

# Ca Special Districts Assoc, Ca League of Cities, Ca State Assoc of Counties, Rural County Reps od CA (Brittney Barsotti)

April 14, 2026  
Clerk of the Board  
California Air Resources Board  
1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

To Chair Lauren Sanchez and the Members of the California Air Resources Board:  
RE: Advanced Clean Fleets Regulation 15-Day Amendment Comments

The California Special Districts Association (CSDA), the League of California Cities, California Association of Recreation and Parks Districts, Rural County Representatives of California, and the California State Association of Counties appreciate the opportunity to provide comments to the proposed amendments to the Advanced Clean Fleets (ACF) regulatory language. Collectively, we represent the thousands of local public agencies providing essential government services vital to life in California.

We are generally supportive of, and encouraged by, the direction that CARB is taking with the recent passage of Resolution 25-6-8 and the proposed amendments to ACF, as well as the commitment to further amendments as evidenced by this 15-day comment period. We also greatly appreciate the time you and CARB staff have taken to hear our members' concerns and the hard work that has been put into this draft for comment period. There is an acknowledgment of the need for fleet resiliency and the flexibility to switch compliance tracks as well as other significant substantive changes.

First, we note that under California's Administrative Procedure Act, the 45-day public comment period is intended to provide stakeholders with a meaningful opportunity to review and comment on the full scope of a proposed regulation. In contrast, the subsequent 15-day comment period is limited to reviewing discrete modifications that are "sufficiently related" to the original proposal. However, in this instance, the CARB's 15-day modifications introduce substantive policy changes with direct implications for municipal operations and contracting practices. We have serious concerns with advancing these changes through a 15 -day comment period potentially undermines the intent of the rulemaking process and limits the ability of cities, counties and special districts to fully evaluate fiscal, legal, and operational impacts.

Additionally, we are disappointed that our modest request for amendments excluding vehicles that support emergency services is not contained in the 15-day comment period language. Our requested amendments are critical to the 40 million Californians our disaster service workers collectively serve and, absent these critical amendments, the ACF as proposed for the 15-Day Comment Period is unworkable and will endanger life and property throughout the communities we have a duty to protect. We want to be clear. Our top priority is ensuring the health and safety of Californians and ensuring our frontline workers have the tools they require to perform their dangerous jobs under any

conditions. In furtherance of this priority, we are resubmitting proposed amendments we previously shared on October 7, 2025, that would accomplish our shared goals for a more resilient California. We cannot and must not leave Californians defenseless against the very climate-related events CARB is striving to mitigate with the ACF regulations.

The "fleet resiliency" exemption for internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles intended for concerns "such as, emergency response support, towing, or range support," appear responsive to some of the serious problems we have raised with the lack of availability and capability of ZEVs for the essential services we provide. However, the arbitrary 25 percent cap on resiliency, extremely onerous requirements for an exemption, and temporary nature of exemptions all ignore the realities of both the marketplace and the conditions and needs of the communities local fleets must serve, sometimes during extraordinary emergency situations.

According to Caltrans' recent 2025 report to the legislature on ZEV spending, ZEVs are on average 132.82 percent more expensive than their ICE counterparts, delivery times vary significantly and that infrastructure or charging stations are estimated to cost over \$210,231 and take three years to complete. The report detailed how the last three fiscal years was spent including, how many vehicles were purchased in each ZEV class, average costs and delivery times and infrastructure challenges. The fact that Caltrans with \$25 million to spend only purchased 13 vehicles in 2024 to 2025 fiscal year above class 2b is likely indicative of the limited availability of these vehicles and the infrastructure challenges noted in the report that our members face to secure the vehicles necessary to provide critical services to the communities they serve.

Moreover, the report states that Caltrans will require two to three ZEVs to complete the same amount of work that one ICE class 3 and above can perform in a regular shift due to limited range and charging times. The report indicates there would need to be one vehicle charging while one is either charging or standing by. Even when the power is on, our members cannot afford these limitations when emergencies require immediate response to prevent further destruction.

#### Emergency Response Vehicles Should Be Excluded from the Mandate

We resubmit for this 15-day comment period that vehicles reasonably anticipated to respond to emergency situations, or that support those efforts should be excluded from the regulations similar to other excluded vehicles such as snow removal vehicles. An emergency response vehicle is always an emergency response vehicle— Not all emergencies are "declared" or benefit from mutual aid.

Some examples of vehicles called upon to preserve public health and safety beyond those currently exempted:

- Vehicles used for purposes of fire prevention and mitigation, public safety, search and rescue, medical response, and poacher prevention should be excluded.
- Vehicles that are essential to the delivery, repair, and maintenance of electricity, water, wastewater, stormwater, and flood protection should be excluded.
- Vehicles used to prevent and respond to the spread of disease and dangerous vector outbreaks should be excluded.

In light of the rising toll of natural disasters in our state, we must prioritize the safety of our communities and the public servants that work around the clock through these unprecedented

events. The most likely current and anticipated future ZEV options depend upon a consistently accessible source of electricity. The risk of electricity disruption, whether due to an earthquake, public safety power shutoff, rolling brownout, wildfire, flood, or other emergencies is too great to risk the operability of these vehicles when they are most desperately needed and, with it, imperil the health and safety of Californians.

Thank you for your consideration of this important issue. Should you have any questions or concerns regarding our position, please do not hesitate to contact us.  
Sincerely,

Mark Neuburger  
Legislative Representative Legislative Advocate  
California Special District Association California State Association of Counties  
brittneyb@csda.net mneuburger@counties.org

Damon Conklin Ethan Nagler  
Legislative Advocate Associate Lobbyist  
League of California Cities California Public Policy Group  
dconklin@calcities.org enagler@publicpolicygroup.com

Staci Heaton  
Senior Policy Advocate  
sheaton@rcrcnet.org

CC: CARB program staff  
Attachment: Proposed Amendments to 13 CCR § 2013.

Part (c) of § 2013 of title 13:

Exemptions. The following vehicles are exempt from the requirements specified in sections 2013 through 2013.4:

- (1) School buses as defined in CVC section 545(a);
- (2) Military tactical vehicles as described in title 13, CCR, section 1905;
- (3) Vehicles awaiting sale;
- (4) Emergency vehicles as defined in CVC section 165;
- (5) Historical vehicles;
- (6) Dedicated snow removal vehicles, water utility vehicles, flood protection vehicles, sewer utility vehicles, electric utility vehicles, fire prevention vehicles, fire protection vehicles, search and rescue vehicles, and disease and vector control vehicles;
- (7) Two-engine vehicles;
- (8) Heavy cranes as defined in title 13, CCR, section 2021(b)(16);
- (9) Transit vehicles subject to the Innovative Clean Transit regulations commencing with title 13, CCR, section 2023; and
- (10) Vehicles that are subject to the Zero-Emission Airport Shuttle regulations of title 17, CCR, sections 95690.1, 95690.2, 95690.3, 95690.4, 95690.5, 95690.6, 95690.7, and 95690





California Special  
Districts Association  
*Districts Stronger Together*



April 14, 2026

Clerk of the Board  
California Air Resources Board  
1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

To Chair Lauren Sanchez and the Members of the California Air Resources Board:

**RE: Advanced Clean Fleets Regulation 15-Day Amendment Comments**

The California Special Districts Association (CSDA), the League of California Cities, California Association of Recreation and Parks Districts, Rural County Representatives of California, and the California State Association of Counties appreciate the opportunity to provide comments to the proposed amendments to the Advanced Clean Fleets (ACF) regulatory language. Collectively, we represent the thousands of local public agencies providing essential government services vital to life in California.

We are generally supportive of, and encouraged by, the direction that CARB is taking with the recent passage of Resolution 25-6-8 and the proposed amendments to ACF, as well as the commitment to further amendments as evidenced by this 15-day comment period. We also greatly appreciate the time you and CARB staff have taken to hear our members' concerns and the hard work that has been put into this draft for comment period. There is an acknowledgment of the need for fleet resiliency and the flexibility to switch compliance tracks as well as other significant substantive changes.

First, we note that under California's Administrative Procedure Act, the 45-day public comment period is intended to provide stakeholders with a meaningful opportunity to review and comment on the full scope of a proposed regulation. In contrast, the subsequent 15-day comment period is limited to reviewing discrete modifications that are "sufficiently related" to the original proposal. However, in this instance, the CARB's 15-day modifications introduce substantive policy changes with direct implications for municipal operations and contracting practices. We have serious concerns with advancing these changes through a 15-day comment period potentially undermines the intent of the rulemaking process and limits the ability of cities, counties and special districts to fully evaluate fiscal, legal, and operational impacts.

Additionally, we are disappointed that our modest request for amendments excluding vehicles that support emergency services is not contained in the 15-day comment period language. Our requested amendments are critical to the 40 million Californians our disaster service workers

## **Attachment: Proposed Amendments to 13 CCR § 2013. State and Local Government Fleet Applicability, Definitions, and General Requirements.**

collectively serve and, absent these critical amendments, the ACF as proposed for the 15-Day Comment Period is unworkable and will endanger life and property throughout the communities we have a duty to protect. We want to be clear. Our top priority is ensuring the health and safety of Californians and ensuring our frontline workers have the tools they require to perform their dangerous jobs under any conditions. In furtherance of this priority, we are resubmitting proposed amendments we previously shared on October 7, 2025, that would accomplish our shared goals for a more resilient California. We cannot and must not leave Californians defenseless against the very climate-related events CARB is striving to mitigate with the ACF regulations.

The “fleet resiliency” exemption for internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles intended for concerns “such as, emergency response support, towing, or range support,” appear responsive to some of the serious problems we have raised with the lack of availability and capability of ZEVs for the essential services we provide. However, the arbitrary 25 percent cap on resiliency, extremely onerous requirements for an exemption, and temporary nature of exemptions all ignore the realities of both the marketplace and the conditions and needs of the communities local fleets must serve, sometimes during extraordinary emergency situations.

According to [Caltrans’ recent 2025 report to the legislature](#) on ZEV spending, *ZEVs are on average 132.82 percent more expensive than their ICE counterparts, delivery times vary significantly and that infrastructure or charging stations are estimated to cost over \$210,231 and take three years to complete.* The report detailed how the last three fiscal years was spent including, how many vehicles were purchased in each ZEV class, average costs and delivery times and infrastructure challenges. The fact that Caltrans with \$25 million to spend only purchased 13 vehicles in 2024 to 2025 fiscal year above class 2b is likely indicative of the limited availability of these vehicles and the infrastructure challenges noted in the report that our members face to secure the vehicles necessary to provide critical services to the communities they serve.

Moreover, the report states that *Caltrans will require two to three ZEVs to complete the same amount of work that one ICE class 3 and above can perform* in a regular shift due to limited range and charging times. The report indicates there would need to be one vehicle charging while one is either charging or standing by. Even when the power is on, our members cannot afford these limitations when emergencies require immediate response to prevent further destruction.

### **Emergency Response Vehicles Should Be Excluded from the Mandate**

*We resubmit for this 15-day comment period that vehicles reasonably anticipated to respond to emergency situations, or that support those efforts should be excluded from the regulations similar to other excluded vehicles such as snow removal vehicles. An emergency response vehicle is always an emergency response vehicle— Not all emergencies are “declared” or benefit from mutual aid.*

**Attachment: Proposed Amendments to 13 CCR § 2013. State and Local Government Fleet Applicability, Definitions, and General Requirements.**

Some examples of vehicles called upon to preserve public health and safety beyond those currently exempted:

- Vehicles used for purposes of fire prevention and mitigation, public safety, search and rescue, medical response, and poacher prevention should be excluded.
- Vehicles that are essential to the delivery, repair, and maintenance of electricity, water, wastewater, stormwater, and flood protection should be excluded.
- Vehicles used to prevent and respond to the spread of disease and dangerous vector outbreaks should be excluded.

In light of the rising toll of natural disasters in our state, we must prioritize the safety of our communities and the public servants that work around the clock through these unprecedented events. The most likely current and anticipated future ZEV options depend upon a consistently accessible source of electricity. The risk of electricity disruption, whether due to an earthquake, public safety power shutoff, rolling brownout, wildfire, flood, or other emergencies is too great to risk the operability of these vehicles when they are most desperately needed and, with it, imperil the health and safety of Californians.

Thank you for your consideration of this important issue. Should you have any questions or concerns regarding our position, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,



Legislative Representative  
California Special District Association  
[brittneyb@csda.net](mailto:brittneyb@csda.net)



Mark Neuburger  
Legislative Advocate  
California State Association of Counties  
[mneuburger@counties.org](mailto:mneuburger@counties.org)



Damon Conklin  
Legislative Advocate  
League of California Cities  
[dconklin@calcities.org](mailto:dconklin@calcities.org)



Ethan Nagler  
Associate Lobbyist  
California Public Policy Group  
[enagler@publicpolicygroup.com](mailto:enagler@publicpolicygroup.com)



Staci Heaton  
Senior Policy Advocate  
[sheaton@rcrcnet.org](mailto:sheaton@rcrcnet.org)

**Attachment: Proposed Amendments to 13 CCR § 2013. State and Local Government Fleet Applicability, Definitions, and General Requirements.**

**CC: CARB program staff**

Attachment: Proposed Amendments to 13 CCR § 2013.

Part (c) of § 2013 of title 13:

Exemptions. The following vehicles are exempt from the requirements specified in sections 2013 through 2013.4:

- (1) School buses as defined in CVC section 545(a);
- (2) Military tactical vehicles as described in title 13, CCR, section 1905;
- (3) Vehicles awaiting sale;
- (4) Emergency vehicles as defined in CVC section 165;
- (5) Historical vehicles;
- (6) Dedicated snow removal vehicles, water utility vehicles, flood protection vehicles, sewer utility vehicles, electric utility vehicles, fire prevention vehicles, fire protection vehicles, search and rescue vehicles, and disease and vector control vehicles;
- (7) Two-engine vehicles;
- (8) Heavy cranes as defined in title 13, CCR, section 2021(b)(16);
- (9) Transit vehicles subject to the Innovative Clean Transit regulations commencing with title 13, CCR, section 2023; and
- (10) Vehicles that are subject to the Zero-Emission Airport Shuttle regulations of title 17, CCR, sections 95690.1, 95690.2, 95690.3, 95690.4, 95690.5, 95690.6, 95690.7, and 95690