- R > In what timeframe? What are the reductions per device replaced? NOT in support of "cleaner" devices that use natural gas and pellets. Should be all electric; heat pumps. If all electric is not an option, use money elsewhere.
- R > Very High Priority! I would like to know how much each type are and how much does the resident pay or is it based on need/income?

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$300,000

Units: 100 Devices

Today's Comments

-

ELECTRIC BIKE SHARE PROGRAM

Incentive program to bring a partner to launch an electric bike share program to help residents share clean bike in community.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- A >Use existing funds.
- B >OK
- R >Very High
- R >Low Priority
- G >Like this in general.
- A/R/A/A > Only when safe. Could money go toward creating the bike lanes rather than studying? What about road diets,
- R > Good program to begin with modest funding.
- R > Important. and update from SJCOG with status of their grant. assuming there are safe bike opportunities.
- R > Low Priority
- R > Only when safe. Could money go toward creating the bike lanes rather than studying? What about road diets, like tree planting and other things that slow traffic?
- R > Let's see if the Electric Bike Sharing takes off. It would be great to add to the program.

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$50,000

Units: n/a

Today's Comments

-

REPLACE COMMERCIAL LAWN CARE EQUIPMENT

Incentive program for the replacement of commercial lawn and garden equipment.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- R >How do we determine if to be used widely within the boundaries.
- A >Use existing funds. No guarantee these stay within the boundary.
- B >OK
- R > High
- R >Very Low Priority
- G >Took unit count up on this as well.
- A/R/A/A > Why more funding for commercial replacement? Wouldn't replacement for residents be more likely to benefit the area? Shift funds to community based rather than commercial. For commercial, focus should be on small, locally owned businesses.
- R > Very High Priority. Will reduce pollution directly in residential areas. Independent contractors may convert to electric equipment with incentives.
- R > Important if the machinery is used >75% within the boundaries.
- R >Wouldn't replacement for residents be more likely to benefit the area? Shift funds to community based rather than commercial.
- R >Why more funding for commercial replacement? Wouldn't replacement for residents be more likely to benefit the area? Shift funds to community based rather than commercial. For commercial, focus should be on small, locally owned businesses. This must be for ELECTRIC only.
- R > Very High Priority! I would like to know how much each type are and how much does the resident pay or is it based on need/income?

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$100,000 Units: 5 Large Commercial Devices

Today's Comments

-

REPLACE HOME LAWN CARE EQUIPMENT

Incentive program for the replacement of residential lawn and garden equipment.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- R >Would like to see this widely introduced.
- A >Only for people who live in the boundary. Not a high priority.
- R >High
- B >OK
- R >replacement to electric? Residents already have high electric bills
- R >Low Priority
- G >Took this up some for units/distribution. Seems like a great local solution.
- A/R/A/A > flip allocations so residents get most of the funding; commercial likely goes outside the community
- R > As with fireplace conversions, many people will resent mandates, will not convert, and may provide loud public resistance.
- R > High importance. Education important. Need to investigate options if would create high electric bills. We haven't talked about assistance with rooftop solar. That might be a good option for residences.
- R >Low Priority
- R >flip allocations so residents get most of the funding; commercial likely goes outside the community
- R > Same comment as above but add: Extremely High Priority add more money to this!!

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$12,500

Units: 50 Home Units

Today's Comments

-

MARINE EXHAUST

Incentive program to install marine exhaust intake bonnet emission control technology.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- A/R/A/A > Not in support of incentives for the port. They should pay for clean up. Reallocate money elsewhere.
- R > Good to reduce stationary pollution source.
- R > is this something required by regulation? If so, the Port should be covering.
- R >Reallocate money elsewhere
- R > Not in support of incentives for the port. They should pay for clean-up. Reallocate money elsewhere. Partner funds for feasibility study that assesses emission reduction and ability to implement.

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$1,000,000

Units: Unknown

Today's Comments

-

AIR FILTRATION IN HOMES

Incentive program to install advanced air filtration systems in homes within the community.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- A >Please ADD based on estimates of houses in the highest polluting zones.
- A >Need funding that immediately protects residents in the danger zones closest to major polluting sources.
- R >Very High
- A/R/A/A/R > High priority: Increase funding. Use fines from polluters in the area to create a fund to support long term. Can someone use GIS to analyze how many homes and sensitive sites are within danger zones? Or what is the unit allocation estimated from? Could use some data analysis.
- R > Good to begin project for Disadvantaged Communities.
- R > air filtration for homes may be considered as with the strategy for advanced air filtration systems for schools. Again this should be done in conjunction with proper health studies, but if we indeed have a \$35 million budget, then perhaps we should allocate 20% or \$7 million to this strategy since it has the prospect of possibly reducing the incidence of childhood asthma.
- R > Very important. Might consider more money. Filtration as well as air purifier.
- R >High priority: Increase funding. Use fines from polluters in the area to create a fund to support long term. Can someone use GIS to analyze how many homes and sensitive sites are within danger zones? Or what is the unit allocation estimated from? Could use some data analysis. Clarify what constitutes electrification – replacing natural gas appliances, how this incentive program will work with existing PGE and Energy Commission programs.
- R > Add more \$ to this!! VERY IMPORTANT! Determined by income and need! Especially in area of need!

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$1,000,000

Units: Unknown

Today's Comments

-

HOME WEATHERIZATION AND ELECTRIFICATION

IAQ.1 Incentive program to bring a partner to expand home weatherization and electrification within the community.

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- A/R/A/A/R > Highest priority: Add more \$\$\$ Focus of funding should be protecting and benefitting people living in the community. Ask entities like CA Public Utilities Commission and groups like GRID Alternatives to support. Use fines from polluters in the area to create a fund to support long term.
- R > Good to begin project for Disadvantaged Communities.
- R > Home weatherization and electrification probably should not be an AB 617 project. PG&E has a low income energy efficiency program (Energy Savings Assistance Program) that would provide these types of benefits.
- R > High priority. connect with other agencies working on this. And again, more focus on solar rooftops. In fact, what would 100% rooftop solar look like in these charts? And would be good assistance for residents.
- R > Clarify what constitutes electrification – replacing natural gas appliances, how this incentive program will work with existing PGE and Energy Commission programs.
- R > Add more \$ to this!! VERY IMPORTANT! Determined by income and need!

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$1,000,000

Units: Unknown

Today's Comments

-

**NEW
TRUCK IDLING PLUG INS**

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- AR/A/A/R > Plug ins for trucks idling as they wait to get into the port, when they stop to rest, etc.: Needs research and responsible parties listed.

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$0 (\$2 MIL)

Units: Unknown

Today's Comments

-

NEW
PARKLETS, POCKET PARKS, TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURE

Comments received prior to Oct. 31

- AR/A/A/R > Parklets, pocket parks, and traffic calming measures like medians, cross walks, adjusting traffic signals. Needs research and responsible parties

Updated Proposed Funding Amount: \$0 (\$3 MIL)

Units: Unknown

Today's Comments

-