Hello,

I took the time to travel to the VW Mitigation Trust meeting today in Sacramento, although declined to ask a question or make a comment, but do so now.

I represent the Silicon Valley chapter of the Electric Automobile Association.  We would like to echo comments made by other participants about maximizing expenditures on public EV charging infrastructure.  Although for Appendix D funds, it doesn't directly reduce NOX emissions, we feel that your excellent efforts in other areas will efficiently achieve your 10,000-ton reduction target.  Further, we feel that it is simply impossible to overemphasize funding of EV infrastructure.  For Appendix D funding, we believe that the maximum benefit can be realized by spending the funds for multi-unit dwellings in economically disadvantaged areas and also helping employers to add charging infrastructure.

Finally, I'd also like to comment on the several impassioned pleas made today  in support of hydrogen. I thought about making this comment at the meeting but did not want to spark debate. As you are likely aware, there is an almost religious war going on between BEVs and FCEV camps. Five or six years ago, FCEVs seemed to finally be ready to compete at the commercial level and a large scale. It was unclear at that time what the future would hold for next-generation light-duty transportation; would the market go BEV or FCEV?

But in the subsequent years, battery technology and fast-charging along major transportation corridors have clearly made much more progress than hydrogen.

In 2017 there were 199,826 plug-in sales in the United States.This is against 1,838 FCEV sold during the same time period.  That's 100:1.  The market has spoken.  It's time to let hydrogen (at least for light-duty transportation) die a natural death and channel those funds to maximum good for the public.

Thank you for your time.

John Higham