Connecticut Hydrogen and Electric Automobile Purchase Rebate Program
(CHEAPR)
Board Meeting
October 9, 2020
11:00 AM via Zoom
Meeting Minutes

Board Members: Department of Energy & Environmental Protection (DEEP) Commissioner Katie Dykes, Department of Consumer Protection (DCP) Commissioner Michelle Seagull, Bradley Hoffman, Matt Macunas, Tony Cherolis, Jody Ellant, Department of Transportation Deputy Commissioner Garrett Eucalitto, and Amy McLean

DEEP Staff: Tracy Babbidge, Paul Farrell, Lakiesha Christopher, Walter Barozi

Members of public offering comment: Barry Kresch, Charles Rothenberger, Chris Phelps, Zach Kahn, Quailan Homann

Public Attendees: John Livermore, Betsey Wingfield

At 11:05 AM, Tracy Babbidge called the meeting to order on behalf of Commissioner Dykes, who was running late due to a schedule conflict but joined the meeting shortly after.

Tracy Babbidge opened the meeting and called roll. All Board Members acknowledged their presence except for Jim Fleming and Commissioner Dykes. Tracy Babbidge introduced and welcomed Deputy Commissioner Eucalitto to his first CHEAPR Board Meeting since his recent appointment to the Board by Commissioner Dykes. Deputy Commissioner Eucalitto expressed his enthusiasm for collaborate with the Board to promote electric vehicles (EVs) and associated infrastructure in Connecticut. Tracy Babbidge indicated that the purpose of the meeting is to:

- Vote on the September 10, 2020 Meeting Minutes;
- Provide an update on the CHEAPR Budget;
- Review, discuss, and approve incentive design recommendations;
- Review, discuss, and approve stimulus funding implementation;
- Accept public comments; and
- Outline the next steps for Board action.

Tracy Babbidge then noted that there was a suggestion for program design that was not included in the formal presentation of the Board Meeting; the suggestion was received by

DEEP on the evening of October 8, 2020 which left an inadequate amount of time to incorporate the relevant materials into the slideshow. She assured the Board that this suggestion will still be highlighted and discussed later in the meeting when design incentive updates are given. She then asked the Board if anyone had changes to the proposed agenda. The Board did not suggest any changes.

Affirmative Vote to Adopt September 10, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Tracy Babbidge stated that the September 10, 2020 Meeting Minutes had been circulated to the Board in advance of the meeting, and asked for a motion to approve them. Tony Cherolis made a motion to approve the minutes and Matt Macunas seconded. Tracy Babbidge asked the Board if any member wanted to discuss or amend any part of the Meeting Minutes; no comments were made by the Board. All Board members moved to adopt the September 10, 2020 Meeting Minutes.

CHEAPR Budget Update

Tracy Babbidge addressed the present state of the CHEAPR Budget in relation to a discussion from the September 10, 2020 meeting about using excess funding from 2020 to fund a 50% stimulus increase to the base rebate value for the entirety of the 2021 calendar year. She affirmed that the budget carryover to be utilized is still projected to be $1.9M, consistent with the estimate that the Center for Sustainable Energy (CSE) provided in the September 2020 Board meeting. She also expressed her intent to provide regular updates on the state of this projection at each Board Meeting going forward.

Discussion and Selection of Incentive Design Factors for 2021 Program

Tracy Babbidge provided a review of two different range-dependent incentive level structures that had been discussed in the September 2020 Board meeting. These include a Range Agnostic Structure and a Proposed Structure. The former structure uses a fixed rebate value for all eligible newly purchased all-battery EVs (BEVs) regardless of range, while the latter structure offers a reduced rebate value for new BEVs with a range lower than 200 miles. In the Proposed Structure, the base rebate value for these low-range BEVs is cut from $1500 to $500 and the supplemental low/moderate income (LMI) rebate value is cut from $2000 to $1500.

Tracy Babbidge then presented a summary of the results of an analysis performed by CSE which estimates the annual cost of four different design scenarios, including:

(1) Proposed Structure with a $42,000 MSRP cap;
(2) Proposed Structure with a $50,000 MSRP cap;
(3) Range Agnostic Structure with a $42,000 MSRP cap; and
(4) Range Agnostic Structure with a $50,000 MSRP cap.

Three respective cost projections were calculated for each scenario to reflect low, baseline, and high demand conditions. With the addition of the expected $1.9M budget carryover from 2020, the overall budget for 2021 will be $4.9M. Out of the modeled annual costs for each scenario and demand condition, there were three projections that exceeded the expected budget for 2021: Scenario (2) with high demand is estimated to cost 5.1M, Scenario (4) with baseline demand is estimated to cost $5.0M, and Scenario (4) with high demand is estimated to cost $6.2M. After presenting this data, Tracy Babbidge pauses to take questions.

Amy McLean asked for clarification on what constitutes each demand condition quantitatively. Tracy Babbidge said that she believes that low demand is 25% of the baseline demand, which is then confirmed by John Livermore. He then went on to define low demand as the number of rebates to date projected forward to the end of 2020.

Matt Macunas observed that raising the MSRP cap to $50,000 causes a substantial budget increase for both individual range-dependent incentive level structures, and that the difference in annual costs between the Proposed Structure and Range Agnostic Structure is small in comparison. He went on to speculate that this is because the price of most long-range electric vehicles exceed the current MSRP cap of $42,000. Paul Farrell and Tracy Babbidge agreed with this assertion.

Tony Cherolis pointed out that the conditions for low demand used for the CSE model are a conservative estimate as they include the first three months of 2020 that preceded the rise of the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States and the economic shutdown that followed.

Tracy Babbidge asked the Board if they have any more questions or comments that they would like to share. The Board did not have any further input to offer at the time.

Transitioning from the quantitative analysis of potential incentive design scenarios, Tracy Babbidge presented a table prepared by DEEP staff summarizing and comparing the qualitative aspects of the design components in relation to six goals that are central to the 2021 CHEAPR Program:

(1) LMI Participation
(2) Budget Efficiency
(3) Economic Stimulus
(4) Technology Forcing
(5) Budget Burn Rate
(6) Minimizes Free Ridership

Tracy Babbidge asserted that the Proposed Structure hits all of the goals, the Range Agnostic Structure/BEV Consolidated Structure fulfills most of the goals except for Budget Efficiency and Technology Forcing, and the MSRP cap increase only accomplishes the Economic Stimulus and Technology Forcing goals. She acknowledged that these designations are subjective and encourages members of the Board to speak about their comments and reactions to these evaluations.

Tony Cherolis commented that the Proposed Structure would be more likely to decrease LMI participation, citing affordability concerns with high-range vehicles. He claimed that the Range Agnostic Structure approach would be more LMI-friendly as the higher rebate value paired with a lower vehicle cost would make BEV ownership more accessible to those who are struggling financially. He also reiterated Matt Macunas's previous observation that the difference in cost between the Proposed Structure and Range Agnostic Structure was insignificant and thereby the Budget Efficiency goal for the Range Agnostic Structure should be fulfilled. Matt Macunas agreed with this view and asked if the small differential in the estimated annual costs was the only factor that contributed to the failure of the Range Agnostic Structure to meet the Budget Efficiency goal, which Tracy Babbidge confirmed.

Stimulus Funding Implementation for 2021 Program

Tracy Babbidge suggested that although the $1.9M budget carryover is expected to support the 50% stimulus increase through the end of 2021, to err on the side of caution the enhanced rebates should be implemented in phases. The first phase will accept applications from January 1, 2021 to May 31, 2021; at the end of this phase if less than 50% of the surplus budget has been issued then the program will be extended through the end of December 2021, but if more than 75% of the surplus budget has been issued then there will be a prompt return to the standard rebate. Tracy Babbidge asked for feedback on this concept from the board and Tony Cherolis, Matt Macunas, and Amy McLean all offered praise for this methodology.

Amy McLean inquired about whether or not the board would increase the stimulus amount or otherwise modify the incentive design if the proportion of the $1.9M surplus that distributed by the aforementioned mid-year milestone was substantially below 50%. Tracy Babbidge responded that this suggestion is worth considering, but she would be hesitant to do it due to administrative and communication concerns pertaining to changing the rebate values more than once in a short time frame. She then insisted that she would prefer to periodically check in on the amount of stimulus funding throughout the year and to make the effort to escalate outreach efforts if the initial response from the public turns out to be underwhelming. She went on to express that she liked Amy McLean's idea and that the Board should return to it if the hypothetical scenario should come to fruition.

Amy McLean claimed that increased incentives emphasizing energy efficiency have had recent success in increasing the number of consumers that purchase high-efficiency vehicles and therefore that these types of incentives are effective. Regarding communication and outreach, she remarked that while it might be a challenge to get the word out about the enhanced rebates, advertising them to the public is nonetheless an important task. She went on to say that outreach should be advertised early in the program's implementation rather than as a response to low turnout.

Tracy Babbidge asked the Board if anyone else had any questions or commentary to provide. The Board did not have any further input to offer at this time.

Tracy Babbidge offered to initiate discourse and subsequently produce a recommendation regarding the proposed incentive levels. She acknowledged that she was aware of the popularity of the Range Agnostic Structure paired with an MSRP cap increase among the Board members, but that the implementation of this design combination would take on a lot of risk as the CSE analysis projected that staying within the overall budget for the 2021 program would be contingent upon demand for EVs remaining low. She suggested that John Livermore provide any more context or feedback that he could offer about the situation. John Livermore supported Tracy Babbidge's statement by explaining that in a baseline demand condition within the model the Range Agnostic Structure would raise the average rebate amount from roughly $1500 to roughly $2300 and that the specified MSRP cap increase would elevate the budget by 1.65M.

Tracy Babbidge prompted a discussion about the proposal received on the evening of October 8 that was mentioned at the very beginning of the meeting. Tony Cherolis asserted that after reviewing the document, he believed that treating the stimulus with a responsive mechanism in the way that the document proposed may involve an unnecessary degree of risk as it would rely on the economy improving substantially in order to be successful, largely because of the proposed MSRP cap increase. However, he did go on to say that the idea of a responsive program piqued his interest, and that he is open to applying the concept using a different method, such as restricting an MSRP cap increase to a six month period. He said that he is in favor of adding the author of the proposal to the Board and that he is very interested in the proposal. He also echoed the sentiment previously expressed by others that it is crucial to have a plan for advertising the stimulus early on.

Amy McLean directed a question to the DEEP employees in the meeting, asking for clarification on why Connecticut hasn't been more aggressive with rolling out cheaper rebates. She expressed that there are other states who have taken this approach and that she did not see any apparent value in Connecticut continuing to remain cautious.

Paul Farrell replied to Amy McLean by saying that raising the MSRP cap from $42,000 to $50,000 would essentially only serve to include the Tesla Model 3, which has already been a great success and has maintained high demand during a pandemic. He argues that raising the maximum MSRP just to specifically include this car would only serve to give discounts to people already planning on purchasing it, taking away the CHEAPR program's goal of empowering someone to purchase an EV that would not have done so otherwise.

Jody Ellant countered Paul Farrell's statements by contending that there is no way to predict how raising the MSRP cap to accommodate for the inclusion of the Tesla Model 3 would affect consumer behavior and that if anything, including the rebate for a high-demand car will attract more people to purchase an EV.

Bradley Hoffman used his career experience as a car dealer to speak out on the price sensitivity among consumers in the automobile market, telling the story of an encounter he had with someone who was considering a Porsche Taycon but ended up purchasing a gas vehicle, adding that he would have bought the Taycon if the price were lower.

Matt Macunas took a big-picture economic approach to describe why he is hesitant to agree to raising the MSRP at this time, citing the ongoing development of the long-range BEV market that could one day include various car models that compete with the Tesla Model 3. He went on to describe other concerns he has on the topic, including the failure of one of the high-MSRP modeled scenarios to stay within the budget at baseline demand, and the volatility of relevant federal laws surrounding income tax credit.

Commissioner Dykes spoke out in opposition of raising the MSRP cap to $50,000; she confirmed with Paul Farrell that Tesla sales haven't dropped since the MSRP credit was reduced to $42,000 and goes on to voice her support for the low cutoff. She communicated that if Tesla sales will stay consistent regardless of whether or not the CHEAPR program applies to them, then excluding the Model 3 from the program will result in more electric vehicles on the road. She emphasized that the mission of the CHEAPR program is to reduce carbon emissions as much as possible in an equitable way and on a limited budget, and voiced concern that raising the MSRP cap may not serve to accomplish this goal adequately.

On the topic of reducing carbon emissions as much as possible, Bradley Hoffman proposed that in the Board's outreach efforts, it might be helpful to seek out first-time buyers to bring new consumers into the EV market and to establish brand loyalty. This idea received praise from fellow board members Jody Allant and Matt Macunas for abiding my marketing theory and for "locking people in" to driving electric.

Tony Cherolis asked for clarification on the "once per lifetime" rule for receiving rebates. Paul Farrell confirmed that a person can only participate in CHEAPR once, and that this is verified by recording the license numbers of people who receive rebates. Paul Farrell then mentioned that this feature was meant as a control for when the pilot program was first introduced with limited funding in 2015.

Amy McLean brought up that perhaps allowing people who are already EV owners to use a rebate to replace their vehicle with a newer model could drive supply up in the state's used-EV market, increasing the likelihood for LMI populations to be able to afford EV ownership. Noting the CHEAPR program's lack of participation and excess funding, she stated that perhaps the Board should take a bolder approach and strive to emulate the plans that Connecticut's neighbor states have implemented to incentivize EV purchasing.

Going back to his initial question about the "once per lifetime" rule, Tony Cherolis suggested resetting the record of people who have received the rebates in the past for the years of 2021 to 2025 due to how much economic conditions have changed since the program's genesis, and how the affordability and accessibility of EVs have changed as well. He reiterated Amy McLean's point that allowing former CHEAPR rebate recipients to receive a rebate again could help drive up used-EV sales in the state and thereby potentially help to subside affordability concerns for LMI populations. He also voiced concern about how limiting higher BEV rebates to high-range vehicles could exacerbate affordability concerns for LMI populations and ultimately decrease the participation of these people from the program.

At 11:50 AM, Tracy Babbidge checked in with the Board, inquiring about their comfort levels with voting on a solution about incentives in the near future and whether everyone had enough information to form a position on the topic. She noted how the meeting's agenda indicated that the Board would have already voted and that the segment of the meeting reserved for public comment would have begun at this point in the meeting.

Matt Macunas asked for confirmation that the Range Agnostic Structure would issue rebates for all BEVs at $1500, which is the upper end value for high-range vehicles according to the Proposed Structure. Tracy Babbidge confirmed that the Range Agnostic Structure rebate value for all EVs is in fact $1500. She elaborated that the Proposed Structure is favored by DEEP staff because the agency has historically viewed incentive programs as a means to force the integration of the most efficient technology into the market. Commissioner Dykes spoke out in support of Tracy Babbidge's statement and reiterated that since the goal of the program is ultimately to reduce carbon emissions, technology forcing should be prioritized to incentivize consumers to purchase EVs that they will get the maximum mileage out of.

Amy McLean stated that she respectfully disagrees with DEEP's stance on the Range Agnosticism and makes a motion to accept the parameters for market design from the EV Coalition, emphasizing how much Connecticut's economy has struggled recently. She added that perhaps the Board could revisit the issue in six months, review the budget, and adjust their approach as necessary if funds have depleted at that point. When asked for clarification by Matt Macunas, Amy McLean answered that her motion is to adopt the entirety of the EV Coalition's design parameters, not just the Range Agnostic Structure. She criticized the Board's tendency to pull rebates back when state-allocated funding is low and suggested that the Board start considering acquiring supplemental funding from outside sources to issue more rebates and thereby to better serve the program's intent.

In response to Amy McLean's motion, Tracy Babbidge requested the Board quickly review the full extent of the EV Coalition's proposal. Matt Macunas briefed the group on the specifics of the proposal, including: cutting incentive values for fuel cell EVs (FCEVs) in half, raising the base rebate level for all BEVs regardless of range to $2500, keeping the six-month 50% campaign adder, and increasing the MSRP cap to $50,000. Tracy Babbidge reminded the Board that the modeling executed by CSE showed that a Range Agnostic Structure paired with a raised MSRP cap would cause the CHEAPR budget to be exceeded at baseline demand. Tony Cherolis mentioned that if the EV Coalition's proposal was implemented, the six-month checkpoint could still allow the Board to re-evaluate their approach and adjust accordingly if the state economy were to meet baseline or high demand conditions. John Livermore reminded the Board that the modeled budget for a 12-month budget at baseline demand conditions was $6.55M for a Range Agnostic Structure paired with a raised MSRP cap, compared to the expected 2021 budget of $4.9M.

Deputy Commissioner Eucalitto questioned whether, if the EV Coalition's proposal were to be adopted, the logistics of what would hypothetically happen if the program was not massively scaled back after six months and the CHEAPR budget was completely depleted before the end of 2021. Paul Farrell answered that when this problem has occurred in the past, DEEP implemented waitlists as a solution, but emphasized that this is not a preferable outcome as consumers would have to wait months for rebates. Paul Farrell then called on

Bradley Hoffman to weigh in on how this issue could potentially be inconvenience from a dealer's perspective.

Bradley Hoffman commented that the cash flow of his business would not likely be affected if CHEAPR rebates were not readily available mid-way through the year, he would just not sell as many electric vehicles. However, he went on to say that utilizing as much of the CHEAPR budget as possible will ultimately convert more consumers from gas vehicles to EVs, even if rebates are not immediately accessible for a fraction of the year. Tracy Babbidge highlighted that this plan of action would require extremely close monitoring and communication among the Board.

Amy McLean remarked that the intent of her motion is not to dissipate all of the CHEAPR funding, but rather to take bold action to inspire consumers to make otherwise unlikely decisions in the midst of a desolate economy. She stated that if there is a capacity to closely monitor the program's budget and to redact the rebate guidelines after initial implementation if any issues come about, then the Board may as well choose this bold course of action to promote maximum participation.

Responding to comments in the chat, Jody Ellant spoke out against the notion that the Board should avoid raising the MSRP cap to $50,000 for the sole purpose of preventing people from using rebates to purchase a Tesla Model 3. Citing her background in economics, consumer products, and law, she echoed her previous sentiments that it is beyond the scope of government to implement policy that targets a specific manufacturer. She insisted that raising the MSRP cap will allow consumers to apply rebates to cars besides the Tesla Model 3 and that by neglecting to do so, the Board would be neglecting an opportunity to get as many EVs on the road as possible. Paul Farrell mentioned that there exist about 13 EV models that fall under the $40,000 to $50,000 MSRP range, but that particular emphasis is placed on the Tesla Model 3 due to its immense popularity in Connecticut.

Matt Macunas brought up a potential issue with the adoption of the EV Coalition's recommendations, noting that the recommended Range Agnostic base rebate for BEVs is $2500 while the Range Agnostic base rebate value that was modeled by CSE is $1500. He asked if this would cause the projected cost to rise above the previously mentioned $6.55M figure. John Livermore responded that in the updated version of the model, all of the factors from the EV Coalition's proposal were modeled.

Jody Ellant suggested that perhaps the Board should consider reducing the value that each individual rebate issues in the interest of working within the framework of the program budget. She proposed that the Board examine the historical number of rebates that have been issued in past years to project the number of rebates to be issued in 2021, and use this estimate to calibrate reduced incentive values per vehicle. In response, Paul Farrell mentioned that the Proposed Structure would issue an average of $1500 per rebate and the Range Agnostic Structure would issue an average of $1800 per rebate. Jody Ellant queried about the feasibility of aiming to issue closer to $750-$1000 per rebate in order to open the incentive up to more consumers and to provide some relief to the program's budgetary concerns.

Matt Macunas then asked Jody Ellant if she felt that this could have negative repercussions with respect to price sensitivity and reduced demand. Jody Ellant commented that she has not been provided data that would allow her to answer Matt Macunas's question definitively. However, she asserted that an improved marketing strategy for the CHEAPR program would compensate for lost demand, as consumers will be attracted to an initiative that will save them money, even if the rebate value is small; thereby, issuing as many rebates as possible would be the most prolific approach to getting as many EVs on the road as possible. Bradley Hoffman voiced support for Jody Ellant's analysis, most especially that more robust marketing tactics would boost program participation.

Returning to the EV Coalition's proposal, Matt Macunas discussed his mixed feelings about technology forcing and Range Agnosticism and how his opinions on the topic more generally have evolved over time, but admitted that he is still torn on his preferred resolution in this area as applied to the 2021 CHEAPR budget. Tangentially, he criticized the propsal's 50% reduction in FCEV funding, noting that rebates for FCEVs would not cause strain on the CHEAPR budget due to the lack of availability of FCEVs regionally and thereby, this change would have little to no consequence besides simplicity in marketing. Tony Cherolis responded that the marketing simplicity is more important than it may seem on the surface, as promoting a higher rebate value for a car that is not locally available could be seen as disingenuous marketing or just generally confusing.

Tracy Babbidge reminded the Board of the motion that Amy McLean made earlier in the meeting, and once again queried the Board members about voting for a resolution or if the group had any questions. Amy McLean encouraged group members to start making amendments to her motion if there were any objections.

Jody Ellant reminded Amy McLean that her motion had not yet been seconded, and thereby could not be voted on. Jody Ellant proceeded to make a counter motion to: task DEEP staff to analyze data to estimate the demand for a hypothetical scenario targeting first-time buyers exclusively and raising the MSRP cap to include 90% of vehicles currently on the market. DEEP can then use that projected demand to select reduced rebate-per-vehicle values that will allow as many rebates as possible to be issued while staying within the CHEAPR budget. Matt Macunas voiced partial support for this line of action, inquiring about how first-time buyers could be identified. Paul Farrell stated that DEEP tracks rebate recipients by Driver's License numbers, and Jody Ellant posited that the database where this is tracked could be used as a basis for data analysis.

Regarding the database of past rebate recipients, Amy McLean asked about the frequency that the data is updated and the amount entries in the database (or the amount of rebates that had been issued to date). Paul Farrell stated that it is a running database which is updated regularly. Tracy Babbidge stated that approximately 11,000 rebates issued to date.

Tony Cherolis offered a third motion: stressing his concerns about the affordability issues that LMI populations could face when purchasing an EV, he suggested a modification to the EV coalition recommendations in which, for new vehicles only:

- FCEVs: \$5,000 base rebate / \$2,500 LMI rebate / \$1,750 six-month limited
    - *Previously: \$2,500 base rebate / \$2,000 LMI rebate / six-month limited N/A*
- BEVs: \$1,500 base rebare / \$2,500 LMI rebate / \$1,750 six-month limited
    - *Previously: \$2,500 base rebate / \$2,000 LMI rebate / \$1,250 six-month limited*

Everything else from the EV Coalition's recommendations remains unchanged, including the Range Agnosticism and the \$50,000 MSRP cap.

Matt Macunas seconded the motion by Tony Cherolis on the basis of the support that is offered for LMI populations. Commissioner Dykes noted that the alumni rebate would be increased. Amy McLean noted concerns about going backwards on a base rebate value.

Regarding the raised MSRP cap, Matt Macunas asked Bradley Hoffman about whether removing vehicles from his dealership would be problematic if the CHEAPR budget was depleted prematurely. Bradley Hoffman replied that this is not a concern to him.

Matt Macunas asked about whether other states have taken on the approach of bifurcating EV incentives based on range. John Livermore responds that New York does bifurcate, New Jersey is based on e-miles, and Massachusetts does not bifurcate.

Commissioner Dykes advised that before a vote can be held on Tony Cherolis's motion, modeling will need to be done to estimate the annual cost of the design values that were modified. She expressed concern that the budget would deplete quickly under the proposal. Furthermore, she noted that although she liked the proposal's increased support of LMI, she would suggest that the lowered base rebate for BEVs be reversed and instead the MSRP cap be reduced back to 42,000. She additionally expressed dislike for the Range Agnostic nature of the proposal.

Jody Ellant inquired about the increased support for FCEVs in the proposal; various members of the Board responded that although the rebate values are different from the EV Coalition Recommendations, they are the same values that are in place at present. Matt Macunas elaborated that the robust inventive values for FCEVs are in place in order to send a market signal in hopes of attracting the fuel cell EV industry to the region. Tracy Babbidge and Paul Farrell verified Matt Macunas's explanation.

Tony Cherolis asked for confirmation that the conditions set forth in his motion would be modeled as well as Commissioner Dykes's modifications. When asked by Commissioner Dykes, John Livermore confirmed that he would be willing to do this and that it would take about three days to complete. Deputy Commissioner Eucalitto requested a third model run that includes a range differential. Tracy Babbidge confirmed with John Livermore that this is possible. Jody Ellant asked to add a fourth modeling option to lower rebate values to see if demand would be increased, which Tracy Babbidge confirmed.

The group agreed to meet at a later date to follow up on this discussion and to delay the vote on the incentive design until after the modeling has been updated.

Public Comments
Barry Kresch inquired about a timeline for the implementation of the new program, whether monthly Excel data reporting will be expanded to include reporting on components of the program, and if there are any specific parameters to determine the whether or not a CHEAPR grant can be distributed by a used car business.

Charles Rothenberger asked for clarity on the incentive levels to be modeled under the range differential proposal and suggests an incentive level higher than $1500 be included as part of that for the long-range vehicles.

Chris Phelps seconded Charles's comments and poses a question about whether the CHEAPR program's primary goal is to replace as many internal combustion vehicles as possible, or rather to just generally shift the market in the direction of electric vehicles and further comments that under-emphasizing the consumer adoption of vehicles may be counter-productive.

Zach Kahn brings up a solution for the used EV incentive involving a post-sale voucher to account for the used car dealers that have not been verified. In addition, he suggests that the stimulus program be implemented as soon as possible so there is no delay for the people waiting for the new program. He also mentioned how enthusiastic he is about the fact that the Board is considering redacting the MSRP cap.

Quailan Homann discusses the MSRP cap for fuel cell EVs and the possibility of changing it. He discusses the EV coalition lowering the cap for fuel cell EVs from 60,000 to 50,000. He adds that leaving it unchanged will probably not affect the state much since no fuel cell EVs are sold in this area.

At 1:00 PM, the meeting adjourned.