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DISCLAIMER
This report was prepared as the result of work sponsored by the California Energy Commission (CEC). It does not necessarily represent the views of the CEC, its employees, or the State of California. The CEC, the State of California, its employees, contractors, and subcontractors make no warrant, express or implied, and assume no legal liability for the information in this report; nor does any party represent that the use of this information will not infringe upon privately owned rights. This report has not been approved or disapproved by the CEC nor has the CEC passed upon the accuracy or adequacy of the information in this report.
ADDENDUM 4

The Localized Health Impacts (LHI) Report for Selected Projects Awarded Funding Through the Clean Transportation Program Under Solicitation GFO-16-605 was posted November 7, 2017 (CEC-600-2017-009).¹ This addendum uses the same approach to assess the localized health impacts for a project with location changes. The GFO-16-605 awardee, Envoy Technologies, Inc. (Envoy), is proposing to add five Level 2 electric vehicle (EV) charging station locations. The newly proposed locations are described in Table 1, along with environmental justice (EJ) indicators.² (See Appendix A.) Charger quantity and type for the new locations are identical to the original proposal.

Table 1: Project Details Along With EJ Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awardee</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>New Site Locations</th>
<th>EJ Indicators for New Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Envoy Technologies, Inc.</td>
<td>Sustainable Shared Mobility Project</td>
<td>1133 Olive Dr., Davis, CA 95616</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envoy Technologies, Inc.</td>
<td>Sustainable Shared Mobility Project</td>
<td>539 39th St., Oakland, CA 94609</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envoy Technologies, Inc.</td>
<td>Sustainable Shared Mobility Project</td>
<td>1100 Webster St., Oakland, CA 94607</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envoy Technologies, Inc.</td>
<td>Sustainable Shared Mobility Project</td>
<td>1411 Alice St., Oakland, CA 94612</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envoy Technologies, Inc.</td>
<td>Sustainable Shared Mobility Project</td>
<td>900 Folsom St., San Francisco, CA 94107</td>
<td>Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envoy Technologies, Inc.</td>
<td>Sustainable Shared Mobility Project</td>
<td>950 Gough St., San Francisco, CA 94102</td>
<td>Minority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Energy Commission staff

Air Quality and EJ Indicators

The newly proposed station locations (electric vehicle charging stations) are in a nonattainment zone for ozone, particulate matter (PM³) 2.5 and PM 10. If a project site is in a nonattainment zone, it has higher emissions which can contribute to air pollution.

3 "Particulate matter" is unburned fuel particles that form smoke or soot and stick to lung tissue when inhaled. The numbers stand for microns in diameter.
nonattainment zone and has more than one EJ indicator, as shown in Table 1, with further detail in Table 2, it is considered a high-risk community, according to the Environmental Justice Screening Method.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Indicator Threshold</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>29.8%*</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>13.9%*</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>37.4%*</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: CEC staff, Employment Development Department, and U.S. Census Bureau. *The city/county names in bold indicate a high-risk community, while the asterisk (*) next to the percentages indicate which categories exceed the EJ indicator threshold.

**Location Analysis Summary**

The newly proposed station locations are assessed according to the original LHI. According to staff’s assessment, none of the three cities are considered a high-risk community, and the anticipated impacts to the communities where the electric vehicle chargers will be located remains positive in terms of cleaner air and anticipated greenhouse gas reductions.

**Public Comment**
As provided by Title 13 CCR Section 2343 of the California Code of Regulations, a 30-day public review period applies to this LHI report from the date it is posted on the CEC website. The original posting date for this report is listed at www.energy.ca.gov/altfuels/documents/.

The CEC encourages comments by email. Please include your name or organization’s name in the name of the file. Send comments in either Microsoft® Word format (.doc) or Adobe® Acrobat® format (.pdf) to FTD@energy.ca.gov.

The public can email comments to FTD@energy.ca.gov or send them to:

California Energy Commission
Fuels and Transportation Division
1516 Ninth Street, MS-44
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

All written comments will become part of the public record and may be posted to the internet.

News media should direct inquiries to the Media and Public Communications Office at (916) 654-4989 or by email at mediaoffice@energy.ca.gov.
This LHI report assesses the potential health impacts on communities from projects proposed to receive Clean Transportation Program funding. This LHI report is prepared under the California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Motor Vehicles, Chapter 8.1 (CCR Section 2343):

“(6) Localized health impacts must be considered when selecting projects for funding. The funding agency must consider EJ consistent with state law and complete the following:

(A) For each fiscal year, the funding agency must publish a staff report for review and comment by the public at least 30 calendar days prior to the approval of projects. The report must analyze the aggregate locations of the funded projects, analyze the impacts in communities with the most significant exposure to air contaminants or localized air contaminants, or both, including, but not limited to, communities of minority populations or low-income populations, and identify agency outreach to community groups and other affected stakeholders.

(B) Projects must be selected and approved for funding in a publicly noticed meeting.”

This LHI report is not intended to be a detailed pollution analysis of proposed projects nor is it intended to substitute for the environmental review conducted during CEQA. This LHI report includes staff’s application of the EJSM developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to help identify projects in areas where social vulnerability indicators, high exposure to pollution, and greater health-risks are present.

CEC staff identifies high-risk community project locations using data from CARB, the U.S. Census Bureau, and other public agencies. Staff analyzes these data to assign EJ indicators for each project location specified in the LHI report. The proposed project location must meet a two-part standard as follows:

Part 1 – Environmental Standard:

- Communities located within an air quality nonattainment zone for ozone, PM 2.5, or PM 10, as designated by CARB for criteria pollutants.

Part 2 – Demographic Standard:

- Communities having more than one of the following EJ indicators for (1) minority, (2) poverty, (3) unemployment, and (4) age. The EJ indicator thresholds is defined by staff as:

  1) A minority subset represents more than 30 percent of a given city’s population.

  2) A city’s poverty level exceeds the state average poverty level.

  3) The city (or county if city data is unavailable) unemployment rate exceeds the state average unemployment rate.

  4) The percentage of people living in a city who are younger than 5 years of age or older than 65 years of age is 20 percent higher than the
state average for persons under 5 years of age or over 65 years of age.