PMSA
PACIFIC MERCHANT SHIPPING ASSOCIATION

April 27, 2020

Ms. Lea Yamashita
Lead Staff – TRU Regulations
Ms. Cari Anderson
Chief Freight Transport Branch
California Air Resources Board

Subject: Public Comment on Updated Regulatory Concepts for Transport Refrigeration Unit Regulation

Submitted electronically to
https://www.arb.ca.gov/lispub/comm2/bcsubform.php?listname=truregulation-ws

Dear Ms. Yamashita:

The Pacific Merchant Shipping Association (PMSA) appreciates the opportunity to provide informal comments on the proposed regulatory concepts to the ARB Transport Refrigeration Unit (TRU) rule. PMSA is a regional trade association representing ocean carriers and marine terminal operators servicing California's trade demands through the state's commercial ports. Our ocean carrier members own and/or operate intermodal refrigerated containers engaged in international trade, and the generator sets that sometimes power these units when transported over the road or via rail. Our marine terminal members interchange, handle and garage this equipment on behalf of the ocean carrier.

Before delving into the specific comments on the rule, we feel compelled to point out that the maritime and goods movement industry is currently operating in a crisis environment at this time due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. Our member companies are all designated essential businesses focused on maintaining the movement of goods into and out of California's ports, while adopting extraordinary measures to ensure to the greatest extent possible the health and safety of our essential workforce. These measures include operating with reduced, and staggered work shifts, and the expenditure of time, money and resources for health and safety protocols that reduce our normal working efficiencies. This crisis environment has made it extremely difficult to do what we would deem normal outreach and education to our members on these pending regulations. PMSA continues to receive comments as late as this afternoon. Although we and our members have gone to great lengths to coordinate the comments included herein, there are significant gaps in data and information necessary to provide comprehensive and thorough public comment. For that reason, we reserve the right to provide additional comment and have ABR consider those comments, as more information and data is developed.

The maritime industry has a high rate of compliance under the existing TRU rule and is committed to finding a pathway to zero-emission or near zero emission practices and technology under the schedule adopted by California under Governor Brown's Executive Order. From looking at the regulatory concepts, it appears to us that ARB has crafted this proposed rule to address practices and associated health risks when refrigerated cargo is moved into and out of cold storage facilities and grocery stores, where refrigerated intermodal containers may be stationed and stored for extended periods of time while operating under diesel powered TRUs. We understand and appreciate the need to reduce those operating windows to the greatest extent possible, and in fact it is in our interest to reduce the wear and fuel consumption on the equipment that we own and provide. However, contrary to those scenarios, marine terminals are designed to move refrigerated containers into and out of the terminal and connect the equipment to electrical power when situated inside the terminal, in the shortest amount of time possible. Marine terminal personnel disconnect and connect gensets to these refrigerated intermodal containers as needed to facilitate efficient receiving and dispatching of the refrigerated containers. Because marine terminals operate on the most expensive industrial real estate in California, and employ the highest paid, organized blue collar workers, it behooves the marine terminal to move cargo as quickly and efficiently through the ports as possible. That goal lends itself to the goals of the proposed rule, however there are a number of provisions in the draft regulatory concepts that do not recognize or accommodate many of the distinct operational situations and constraints in marine terminals and could result in violations through no fault of the terminal or equipment owner. Our comments attempt to address these issues in the current draft, and propose possible alternatives or solutions if possible.

Included in our comments are several alternative approach recommendations. PMSA would like to see these alternatives evaluated as part of the Standardized Regulatory Impact Assessment. These alternatives may be able to improve flexibility and reduce cost without compromising the emissions benefit of the proposed regulation.

The following comments are specific to the concepts outlined in the March 12 regulatory proposal and the March 19 workshop presentation from ARB.

Section 2478.1 – Definitions

"Applicable Facility Geofence" – The draft rule defines the Applicable Facility Geofence as the usable area of the facility, as specified in the lease agreement. There are several concerns we have with this broad definition:

- The usable area of the facility, which in our member's case is the marine terminal, may include areas outside of the gate where trucks enter into the terminal and in other cases

may not include those areas. The terminals have little or no control over the truck traffic prior to entering through the terminal gate.

- Marine terminals are very large facilities, encompassing hundreds of acres. Trucks can spend considerable time navigating through the terminal doing multiple activities before reaching the area, or Point of Rest, where the TRU is removed or attached to the refrigerated intermodal container. Unlike cold-storage facilities, where containers move to a loading dock where the TRU operates during vanning/devanning operations, trucks will queue for heavy equipment to remove or attach the TRU. The proposed rule needs to reflect the complex logistics that take place on a marine terminal.
- Marine terminals can be located adjacent to one another, with shared fencing. Because of the imprecise nature of GPS tracking and telematics signals, there could be overlap between different terminals. Defining the scope of the geofence to ensure adjacent terminal boundaries, in addition to ingate queues, maintenance areas, equipment interchange areas, and out gate queues are properly handled will be necessary for a successful rule.

"Emergency" – Emergency events exclude Interruptible Service Contracts. This language is increasingly common in CARB regulations and is inappropriate. Interruptible service contracts are important to the function of the California grid. The contracts serve as an effective way to prioritize loss of power when the grid is unable to provide power to serve all needs and do so in a manageable and foreseeable manner. If CARB insists that all industrial customers have non-interruptible service it will not eliminate loss of service, but only serve to make loss of service random and unplanned. This should not be an outcome of California's regulatory scheme.

"Intermodal Railyard" – this is defined as a facility owned or operated by a Class 1 railroad that conducts intermodal rail operations. There are marine terminals that have on-dock rail operations (direct loading and unloading of rail cars) on-site at the terminals. Those on-dock rail sites are owned and operated by the marine terminal, not the Class 1 Railroad. The definitions should be amended to accommodate this operation.

"Non-operational" – Paragraph 5 of this definition would require segregation, signage and physical tags to designate TRU Gen Sets that are noncompliant for use in California. The shipping industry has moved to electronic record keeping of equipment status, with useable and non-useable equipment electronically registered accordingly. Gensets that have a virtual "red tag" for non-compliance applied to them in the terminal's and equipment owner's database is sufficient to designate those Gen Sets as non-compliant and to not be used.

"Port" – This definition contains overlap between the Port Authority and the marine terminal operator who leases a facility from the Port Authority. Because portions of the draft rule

stipulate requirements for qualifying entities, such as the establishment of geofencing, this would create redundancies that both parties must address. That should be avoided.

"TRU Operator" – Although we believe it is not ARB's intent, this definition could capture the longshoremen or mechanics in the terminal moving a TRU for staging within the facility. We believe there should be an exception for these activities that occur in marine terminals as a function of terminal cargo handling.

"Zero-Emission Fueling Infrastructure" – This definition prohibits infrastructure that relies on emergency back-up generation from internal combustion sources. Refrigerated containers must be capable of preserving the cold chain during emergency events, which means having access to emergency backup power in the event of a loss of grid power. Both contracts and existing regulation (see FSMA below) require that refrigeration of cargo be maintained. The only effective sources of emergency back-up generation for marine terminals are internal combustion sources.

The definition also prohibits (non-emergency) power sourced from internal combustion sources onsite or offsite. The definition is written so broadly it effectively prohibits grid-based power. Several port facilities are near or share fence lines with gas turbine (internal combustion) power plants that effectively power the local grid.

Section 2478.7 TRU Emission Standards

Because the draft rule would require Gen Sets under 50 Hp to meet the existing EPA engine standards for Gen Sets over 50 HP, PMSA views this as the establishment of a new engine standard. Does CARB intend to seek a waiver from U.S. EPA before enforcement?

Section 2478.10 Stationary Operating Time Limit Requirements

As we mentioned in our introductory section, we share a common goal with ARB is seeking to minimize the time that a refrigerated container is powered by a Gen Set. Marine terminals have invested in extensive electrical infrastructure to provide electrical power to all intermodal refrigerated containers to the greatest extent possible while on the terminal site. However, there are periods of equipment movement through the terminal, and interchange between the terminal and the trucker or railroad, or other unusual and rare circumstances, when genset operation must occur and may exceed the Stationary Operating Time Limit (SOTL). We appreciate the opportunity to outline these situations and circumstances in order to guide ARB in crafting the rule and make appropriate accommodations.

(a)(1-4) – As we commented under the Definition for Applicable Facility Geofence, because of the large footprint of the marine terminal facility, the SOTL should not apply to those locations

inside the terminal where the truck is being processed. Examples of these areas include the ingate, outgate, and equipment interchange areas. The orderly handling of cargo requires queueing in these areas. In addition, labor-required breaks or other, more unusual circumstances as discussed below, may require queuing during these periods.

There are also situations that are open to exceedance of the SOTL even under a narrowed geofence area. Here are a few examples:

- The workforce at marine terminals operate under a multi-state, collectively bargained labor contract, which contains various provisions that must be adhered to. The labor contract guarantees two 15-minute work breaks approximately two hours and six hours into the 8-hour shift, at which time work ceases. There is also a guaranteed meal hour about halfway through the shift. Because the labor contract stipulates that the work involved in receiving and dispatching the TRU must be performed by these workers, if a driver arrives immediately before or during those breaks there is no other option but to wait until work resumes.
- There are occasional contractual labor disagreements that arise, which may require the stoppage of work until the incident can be arbitrated under the terms of the labor contract. Likewise, unfortunately there are occasional physical injuries to workers, breakdown of equipment, and the development of hazardous situations beyond the control of any party. In those situations, the interchange of the TRU would not occur in a normal timely fashion and the delay would be beyond the control of responsible parties as established by the rule.
- US Customs and Border Protection (CBP) normally selects certain cargo containers for physical inspection based on their selection criteria. The containers that they select must be staged in various areas of the terminal to accommodate these inspections. Because those areas are not set up for electrical infrastructure, gensets must be attached and running to power refrigerated containers until such time as CBP completes their inspections. The TRU owner, operator or facility do not have any control over these inspections.
- A driver may arrive with a Gen Set powered export container only to find out that there is a problem with the booking information necessary to deliver the container against a vessel. When such situations arise, the trucker will usually park their vehicle and proceed to a “trouble window” to reconcile the missing or erroneous booking information. Because that activity would likely lead to a SOTL violation, there should be accommodation for such situations. Narrowing the geographic scope of the geofence to exclude such areas would address this issue.

- Under circumstances of heavy congestion inside the terminal (caused by such things as peak cargo surges, labor shortages, labor actions or equipment breakdown), trucks may be stopped in their queue for extended periods that could exceed the SOTL.

(a)(5) – As described to us by ARB staff, the one-mile extension of SOTL requirements outside of the facility geofence appears to address a situation that would never occur in a marine terminal. Marine terminals are federally controlled security sites, and anyone entering the facility must have a defined piece of business at hand. The trucker would not leave the marine terminal until that business is completed. Likewise, the marine terminal would never direct a truck to leave the facility simply as a means of avoiding wait times and return later, as the gate interchange into the facility is very labor and resource intensive.

The provision also imposes physical constraints that would result in non-compliance with the SOTL with no remedy available to the marine terminal of equipment owner/operator. Here are a few examples of such constraints:

- Trucks regularly arrive at a marine terminal prior to the opening of the gate; often 1 to 2 hours early. Trucks coming from far distances might arrive as early as 6-8 hours prior to the opening of the terminal. Because the line outside the gate would fall within the one-mile area, any refrigerated containers powered by Gen Sets would fall outside of the 15-minute SOTL.
- Traffic congestion on the roads approaching the marine terminals, but within one-mile, could result in SOTL violations.
- In some situations, the cargo source or destination could be within one-mile of the marine terminal. One example is the new Cool Port facility at the Port of Oakland.
- Because marine terminals are closely situated, often with adjoining fences, a truck would be in one facility but still within one-mile of one or more other facilities.

(a)(6) – This paragraph is apparently intended to limit operations outside an Applicable Facility since Applicable Facilities are covered in Paragraphs 1-4. As a result, Paragraph 6 should be revised to remove Applicable Facility as a responsible party.

Finally, detailed understanding how the SOTL provisions work in conjunction with the Applicable Facility Area Exemptions and reporting requirements will be necessary to understand how the proposed regulation will impact operating costs. Upon initial review, one PMSA member estimated that the proposed regulation would increase labor costs alone by $3 million annually at a single facility. PMSA would appreciate the opportunity to explore with CARB the cost implications of the proposal with our members.

Section 2478.11 Electronic Telematics System Requirements

The use of telematics in marine Gen Sets is rare at this time. Very few equipment owners (ocean carriers) have adopted Gen Set telematics, and those that have report regular technical problems with the equipment that compromise their efficacy and reliability.

There are also locations and activities in marine terminals that may interfere with the efficacy of those telematics. These include:

- Gen Sets located behind or within stacked containers may have their signals blocked.
- Belly mounted Gen Sets may have poor signal range due to their placement under the chassis and container.
- We are seeing the growing use of portable GPS jammers used by truck drivers, for a variety of reasons. These can impair the efficacy of navigational systems used by ships located at a distance from the truck, and would definitely cause even greater impacts on Gen Set telematics with much closer proximity.

The draft rule stipulates that the ETS shall be transmitted once per minute and stored in a database. This frequency of data transmission will create huge data streams and content. From recent experience with collecting telematic data from refrigerated intermodal containers applying for Low Carbon Fuel Standard credits while plugged in, the data sets can become very large, very quickly, and they have already overwhelmed electronic transmission and reception of this data to ARB.

Section 2478.12 TRU Registration and Compliance Label Requirements

Because a substantial amount of data has been input into ARBER for the existing Gen Set fleet, we hope that ARB can migrate existing data to the new registration database to minimize duplication of effort.

(b) & (d) - The physical space available on the Gen Set is limited in terms of application of additional labeling. We would suggest that the existing unit identification numbers (BIC Codes) on the Gen Sets be cross referenced with the ARB specific data in the ARB registration database, just as it is now for the existing Gen Set fleet, so that the existing Gen Set numbering systems will suffice for all ARB specific information.

The existing TRU rule made such accommodations through the TRU ATCM Advisory 08-03. We hope the same accommodation can be made for this new rule.
https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/diesel/tru/documents/advisory_08_03.pdf

(c)(1)(A-C) – Applicable Facility Area Exemption. These provisions can address several of the areas of concern that have been raised in earlier comments in this letter. In regards to (B), provided that this would apply to on-dock rail locations in marine terminals, and not only to Class 1 owned and operated railyards, this could accommodate the staging of TRUs for on-dock railcar loading, or unloading TRUs from on-dock railcars to be brought to their Point of Rest. Exclusion areas should also include the ingate and outgate queues, equipment interchange area, and maintenance areas. This may also accommodate CBP inspection areas, although those areas can be more dynamic and not always in a specific defined area of a marine terminal.

(d) – Reporting TRUs. Although the marine terminal garages the Gen Sets at their facility on behalf of the owner of the equipment (the ocean carrier), it is the equipment owner who oversees and actively manages the inventory, location and status of the Gen Sets. Under the existing TRU rule, the equipment owner has the option to provide reporting on behalf of the facility (TRU ATCM Advisory 13-28).
https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/diesel/tru/documents/advisory_13_28.pdf

We ask that a similar accommodation be made for this new rule. If the additional information to be collected under the new proposal is needed by both the marine terminal facility and equipment owner (ocean carrier), that information should be allowed to be reported by one entity on behalf of the other and shared between the two.

Section 2478.15 Fees

The proposed regulation proposes new fees for TRU owners and Applicable Facilities. Unfortunately, the draft concept does not cite authority for CARB's ability to impose and collect proposed fees. PMSA is concerned that CARB is relying on CA Health & Safety Code § 43019.1 (2018). The language contained in the statute does not authorize CARB to assess fees on equipment owners or facility operators. PMSA recommends that CARB remove the Section 2478.15 in its entirety from the proposed rule.

Section 2478.17 Vehicle Owner requirements

Similar to our comment under Definitions for TRU Operator, we assume that these provisions would not apply to the owners of vehicles (Cargo Handling Equipment) transporting TRU equipped containers within the marine terminal as part of cargo operations. Please confirm.

Section 2478.18 Driver Requirement

As with the above comment, we assume these provisions do not apply to workers on marine terminals moving TRU equipped containers within the marine terminal as part of cargo operations. Please confirm.

Section 2478.23 Safe Passage for Noncompliant Equipment Traveling in California

This section appears to address the movement of noncompliant truck or trailer TRUs within California and would not seem to apply to situations in the maritime industry and the potential movement of noncompliant Gen Sets on state roads or highways. If such moves were to occur, they would be moved separately from a refrigerated container, most likely within a dry van container or on a flatbed, and could not be in a situation where they would be powered. For that reason, we believe that these requirements should not apply to the movement of noncompliant Gen Sets.

Section 2478.27 Non-Compliance and Penalties

In accordance with many of our comments in this letter, we would like to suggest to ARB an alternative to the proposed Non-Compliance and Penalties provisions that can accomplish the same goals of the rule, reduce unnecessary workload and bureaucracy, and also accommodate many of the unique and rare situations that can occur within normal operations at marine terminals.

As we mentioned in our introduction, the movement of TRU powered containers at marine terminals is focused on reducing the usage of Gen Set power to the greatest extent possible within operational constraints. Furthermore, per comments from ARB staff, the data collected for SOTL monitoring is intended to provide a historical view of the last three months of activities for compliance verification, and is not intended to be a real-time management tool to avoid exceedances of SOTL.

We would therefore propose that rather than assign each exceedance of SOTL as a separate offense and violation under the rule, the SOTL data should be used to provide an average, or weighted average of all TRU movements at a facility over the three-month period. If the average SOTL for that period is 15 minutes or less, then the goal of the rule has been achieved and no violations should be incurred or pursued. If the average SOTL exceeds the 15-minute limit for a facility, then ARB can review the data and assess violations and penalties for each separate offense accordingly for those instances when exceedances occurred. Furthermore, because the operational impacts of this rule are new and unique to the industry, we ask that ARB allow a grace period of one year from the time of enforcement before fines and/or penalties are incurred with any assessed violations.

Such a strategy would provide the emission reduction goals sought under the rule, could accommodate many of the operational constraints and variables outlined in this letter, and make enforcement much more feasible for ARB. We would be happy to discuss this proposal in greater detail at your convenience.

Evaluate Other Time Limits

In reviewing the proposed concept, PMSA did not find the basis for a 15-minute operating limit. What method did CARB use to evaluate and select the 15-minute limit? Has CARB evaluated other time limits such as 20 or 30 minutes to determine what the trade-off is between flexibility and emissions?

Safe Harbor Provision

As described earlier in this letter, the proposed rule is primarily designed to address operations at cold-storage warehouses and grocery stores. As a result, there are operational challenges when applied to a marine terminal. Marine terminals are intermodal waystations; the terminals are not the ultimate cargo destination and terminals do not book the cargo that flow through their terminals. In addition, the facilities are not dedicated to refrigerated cargo and the amount of cargo fluctuates with season and market demand, beyond the control of the terminal operator. As a result, it is not possible, with any certainty, to know what future cargo flows will be beyond a few weeks ahead.

As a general principle, marine terminals have more electrical hook-ups than necessary to meet anticipated demand. However, rare occasions can occur when cargo owners push more refrigerated cargo through a marine terminal than typical in a manner that would exceed the facility's electrical infrastructure capability. In those rare cases, a Gen Set is left on the container to maintain needed temperature control.

Under the current proposed rule, a terminal operator would have to choose between refusing time-sensitive, perishable cargo or face regulatory penalties. In order to avoid this, PMSA recommends that the proposed rule contain a safe harbor provision. Under such a provision, a terminal operator that provides infrastructure to meet 100% of the highest peak demand over the past five years would be granted a safe harbor provision if demand exceeded this design value. In addition, to ensure that this does not become a regular occurrence, the safe harbor design value would be adjusted for all subsequent years to the new peak demand. In this way, terminal operators can ensure adequate infrastructure is available without wasting capital on likely unnecessary infrastructure.

Alternatively, the problem of managing unanticipated cargo peaking can be handled by changing the zero-emission operations requirement from 100% of all onsite Gen Sets to 95% all onsite equipment. The prior solution has the advantage of requiring additional future infrastructure or losing access to the safe harbor provision, while the latter solution favors simplicity.

Possible Conflicts with Federal Regulations

PMSA has been informed that aspects of the proposed regulation may be in conflict with aspects of Federal regulations. Given the limited time to prepare responses to the concept while our members are engaged in emergency operations and business continuity planning due to current global pandemic, PMSA is unable to assess the level of potential conflict at this time. Therefore, PMSA requests that CARB investigate these conflicts and ensure State regulation is ultimately compatible with Federal regulation.

Marine terminals are governed, in part, under Federal regulation by 33 CFR Part 105 – Maritime Security: Facilities. Under the provisions of this regulation, marine terminals must prepare Facility Security Plans (FSP), including the identification of facility boundaries and internal facility areas (e.g., railyards). Facilities are prohibited from disclosing elements of the FSP without Transportation Security Administration approval. It is unclear to what degree these Federal regulations would interfere with the implementation of the proposed TRU regulation, particularly in regard to release of facility boundaries or designation of internal exclusion areas such as railyards.

Refrigerated cargo moved through port facilities may also be subject to the Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA). The Act regulates the cold chain for food in transit. The goal of the Act is to ensure and improve food safety throughout the United States. Again, given the short time to review the proposed concept under the current circumstances, it is unclear what conflicts may exist between the proposed regulation and FSMA. PMSA requests that CARB ensure that none of the State's proposals would result in the handling of cargo in a manner that would violate FSMA.

Reporting and Recordkeeping

The proposed rule requires multiple entities to report the same information to CARB. This creates an unnecessary regulatory burden, which increases costs but does not improve compliance or emissions reductions. The burden is particularly unnecessary since the only way Applicable Facilities can submit much of the required information is by obtaining data that the TRU owner must also submit. It is not possible that passing data through a third-party improves data quality or level of compliance. CARB should review the rule to ensure that only parties that directly generate data are required to submit it. CARB can substantially reduce the cost of compliance by eliminating duplicative reporting and recordkeeping.

Proposed Rule May Require Underutilized Capacity to be Developed

The manner in which the rule has been developed would appear to require the construction of significant excess capacity. As is the case for most industrial infrastructure, the most economical use of facilities is when they operate near their capacity. While this results in the

fewest and most sustainable number of facilities, it does result in occasional peaking that exceeds capacity. It is analogous to how airlines (normally) operate near the capacity of their planes during most of the year, but during periods of high demand (e.g., holidays) there are insufficient seats to meet all demand.

If logistics facilities must ensure that peak demand never exceeds facility capacity on any occasion in order to ensure compliance under the proposed rule, facilities will need to limit their operations and new facilities would need to be constructed to meet peak demand. PMSA is concerned about this outcome, because under the proposed rule PMSA member ocean carriers would be liable if a refrigerated container arrived at a facility to find it momentarily full. Even if every dock or cargo bay was outfitted with infrastructure to support zero emission operations, the fact that a truck would need to wait for the next available bay would likely result in a fine exposing the ocean carrier to liability.

A related concern is that in order for ocean carriers to maintain existing cargo volumes into Southern California, a number of logistics facilities, equal to seasonal cargo peaking, would need to be constructed to ensure that upon arriving at a facility there would be ample space for a Gen Set to be connected to zero-emission infrastructure within 15 minutes. The alternative would be to divert cargo from California port complexes.

Joint & Several Liability Unworkable

Joint and several liability as proposed in the regulation is unworkable. The regulation does not place clear responsibilities on regulated parties under the rule. This is particularly problematic because the goods movement system does not work in the idealized manner envisioned in the rule. For example, ocean carriers may be contracted to deliver refrigerated cargo to a marine terminal, but typically the cargo owner is responsible for moving the cargo to its final destination. A truck driver, on behalf of the cargo owner, would dray that cargo to a logistics facility and due to the vagaries of traffic may be substantially early (or late) for the loading bay appointment resulting in waiting on the part of the truck. Scenarios such as this raise two issues. First, why would the ocean carrier be liable for decisions it had no role in. The proposed rule should be revised to eliminate joint and several liability and replace it with clear roles and responsibilities. Second, it is unclear why any party should be held liable for arriving early or late for an appointment due to traffic, mechanical problems, or other issues. The only solution under the proposed rule is to operate substantially below capacity in order to accommodate cargo flow changes, as previously described.

Unintended Consequences

Due to facility size and the amount of time truck drivers spend on premises, marine terminals offer truck driver accommodations such as restrooms, break areas, and lunch trucks onsite. In

order to maintain compliance with the proposed rule such accommodations will likely need to be eliminated. Today, truck drivers taking advantage of these facilities onsite result in overall longer time spent onsite but benefit from (obviously) needed services for truck drivers. There does not appear to be a way to accommodate these uses while not running afoul of the SOTL limits in the rule. As a result, terminal operators may be forced to permanently close or eliminate these accommodations.

PMSA appreciates the opportunity to work with CARB staff on this rule development with the hope of developing a proposal that reduces emissions while recognizing the complexities and nuances of operating global supply chains. PMSA would appreciate the opportunity to further discuss the issues outlined in this letter.

Sincerely,

Thomas Jelenić
Vice President