

Measure	Concerns	Suggestions	Questions/Add'l Discussion	Status Based on CSC Feedback
<p><b>2. TREES AND URBAN GREENING</b></p> <p>Overall, CSC supports this measure. Some implementation concerns.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long term maintenance trust</li> <li>• Quantifying benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include Hazelton Ave</li> <li>• Consider planting from seeds</li> <li>• Increase number of sites</li> <li>• Connect with Caltrans</li> </ul>		Green
<p><b>3. TRUCK ROUTES</b></p> <p>CSC supports and wants to ensure focus around Port and through Boggs Tract.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don't use money for another study</li> <li>• Line up with the air monitoring results</li> <li>• Port actions on this</li> <li>• Quantifiable goals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could this money be used to actually add speed bumps and signs directing trucks rather than just studying?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting information is appreciated</li> <li>• CLARIFY to establish what the money is needed for</li> <li>• What "access means"</li> <li>• Please ask the county's consultant to give an update on the Boggs Tract Sustainability Plan</li> </ul>	Green
<p><b>4. AIR FILTRATION IN SCHOOLS</b></p> <p>CSC supports for schools within AB 617 boundary.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritize older schools first</li> <li>• Consider health benefits and use monitoring data to show that 33 schools are in need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For schools near transportation corridors</li> <li>• Public and private schools</li> <li>• Should cover full cost for schools to transition as well as support for ongoing maintenance</li> <li>• Oldest school building should get it first</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are these schools in the boundaries?</li> <li>• Is this upgrading the system plus a supply of filters?</li> <li>• Needs more detail on where the money goes.</li> </ul>	Green
<p><b>5. BIKE PATHS AND INFRASTRUCTURE</b></p> <p>CSC supports and wants to see money is spent on projects that provide connectivity and safety, do not overlap, and are based on recent studies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don't spend money on planning</li> <li>• Ensure safety</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considered Van Buskirk Golf Course</li> <li>• Matching funds for safe routes to school, bicycle helmets, safety education</li> <li>• Connect with other projects (TCC) and infrastructure to maximize the benefit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Share the list of potential projects</li> </ul>	Green
<p><b>6. TRUCKS</b></p> <p>CSC supports and wants to focus on zero emission truck only.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do we ensure 50 trucks are part of the local solution</li> <li>• Need robust charging infrastructure too</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zero emission vs near zero emission</li> <li>• Who should pay this cost</li> </ul>	Green

Measure	Concerns	Suggestions	Questions/Add'l Discussion	Status Based on CSC Feedback
<p><b>7. CHARGING STATIONS FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLES</b></p> <p>Overall, CSC supports this measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long term solution</li> <li>• This should be an ongoing program as we transition from fossil fuels to electrification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electric upgrade for residents</li> <li>• Outreach to business</li> <li>• Assistance with accessing incentive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where is VW settlement funding being spent?</li> <li>• Fees and fines from local facilities?</li> <li>• Other sources of money?</li> </ul>	Green
<p><b>8. TRAINING FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLE MECHANICS</b></p> <p>Overall, CSC supports this measure and suggests adding more trainings and establishing more concrete goals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two mechanics trainings is not enough to keep up with growth in EVs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More trainings</li> <li>• Connect with Delta College vocational training</li> <li>• Check on feasibility at SJDC or find the nearest opportunity to be available for potential residents of our area</li> <li>• Spend on a "graduate" stipend, including tuition for Delta College electrical technical program (\$1800/mo)</li> <li>• It seems cost efficient to invest more here and bring green jobs to the AB 617 community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of trainings</li> <li>• Concrete details</li> <li>• What would this money be used for? (Scholarships, hiring staff, etc.) Is it enough?</li> </ul>	Green
<p><b>9. SCHOOL BUSES</b></p> <p>CSC questions 'bang for the buck', availability of other funding and COVID's shifting priorities. CSC may not want to include in CERP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other heavy equipment programs can deliver more bang for the buck</li> <li>• Buses are still used in the community? Be clear on need before spending so much money</li> <li>• More immediate Covid-19 needs?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School lists. Need emergency charging opportunities</li> <li>• Maybe check on disabled buses</li> <li>• Invest in more immediate needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many of these buses are in use in the community?</li> <li>• Are there other grants to access?</li> </ul>	Red
<p><b>10. LARGE CLEAN FUEL INFRASTRUCTURE</b></p> <p>CSC support installation of large clean fuel infrastructure, but needs more discussion regarding types of fuel.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don't spend on planning</li> <li>• No incentivizing dirty forms of upstream energy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blend into HD.1</li> <li>• Planning here should include partnering with the City of Stockton to update the Climate Action Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is "clean fuel" here? <i>Need to clearly define</i></li> <li>• Program is vague</li> </ul>	Yellow

Measure	Concerns	Suggestions	Questions/Add'l Discussion	Status Based on CSC Feedback
<p><b>11. NEW ELECTRIC VEHICLES, PLUG-IN EVs, AND HOME CHARGERS FOR RESIDENTS</b></p> <p>CSC supports program.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investments stay in the AB 617 area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include assistance to homeowners in finding rebate</li> <li>Target AB 617 area investment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timeframe</li> <li>Program details</li> <li>Metrics</li> </ul>	<p>Green</p>
<p><b>12. TRAINS AND OTHER RAIL EQUIPMENT OPERATING IN THE COMMUNITY</b></p> <p>While CSC recognizes emission reduction potential, cost and who picks up the bill is a concern. Need more discussion on benefits.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why does CSC have to pick up the bill?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use other grant options first</li> <li>Port has to do that</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timeframe</li> <li>What is estimated emission reduction?</li> </ul>	<p>Red</p>
<p><b>13. TRUCKS AND OTHER HEAVY DUTY EQUIPMENT OPERATING AT THE PORT</b></p> <p>Despite the concerns, CSC recognizes an opportunity with this strategy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only zero emission, not near zero</li> <li>Port needs to be involved</li> <li>Large operations should pay for it</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Equipment primarily used in Stockton; vehicles that will be in area &gt;75% of time</li> <li>Money only goes to low income independent owners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timeframe, how many?</li> <li>What is emission reduction?</li> </ul>	<p>Yellow</p>
<p><b>14. REPAIR CARS TO PASS SMOG CHECK</b></p> <p>CSC supports program and wants to further target it in AB 617 community and potentially increase the incentive.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How effective is this program?</li> <li>\$500 does not cover smog repair cost</li> <li>Limited to certain mechanics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace 1999 and newer vehicles</li> <li>Host the program in smaller communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aren't existing programs adequate?</li> <li>Metrics</li> <li>Provide summaries of existing programs</li> </ul>	<p>Green</p>

Measure	Concerns	Suggestions	Questions/Add'l Discussion	Status Based on CSC Feedback
<p><b>15. CAR SHARE PROGRAM</b></p> <p>CSC supports further discussion of joining forces with SJCOG and HACSJ to expand car sharing grant to provide super low cost car share for residents in AB 617.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transit could be harmed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to rent 4WD for winter sports</li> <li>The vehicle should be a truck--can reach more people since everybody needs a truck</li> <li>Get the pilot first then expand</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What does it cover?</li> <li>Where the money is going to?</li> <li>What's the emission reduction?</li> <li>Strictly for AB 617 residents?</li> </ul>	<p>Yellow</p>
<p><b>16. TUG BOATS</b></p> <p>More discussion needs to occur regarding other resources and the port being responsible for financing and implementing this.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Port &amp; operators should pay for it</li> <li>Port should seek funding and cover the cost</li> <li>CSC is not in position to determine what port needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relocate money</li> <li>Compare benefits to other programs first</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to know port's operations</li> </ul>	<p>Red</p>
<p><b>17. REPLACE WOOD BURNING FIREPLACE, STOVES AND INSERTS</b></p> <p>There is some skepticism about this measure. Need more information.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If all electric is not an option, use money elsewhere</li> <li>Residents will never convert from wood and will resent the mandates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be all electric</li> <li>Enforcement should focus on assistance with options to replace</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program metrics and impact</li> <li>How much each type are and how much does the resident pay or is it based on need/income?</li> </ul>	<p>Yellow</p>
<p><b>18. ELECTRIC BIKE SHARE PROGRAM</b></p> <p>CSC likes this measure in general. Safety is a big concern.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety</li> <li>Don't use money for a study</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include update from SJCOG with status of their grant and overlap</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What about road diets?</li> </ul>	<p>Yellow</p>
<p><b>19. REPLACE COMMERCIAL LAWN CARE EQUIPMENT</b></p> <p>CSC is concerned with ensuring that the equipment stays in the area and questions why commercial is prioritized over residential.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure these stay within the boundary (at least 75%)</li> <li>Isn't it better to fund residential?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use existing funds</li> <li>Shift funds to community used equipment rather than commercial used</li> <li>If commercial, fund small businesses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How much each type are and how much does the resident pay or is it based on need/income?</li> </ul>	<p>Green</p>

Measure	Concerns	Suggestions	Questions/Add'l Discussion	Status Based on CSC Feedback
<p><b>20. REPLACE HOME LAWN CARE EQUIPMENT</b></p> <p>It's a mix of high and low priority ranking. CSC prioritizes effectiveness, AB 617 boundary, direct benefits to residents and lower electric bills.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to stay in the boundary</li> <li>• People will resent mandates</li> <li>• Will replacement increase electric bill higher?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education is an important piece</li> <li>• Flip allocation so residents get most of the funding</li> <li>• What about assistance with rooftop solar for residents? It might be a good option instead</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are we replacing to electric?</li> </ul>	Green
<p><b>21. MARINE EXHAUST</b></p> <p>One member recognizes this strategy as "good to reduce stationary pollution sources." Majority of a few comments received suggest the port should pay for it.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Port should pay for clean-up, especially if it's required by regulation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-allocate funds</li> <li>• Partner funds for feasibility study that assesses emission reduction and ability to implement.</li> </ul>		Red
<p><b>22. AIR FILTRATION IN HOMES</b></p> <p>This is a very important, high priority measure for CSC. Members want to see a more data driven approach, increased funding and ensure that the most vulnerable benefit from this strategy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure protection of residents living closest to major polluting sources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use fines from polluters in the area to create a fund to support long term</li> <li>• Should be done in conjunction with proper health studies</li> <li>• Could use some data analysis</li> <li>• Income and <i>need</i> determines eligibility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can someone use GIS to analyze how many homes and sensitive sites are within danger zones? Or what is the unit allocation estimated from?</li> </ul>	Green
<p><b>23. HOME WEATHERIZATION AND ELECTRIFICATION</b></p> <p>CSC supports this measure and wants to maximize partnerships.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that funding benefits people living in the community</li> <li>• Since PG&amp;E already provides these benefits, this should not be an AB 617 project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partner up with CPUC, Grid Alternative, and other agencies</li> <li>• Use funds from fines to support long term</li> <li>• Focus on solar rooftops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What would 100% rooftop solar look like in these charts?</li> <li>• Clarify what constitutes electrification</li> </ul>	Green
<p><b>NEW. TRUCK IDLING PLUG INS</b></p> <p>CSC member new suggestion needs discussion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need research and responsible parties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	Yellow

Measure	Concerns	Suggestions	Questions/Add'l Discussion	Status Based on CSC Feedback
<p><b>NEW. PARKLETS, POCKET PARKS, TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURE</b></p> <p>CSC member new suggestion needs discussion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need research and responsible parties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p><b>Green</b></p>