





Board Agenda



Connecticut Hydrogen and Electric Automobile Purchase Reb **Chair Commissioner Dykes Call to Order** 1:00 pm Introductions and Roll Call Purpose of today's meeting Approval of August meeting minutes **Review of Existing E-bicycle Incentive Programs** 1:15 pm 1:30 pm **Overview of CHEAPR Budget** 2:00 pm **Overview of Program Design Scenarios** 2:15 pm Discussion **Public Comments** 2:45 pm

3:00 pm Next Steps for Board Action



Previous Minutes



Approval of the August 19th Minutes



Previous Minutes



E-Bikes Best Practices from Other States



CA – Regulatory Amendment Includes E-Bike Voucher





Senate Bill No. 400

CHAPTER 271

An act to amend Section 44124 of the Health and Safety Code, relating to vehicular air pollution.

> [Approved by Governor September 6, 2019. Filed with Secretary of State September 6, 2019.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 400, Umberg. Reduction of greenhouse gases emissions: mobility options.

⁴Existing law establishes the Clean Cars 4 All Program, which is administered by the State Air Resources Board to focus on achieving reductions in the emissions of greenhouse gases, improvements in air quality, and benefits to low-income state residents through the replacement of high-polluter motor whicles with cleaner and more efficient motor vehicles or a mobility option¹¹, which means a voncher for public transit or car sharing for pupposes of the program.

This bill would additionally provide that "mobility option" also includes bike sharing and electric bicycles.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 44124 of the Health and Safety Code is amended to read:

44124. For purposes of this article, the following terms have the following meanings:

(a) "Car sharing" has the same meaning as in Section 44258.
(b) "Clean Cars 4 All" means the Clean Cars 4 All Program established pursuant to Section 44124.5.

 (c) "Disadvantaged community" means a community identified pursuant to Section 39711.

(d) "High polluter" has the same meaning as in Section 44090.

(e) "Low-income state resident" or "low-income motor vehicle owner" has the same meaning as the definition of "low-income motor vehicle owner" in Section 44062.1.

(f) "Mobility option" means a voucher for public transit, car sharing, bike sharing, or electric bicycles.



- CA has adopted Legislation enacted a "Mobility Option" = voucher for public transit, car sharing, bike sharing, or *electric bicycles*.
- <u>Redwood Coast Energy Authority, CA</u> has an e-bike program.
- Rebates up to 50% of the purchase price to \$500.
- State hasn't launched an e-bike program but various cities including Roseville and San Gabriel, CA have offered e-bikes incentive.

Sources: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB400 Transportation Research And Education Center – White Paper: https://wsd-pfb-sparkinfluence.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/2019/05/E-bike-Incentives-Paper-05_15_19-Final.pdf



Neighboring E-Bike Programs... MA & VT

Massachusetts

- No incentive currently offered
 - Preliminary discussions surrounding e-bike incentives ongoing
- E-bikes treated as motor vehicles and require license to operate
 - Bill currently before legislature to change that (HD 1596)
- Will monitor for outcome

Vermont

- GMP customers can save up to \$200 on a new e-bike
 - Utility funded
 - \$52k earmarked for program
 - − E-bikes priced \geq \$500 eligible
 - Purchase from participating Vermont bike shops required
 - Must provide retailer w/GMP account information to show eligibility



Source: https://greenmountainpower.com/product/ebike-rebate/



E-Bike Programs Across U.S.

| Location | Funding Source | Type of Funding | Max Funding | Total Earmark | Time Period |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|
| Burlington, VT | Municipally Owned Utilities | Partial purchase subsidy flat rate | \$200 | \$52,000 | May 2018 - Present |
| Roseville, CA | Municipal Government | Partial purchase subsidy | \$200 | \$3,000 | 2018 |
| San Gabriel Valley, CA | Municipal Govt/ Highway tolls | Partial purchase subsidy flat rate | \$700 | \$70,000 | 2017 |
| Boulder County, CO | Select private businesses | Public/private agree discounts | ND | ND | 2013 - 2018 |
| Austin, TX | Municipal Utilities Company | Partial purchase subsidy flat rate | \$300 ind., \$400 com. fleets | ND | 2007 - Present |
| California | State Government | Partial purchase subsidy with cap | \$500: bikes \$1000: E-bikes | \$10 Million *proposed | Proposed |
| Utah | Select private businesses | Com./priv. agree discounts | ND | ND | 2018 |

Transportation Research And Education Center – White Paper:

https://wsd-pfb-sparkinfluence.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/2019/05/E-bike-Incentives-Paper-05_15_19-Final.pdf



E-Bike Best Practices

- Most used incentive structures
 - Partial purchase subsidies
 - most popular program type in use.
 - Vendor funded discounts
 - Pro: minimizes the use of tax dollars
 - Con: vendors may lose motivation to continue once sales plateau
- Limiting program to local pre-approved vendors minimizes fraud and ensures product quality and safety.
- Equity considerations should be incorporated into program.

Image Source: https://greenmountainpower.com/product/ebike-rebate/ Source: Transportation Research And Education Center – White Paper: https://wsd-pfb-sparkinfluence.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/2019/05/E-bike-Incentives-Paper-05 15 19-Final.pdf





E-Bike Best Practices



- Experience-based education and strategic partnerships boost program participation.
 - E-bikes loan programs, test ride events, etc.
 - Partners: state and local government, utilities, vendors, advocacy groups
- Incorporating reporting requirements which include mileage, usage, and lessons learned.-useful for pilot projects such as the <u>Plug In Austin</u> Program
- Identifying untapped sources of funding is advantageous.

Image Source: https://greenmountainpower.com/product/ebike-rebate/

• <u>British Columbia program</u> includes a scrappage requirement



Source: Transportation Research And Education Center – White Paper: https://wsd-pfb-sparkinfluence.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/2019/05/E-bike-Incentives-Paper-05_15_19-Final.pdf

CHEAPR Budget



CHEAPR Budget



CHEAPR Budget



CHEAPR Board Meeting September 10, 2020 Budget Update Jan. 1 2020 through July 31, 2020

| | Rebate Funds | Admin Funds(1) | Total Funds |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Contract Funding Summary: | I | | I |
| Bridge Funding (Previous CHEAPR2 Rebates)(2) | \$ 260,000.00 | \$ 65,000.00 \$ | 325,000.00 |
| Cal Year 2020 Funding | \$ 2,625,016.00 | \$ 374,984.00 \$ | 3,000,000.00 |
| Subtotal 2020 Program Funding | \$ 2,885,016.00 | \$ 439,984.00 \$ | 3,325,000.00 |
| CHEAPR2 Rebates (Vehicle) Paid (3) | \$ (246,500.00) | s | (246,500.00) |
| CHEAPR2 Rebates (Dealer) Paid (3) | \$ (13,400.00) | \$ | |
| Subtotal CHEAPR2 Incentives Paid | \$ (259,900.00) | \$ | (259,900.00) |
| CHEAPR3 Rebates (Vehicle) Paid (4) | \$ (33,000.00) | \$ | (33,000.00) |
| CHEAPR3 Rebates (Dealer) Paid (4) | \$ (2,300.00) | \$ | (2,300.00) |
| Subtotal CHEAPR3 Incentives Paid | \$ (35,300.00) | \$ | (35,300.00) |
| CHEAPR3 Pipeline (5): | | | |
| Rebates Approved for Pmt | \$ (80,125.00) | \$ | (80,125.00) |
| Rebate in Process | \$ (62,550.00) | \$ | (62,550.00) |
| Jan-June Admin Costs - CHEAPR2 Bridge Funding | : | \$ (65,000.00) \$ | (65,000.00) |
| June Admin Costs - Est'd (6) | 5 | \$ (25,598.86) \$ | (25,598.86) |
| July Admin Costs - Est'd (6) | 5 | \$ (23,790.00) \$ | (23,790.00) |
| Total Funds Utilized through 7/30/2020 | \$ (437,875.00) \$ | \$ (114,388.86) \$ | (552,263.86) |
| Estimated Remaining 2020 Funding | \$ 2,447,141.00 | \$325,595.14 | \$2,772,736.14 |
| Funds Held by DEEP/DMV | \$ 1,625,116.00 | \$249,984.00 | \$1,875,100.00 |
| Funds Held by CSE | \$822,025.00 | \$ 75,611.14 | \$897,636.14 |
| Total | \$ 2,447,141.00 | \$ 325,595.14 | \$ 2,772,736.14 |

Notes

(1) Admin cap of 11.5% for CHEPAR 2.0 and 12.5% for CHEAPR 3.0

- (2) Bridge funding added to program May 6, 2020.
- (3) CHEAPR 2 Funding for rebates approved 1/27/20-6/12/20 (226 vehicle rebates).
- (4) CHEAPR 3 Funding for Rebates approved 6/15/20 through 7/17/20 (32 vehicle rebates).
- (5) Vehicle/Dealer Rebate Split not finalized.
- (6) Labor report review not yet completed.
- (7) Program funds held by CSE to provide consumer rebates within 15 days of approval.







Overview of Program Design Scenarios



Proposed Program Incentives



• CHEAPR Proposal for public comment

| New Vehicle Pro | ogram Design | | Used Vehicle Program Design | | |
|---|--------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|--|
| Туре | Base Rebate | Supplemental LMI Rebate | Туре | LMI Rebate | |
| Fuel Cell EVs (FCEV) | \$5,000 | \$2,000 | Fuel Cell EVs (FCEV) | \$5,000 | |
| All-Battery EVs >200 e-miles (BEV) | \$1,500 | \$2,000 | All-Battery EVs (BEV) | \$2,000 | |
| All-Battery EVs <200 e-miles (BEV) | \$500 | \$1,500 | | 4 | |
| Plug-in Hybrid EVs (PHEV) \$500 \$1,500 | | \$1,500 | Plug-in Hybrid EVs (PHEV) | \$750 | |
| MSRP Cap: | \$42,000 | <u> </u> | MSRP Cap | : None | |





Models that could become eligible by changing the cap from \$42,000 to \$50,000.

| Make | Model | Model Year | MSRP | Vehicle Type | Number Sold* |
|---------------------|---|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|
| Tesla | Model Y Long Range | 2020 | \$49,990 | BEV | 31 |
| BMW | X3 xDrive30e | 2020 | \$48,550 | PHEV | 6 |
| BMW | i3 with Range Extender | 2020 | \$48,300 | PHEV | |
| BMW | i3s | 2020 | \$47,650 | BEV | 3 |
| Tesla | Model 3 Long Range Performance AWD (18in) | 2020 | \$46,990 | BEV | 75 |
| Tesla | Model 3 Long Range AWD | 2020 | \$46,990 | BEV | ** |
| BMW | 330e xDrive | 2021 | \$46,550 | PHEV | 1 |
| BMW | i4 | 2021 | \$45,000 | BEV | 0 |
| Byton ^c | M-Byte | 2021 | \$45,000 | BEV | |
| Audi ^c | Q4 e-tron | 2021 | \$45,000 | BEV | |
| BMW | 330e | 2021 | \$44,550 | PHEV | 26 |
| BMW | i3 | 2020 | \$44,450 | BEV | 30 |
| Ford ^{***} | Mustang Mach-E | 2021 | \$43,895 | BEV | |

* Number sold of each make/model (regardless of model year) in CT in 2019.

** Not available in registration data.

*** MSRP values for these vehicles are more speculative and subject to change.





Incentive designs evaluated in analyses that follow

| Input Variable | Current | Proposed | Pre-October 2019 | BEV Consolidated |
|---|---------|----------|---------------------|------------------|
| New BEV (Long Range) Rebate | 1500 | 1500 | 2000 | 1500 |
| New BEV (Short Range) Rebate | 500 | 500 | 1000 | 1500 |
| New PHEV Rebate | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| New FCEV Rebate | 5000 | 5000 | 5000 | 5000 |
| Used BEV (Short Range) Rebate | 0 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 |
| Used PHEV Rebate | 0 | 750 | 750 | 750 |
| Used BEV (Long Range) Rebate | 0 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 |
| Used FCEV Rebate | 0 | 5000 | 5000 | 5000 |
| New BEV (Long Range) LMI Supplement | 0 | 2000 | 1500 | 2000 |
| New BEV (Short Range) LMI Supplement | 0 | 1500 | 1000 | 1500 |
| New PHEV LMI Supplement | 0 | 1500 | 1000 | 1500 |
| New FCEV LMI Supplement | 0 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 |
| Dealer Incentive (Used) | 0 | 75 | 75 | 75 |
| Dealer Incentive (New & <\$1,500 consumer rebate) | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 |
| Dealer Incentive (New & >\$1,500 consumer rebate) | 125 | 125 | 125 | 125 |





Demand scenarios evaluated in analyses that follow

| Scenarios | Low Demand | Baseline Demand | High Demand |
|--------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| LMI Proportion of Participants | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.10 |
| Used Vehicle Proportion ^d | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| Proportion New BEV (Long Range) | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.64 |
| Proportion New BEV (Short Range) | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| Proportion New PHEV | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.29 |
| Proportion New FCEV | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Number of Rebates | 550 | 1650 | 2050 [,] |





Annual costs by incentive design and scenario

| Scenarios | Low Demand | Baseline Demand | High Demand |
|------------------|------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Current | \$1.1M | \$2.2M | \$2.9M |
| Proposed | \$1.2M | \$2.8M | \$3.5M |
| Pre-October 2019 | \$1.4M | \$3.4M | \$4.2M |
| BEV Consolidated | \$1.2M | \$3.0M | \$3.7M |





Annual costs by incentive design and scenario with 50% stimulus increase for January-June of 2021

| Scenarios | Low Demand | Baseline Demand | High Demand | |
|------------------|------------|-----------------|-------------|--|
| Current | \$1.3M | \$2.8M | \$3.4M | |
| Proposed | \$1.4M | \$3.4M | \$4.2M | |
| Pre-October 2019 | \$1.6M | \$4.0M | \$5.0M | |
| BEV Consolidated | \$1.5M | \$3.5M | \$4.4M | |

CSE estimated the carry over to be \$1.9M which can be factored into this scenario





Annual costs by incentive design and scenario with 50% stimulus increase for January-December of 2021.

| Scenarios | Low Demand | Baseline Demand | High Demand | |
|------------------|------------|-----------------|-------------|--|
| Current | \$1.5M | \$3.4M | \$4.1M | |
| Proposed | \$1.7M | \$4.1M | \$5.0M | |
| Pre-October 2019 | \$2.0M | \$4.8M | \$6.0M | |
| BEV Consolidated | \$1.8M | \$4.2M | \$5.2M | |

CSE estimated the carry over to be \$1.9M which can be factored into this scenario





Costs to achieve adoption goal of 150,000 vehicles

| | EVs in Fleet* | Percent Rebated** | Rebates Required | Average Rebate Amount | Annual Administr ation Cost | Total Cost |
|------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|
| Current | 15,379 | 52.8% | 71,079 | \$1,190 | \$0.375M | \$87M |
| Proposed | 15,379 | 52.8% | 71,079 | \$1,526 | \$0.375M | \$107M |
| Pre-October 2019 | 15,379 | 52.8% | 71,079 | \$1,566 | \$0.375M | \$129M |
| BEV Consolidated | 15,379 | 52.8% | 71,079 | \$1,868 | \$0.375M | \$112M |





Public Comment



Next Steps





Board Meeting Schedule Going Forward Next Meeting







