Guidehouse

FILED
11/13/26
10:28 AM
R2312008

Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning: Modeling Inputs & Assumptions Report

DRAFT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Presented to:

California Public Utilities Commission

Presented by:

Guidehouse Inc.
400 Capitol Mall Room #08-102 Sacramento, CA 95814

Reference No.: 225223

July 2026

guidehouse.com

This deliverable was prepared by Guidehouse Inc. for the sole use and benefit of, and pursuant to a client relationship exclusively with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) ("Client"). The work presented in this deliverable represents Guidehouse's professional judgement based on the information available at the time this report was prepared. Guidehouse is not responsible for a third party's use of, or reliance upon, the deliverable, nor any decisions based on the report. Readers of the report are advised that they assume all liabilities incurred by them, or third parties, as a result of their reliance on the report, or the data, information, findings, and opinions contained in the report.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 9

1.1. Overview of Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning (TEPP) 11

1.2. Document Contents 11

2. Vehicles 12

2.1. Input: Vehicle Forecast 13

2.1.1. Limitations 15

2.2. Input: IEPR LD Mapping 15

2.2.1. Limitations 17

2.3. Input: Fleet Vehicle Location: Telematics 17

2.3.1. Limitations 18

2.4. Input: Personal Vehicle Location: Vehicle Registration 19

2.4.1. Limitations 19

2.5. Input: Vehicle Use Cases 19

2.5.1. Limitations 21

3. Charging Infrastructure 22

3.1. Input: Power Preference and Suitability 22

3.1.1. Limitations 23

3.2. Input: Vehicles per Charger 23

3.2.1. Limitations 26

3.3. Input: Charger Power 26

3.3.1. Limitations 28

4. Grid Impacts 29

4.1. Input: “Fuel” Efficiency 29

4.1.1. Limitations 30

4.2. Input: Vehicle Miles Traveled 31

4.2.1. Limitations 31

4.3. Input: Driving Range 31

4.3.1. Limitations 33

4.4. Input: Trip Data 33

4.4.1. Limitations 34

4.5. Input: Public vs Private Charging Allocation 34
4.5.1. Limitations 37
4.6. Input: Load Shapes 37
4.6.1. Limitations 38
4.7. Input: State of Charge (SOC) 38
4.7.1. Limitations 39
4.8. Input: Tract Drayage Operations 39
4.8.1. Limitations 40
5. Geospatial Layers 41
5.1. Input: California Counties 41
5.1.1. Limitations 41
5.2. Input: Freight Analysis Framework 5 Model 41
5.2.1. Limitations 42
5.3. Input: LD Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) 42
5.3.1. Limitations 42
5.4. Input: Investor-Owned Utilities/Publicly Owned Utilities Service Areas 42
5.4.1. Limitations 43
5.5. Input: Disadvantaged Communities 43
5.5.1. Limitations 44
5.6. Input: CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Top Quartiles 44
5.6.1. Limitations 44
5.7. Input: AB 1550 Low Income Designation 45
5.7.1. Limitations 46
5.8. Input: PM2.5 and Ozone Non-Attainment Areas 46
5.8.1. Limitations 46
5.9. Input: Land Use / Zoning 47
5.9.1. Limitations 47
5.10. Input: Planned & Existing Public Infrastructure 47
5.10.1. Limitations 48
5.11. Input: Truck Stops 48
5.11.1. Limitations 48
5.12. Input: Rest Stops 49

5.12.1. Limitations 49
5.13. Input: Fleet Depots 49
5.13.1. Limitations 49
Appendix A. Power Preference and Suitability Calculation 50

List of Tables

Table 1-1. TEPP Modeling Inputs & Assumptions Categories 10
Table 2-1. IEPR Vehicle Class and Definitions 13
Table 2-2. BEV Forecast Sources & Assumptions 15
Table 2-3. IEPR Light Duty Mapping 16
Table 2-4. IEPR LD Mapping Sources & Assumptions 17
Table 2-5. Fleet Vehicle Domicile Location 18
Table 2-6. Personal Vehicle Domicile Location 19
Table 2-7. Vehicle Use Cases 20
Table 2-8. Vehicle Use Case Input Source, Availability, and Justification 21
Table 3-1. Power Preference and Suitability Input Source, Availability, and Justification 22
Table 3-2. Example Vehicle per Charger Values 25
Table 3-3. Vehicles per Charger Input Source, Availability, and Justification 26
Table 3-4. Current and Long-Run Charging Power Estimates 27
Table 3-5. Charger Power Input Source, Availability, and Justification 28
Table 4-1. Fuel Efficiency by Vehicle Use Case 30
Table 4-2. Fuel Efficiency Input Source, Availability, and Justification 30
Table 4-3. Vehicle Miles Traveled Input Source, Availability, and Justification 31
Table 4-4. BEV Driving Range by Duty and Vehicle Use Case 32
Table 4-5. BEV Driving Range Input Source, Availability, and Justification 32
Table 4-6. Trip Data Input Source, Availability, and Justification 33
Table 4-7. Example Allocation of Vehicle Energy to Public and Private Ports 36
Table 4-8. Allocation of Vehicle Energy Input Source, Availability, and Justification 37
Table 4-9. Load Shape Input Source, Availability, and Justification 37
Table 4-10. Charging Behavior Source, Availability, and Justification 39
Table 4-11. Drayage Operations Source, Availability, and Justification 40

Table 5-1. California Counties Source, Availability, and Justification 41
Table 5-2. FAF 5 Source, Availability, and Justification 42
Table 5-3. LDV AADT Source, Availability, and Justification 42
Table 5-4. IOU/POU Service Areas Source, Availability, and Justification 42
Table 5-5. DAC Source, Availability, and Justification 44
Table 5-6. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Top Quartiles Source, Availability, and Justification 44
Table 5-7. DAC Source, Availability, and Justification 45
Table 5-8. PM2.5 and Ozone NAA Source, Availability, and Justification 46
Table 5-9. DAC Source, Availability, and Justification 47
Table 5-10. Planned & Existing Public Infrastructure Source, Availability, and Justification 48
Table 5-11. Truck Stops Source, Availability, and Justification 48
Table 5-12. Rest Stops Source, Availability, and Justification 49
Table 5-13. Fleet Depots Source, Availability, and Justification 49
Table APP-1. Calculation for Vehicle Classes Suitable for Charging Using L2 ports or DC charging 50

List of Figures

Figure 4-1. Vehicle Energy Calculation 29
Figure 5-1. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Dashboard 43
Figure 5-2. California Climate Investments Priority Population Mapping Tool 4.0 45

List of Acronyms

- **AADT:** Average Annual Daily Traffic
- **AATE:** Additional Achievable Transportation Electrification, used by the IEPR forecast as multiple transportation electrification scenarios with different levels of battery electric vehicle adoption
- **AFDC:** Alternative Fuels Data Center, information and data on alternative and renewable fuels, advanced vehicles, fuel-saving strategies, and emerging transportation technologies, provided by the Department of Energy
- **BEV:** Battery Electric Vehicle
- **CAISO:** California Independent System Operator
- **CARB:** California Air Resources Board
- **CDM:** Corridor Designation Methodology, the methodology by which public DC charging load for LD and MDHD EVs is allocated to specific corridor segments throughout major corridors in California
- **CEC:** California Energy Commission
- **CVC:** Commercial vehicle cluster, one of IEPR's light duty vehicle classes
- **DAC:** Disadvantaged Community, as designated by CalEnviroScreen. Disadvantaged Communities refer to areas throughout California which experience a high burden from a combination of economic, health and environmental indicators.
- **DCFC:** Direct current fast charging infrastructure for electric vehicles
- **DOE:** United States Department of Energy
- **Depot:** Refers to private charging for fleets
- **Drayage trucks:** Heavy-duty trucks that transport containers and bulk freight between a port and intermodal rail facilities, distribution centers, and other near-port locations.
- **EDF:** Environmental Defense Fund
- **ESJ:** Environmental and Social Justice, referencing the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's ESJ Screening and Mapping Tool
- **EPA:** U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- **EV:** Electric Vehicle
- **FHWA:** Federal Highway Administration
- **GIS:** Geographic information system
- **GVWR:** Gross Vehicle Weight Rating
- **HVIP:** California's Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project, a CARB voucher intended to help transition California truck fleets to cleaner technologies and reduce trucking-related emissions in and around priority communities

- **I&A:** Modeling Inputs and Assumptions
- **ICCT:** International Council on Clean Transportation
- **ICEV:** Internal combustion engine vehicle
- **IEPR:** California Energy Commission's Integrated Energy Policy Report
- **IOU:** Investor-Owned Utility
- **IRP:** The California Public Utility Commission's Integrated Resource Planning process
- **LD:** Light-Duty [vehicle]
- **L2:** Level 2 charging infrastructure for electric vehicles, operating at anywhere from 3 kW to 19 kW of AC power
- **MCS:** Megawatt Charging System
- **MDHD:** Medium and Heavy Duty [vehicle]
- **MW:** Megawatt
- **NAA:** [Ozone] Nonattainment areas, EPA terminology for areas that do not meet the national primary or secondary ambient air quality for a national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS)
- **NAAQ:** National Ambient Air Quality, referring to the standards set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- **NHTS:** National Household Travel Survey, conducted by the Federal Highway Administration to obtain American public travel behavior insights
- **NHTSA:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
- **NLR:** National Laboratory of the Rockies, formerly known as National Renewable Energy Laboratory
- **OEHHA:** California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, a specialized department within California's EPA with responsibility for evaluating health risks from environmental chemical contaminants
- **OEM:** Original equipment manufacturer, more specifically automotive OEMs as referenced in this report (i.e., automakers)
- **ORNL:** Oak Ridge National Laboratory
- **PM2.5:** Particulate Matter, generally 2.5 micrometers and smaller
- **POU:** Publicly- owned utilities
- **PVC:** Personal vehicle cluster, one of IEPR's light- duty vehicle classes
- **SOC:** State of Charge, representing an electric vehicle battery's energy level as a percentage; analogous to the fuel gauge of a gasoline-powered vehicle
- **TCO:** Total cost of ownership
- **TE:** Transportation Electrification

- **TEPP:** [CPUC] Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning
- **TOU:** Time-of-Use, used in reference to electric rates that have different costs of electricity based on the time of day the energy is pulled from the grid
- **VMT:** Vehicle Miles Traveled
- **ZCTA:** ZIP Code Tabulation Area, a geographic product of the U.S. Census Bureau created to allow mapping, display, and geographic analyses of the U.S. ZIP Codes
- **ZEV:** Zero-Emission Vehicle

1. Introduction

This document describes the key data definitions, categories, values, and sources of the transportation electrification (TE) modeling inputs and assumptions (I&A) for the California Public Utilities Commission's (CPUC) Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning (TEPP) framework.

The **purpose** of establishing the TEPP Modeling I&A is to identify a common set of values and assumptions that can be used to model TE charging's electric system impacts along highway corridors. The **objective** of this document is to identify and vet the best available data relevant to modeling transportation patterns, charging and fueling patterns, and expected zero emission vehicle (ZEV) charging technology adoption timelines and locations.

The TEPP Modeling I&A will inform a Transportation Electrification Corridor Disaggregation Methodology (CDM) that can be used to disaggregate the CEC's Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR) California Energy Demand Forecast. This methodology will provide localized insights to identify the timing, location, and size of expected TE load growth along highway corridors in California for use in existing planning and cost recovery processes. The TEPP Modeling I&A will also allow for consistent forecasting and scenario building across existing planning and cost recovery processes, including but not limited to the Distribution Planning Process (DPP) and Transmission Planning Process (TPP). This report documents the I&A for public charging of electric light-duty vehicles (LD) and a combined medium and heavy-duty vehicle category (MDHD). TEPP Modeling I&A are in alignment with IEPR I&A wherever feasible.

TEPP Modeling I&A Categories

This document includes detailed explanations of the data inputs listed by category in Table 1-1. Subsequent sections provide the definitions, values, sources, and assumptions for each input.

Table 1-1. TEPP Modeling Inputs & Assumptions Categories

Vehicles	Charging Infrastructure	Grid Impacts	Geospatial Layers
Vehicle Forecast	Level 2-DCFC Power Split[1]	"Fuel" Efficiency	California Counties
IEPR LD Mapping	Vehicles per Charger	Vehicle Miles Traveled	Freight Analysis Framework 5 Model
Fleet Vehicle Domicile Location (Telematics)	Charger Power	Driving Range	LD Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)
Personal Vehicle Domicile Location (Registration)		Trip Data	Investor-Owned Utilities (IOU) / Publicly Owned Utilities (POU) Service Areas
Vehicle Use Cases		Public vs. Private Charging Allocation	SB 535 California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's (OEHHA) map layer identifying disadvantaged community using CalEPA's designation specifically
		Load shapes	CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Top Quartiles
		State of Charge (SOC)	AB 1550 Low Income Designation
		Tract Drayage Operations	PM2.5 and Ozone Non-Attainment Areas (NAA)
			Land Use / Zoning
			Planned & Existing Public Infrastructure
			Truck Stops
			Rest Stops
			Fleet Depots

Future iterations of the TEPP Modeling I&A may be updated with additional inputs or different data sources. This version is intended to serve as a starting point in establishing common I&A for TE planning for an initial planning cycle. This draft TEPP Modeling I&A report is accompanied by an Excel workbook known as the "TEPP Modeling I&A Library" (Library). The Library contains the detailed data inputs for TEPP. Both documents are intended to be reviewed together. The TEPP Modeling I&A Report contains more information on the data sources and summarizes key inputs, whereas the Library shows more detailed input values, including values by year.

[1] Preferences for vehicles to charge with either L2 or DCFC

1.1. Overview of Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning (TEPP)

TEPP aims to inform size, timing, and location of corridor-based TE charging in California through a collaborative effort with the California Energy Commission (CEC). The initial TEPP focus will be to develop I&A that will inform a disaggregation methodology that assigns load to highway corridor segments. This document identifies I&A for LD and MDHD battery electric vehicles (BEVs)[2] because these vehicle segments are expected to have significant localized load impacts on electric transmission and distribution infrastructure along key highway corridors.[3] I&A related to off-road vehicles, fuel cell vehicles,[4] and hydrogen production or usage are currently out of scope for this analysis.

1.2. Document Contents

The sections of this document are organized as follows:

- **Section 2: Vehicles** outlines the vehicle-related inputs required to determine the total charging infrastructure need, including total vehicle stock and BEV adoption forecasts. The accompanying Library includes data supporting TEPP Input Category "Vehicles" for identifying the number of vehicles expected to electrify over a given time period.
- **Section 3: Charging infrastructure** outlines the charger-related inputs needed to determine the total charging infrastructure need, including charger type allocation, properties, and specifications. The accompanying Library includes data supporting TEPP Input Category "Charging Infrastructure" for identifying the amount of charging infrastructure necessary to support the vehicles expected to electrify over a given time period.
- **Section 4: Grid impacts** document the inputs and their respective sources for forecasts of BEV electric load, peak demand, and hourly charging load profiles. These forecasts are categorized by vehicle and charging use case. The accompanying Library includes data supporting TEPP Input Category "Grid Impacts" for forecasting the energy demand impacts on California's electric system from vehicle electrification.
- **Section 5: Geospatial layers** identifies inputs associated with characteristics for California's major arterial roads and interstate highway corridors.

Each section represents an input category with subsections providing individual inputs (e.g., Section 2.1 Input: Vehicle Forecast). Each input includes a definition, complete or sample value(s)[5], source(s), as well as assumptions regarding data availability, justification for inclusion in the TEPP Modeling I&A, and key questions or limitations.

[2] This report focuses on fully battery electric vehicles, and does not include inputs and assumptions for plug-in hybrid vehicles

[3] Transport Refrigerated Units (TRUs), which are on-road vehicles, are out of scope for the current TEPP Modeling I&A

[4] The IEPR forecast includes fuel-cell vehicle adoption projections. While this analysis focuses on impacts from BEVs, it also assumes some customers are driving fuel cell vehicles.

[5] Sample values are used for larger data sets. In such instances, complete values are available in the Library.

2. Vehicles

This section provides I&A for vehicle forecasting:

- **BEV forecast** from IEPR, provides IOU-level vehicle count forecast
- **Vehicle registration data** can be used to develop more granular geographic forecasts; to supplement domicile data where gaps exist
- **Vehicle domicile location** can be used to develop more granular geographic forecasts at a higher precision than registration data, where available
- **Vehicle use cases** can inform behavior such as when and where vehicles will charge

BEV forecasts provide the foundation for TE planning. The forecasts identify the number of expected battery electric vehicles on the road over an analysis period. The BEV forecast is the most important factor in determining charging infrastructure, installed capacity, and power demand impacts. The primary source for electric BEV adoption in TEPP is the CEC's IEPR. The IEPR forecast includes multiple TE scenarios with different levels of BEV adoption, referred to as the Additional Achievable Transportation Electrification (AATE) scenarios.[6]

While the vehicle use cases addressed in TEPP encompass the majority of on-road vehicles, some use cases are excluded from the scope. Autonomous vehicles are not considered as a distinct vehicle use case, although underlying energy demand for autonomous vehicles is considered in the IEPR demand model. In addition, interurban buses and electric transportation refrigeration units (eTRUs) are not included in the current scope of TEPP as distinct vehicle use cases. However, energy associated with charging for interurban buses is included in the IEPR; energy associated with eTRUs is addressed in off-road portions of the IEPR.

The IEPR provides BEV adoption figures by vehicle class and IOU service areas as well as the rest of California. However, an accurate analysis of precise locational impacts for the CDM along one-mile-wide highway corridor segments requires more geographically granular vehicle counts.

[6] California Energy Commission, 2022. Additional Achievable Transportation Electrification (AATE). Available at https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/GetDocument.aspx?tn=247954

2.1. Input: Vehicle Forecast

The 2026 IEPR will be used for the initial implementation of TEPP. Since IEPR includes expected BEV adoption from California ZEV policies, incorporating the forecast into TEPP will help plan for necessary infrastructure to meet anticipated energy (kWh) and demand (kW) from these vehicles. Due to their generally unfamiliar class name and description, Table 2-1 lists IEPR non-bus BEV classes with definitions and examples.

TEPP aligns with IEPR across multiple inputs such as vehicle count, load shapes, VMT, and fuel efficiency. The TEPP Modeling I&A also includes the biannually updated IEPR forecast for vehicles-in-operation (VIO[7]).

Table 2-1. IEPR Vehicle Class[8] and Definitions

IEPR Class	GVWR[9] (lbs.)	Example Make & Models	Notes
CVC[10] PC (Commercial Passenger Car)	0–10,000	VW ID4	LD commercial passenger cars
CVC LT (Commercial Light Truck)	0–10,000	Rivian R1	LD commercial light trucks
PVC[11] PC (Personal Passenger Car)	0–10,000	Tesla Model 3	LD personally owned passenger cars
PVC LT (Personal Light Truck)	0–10,000	Ford F-150 Lightning	LD personally owned light trucks
Other PC (Passenger Car)	0–10,000	Nissan Ariya	LD government & rental passenger cars
Other LT (Light Truck)	0–10,000	Chevy Silverado EV	LD government & rental light trucks
GVWR3	10,001–14,000	GMC HUMMER EV	Class 3 Truck
GVWR4and5	GWVR 4: 14,001–16,000 GVWR 5: 16,001–19,500	Ford F-550	Class 4 and 5 Trucks

[7] Vehicles in operation refers to the total count of registered motor vehicles currently active on the road in a specific geographic area.
[8] Note that IEPR and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) classify MDHD vehicle classes beginning at Class 3 (GVWR > 10,000 lbs.), whereas the EPA, CARB, and CPUC classify MDHD vehicle classes beginning at Class 2b (GVWR > 8,500 lbs.)
[9] GVWR stands for Gross Vehicle Weight Rating; values based on Federal Highway Administration classification
[10] Commercial vehicle cluster, one of IEPR's light duty vehicle classes
[11] Personal vehicle cluster, one of IEPR's light duty vehicle classes

IEPR Class	GVWR[9] (lbs.)	Example Make & Models	Notes
GVWR4and5 Delivery	GWVR 4: 14,001–16,000 GVWR 5: 16,001–19,500	Ford E-Transit	Same as GVWR4and5, but for delivery applications
GVWR6	19,501–26,000	Workhorse W56	Class 6 Trucks
GVWR6 Delivery	19,501–26,000	Xos SV Step Van	Same as GVWR6, but for delivery applications
GVWR7	26,001–33,000	Freightliner eM2 108	Class 7 Trucks (Straight truck, all axles connected to single frame)
GVWR8_SU	>33,001	Volvo VNR Electric	Single-unit Class 8 Trucks
GVWR8 REFUSE AND RECYCLING	>33,001	Peterbilt 520EV	Used for refuse and recycling applications
GVWR8 COMBO	>33,001	Volvo VNR Electric	Combination trucks (Semi trucks, can detach from cargo)
GVWR8 IRP	>33,001	Tesla Semi	GVWR8 IRP
GVWR8 PORT	>33,001	Kenworth T680	Combination trucks operating at ports in California (e.g. day cab tractors, drayage trucks)
GVWR8_SU DUMP	>33,001	Peterbilt 520EV	Single-unit dump trucks
GVWR8 CAIRP	>33,001	Freightliner eCascadia	Same as GVWR8 IRP, but with fleet's base jurisdiction in CA
GVWR8 PUBLIC AND UTILITY	>33,001	Peterbilt 520EV	Public and utility applications trucks

IEPR forecasts BEV adoption by the vehicle classes in Table 2-1. Values for this input will be updated when the 2026 IEPR is available.

Table 2-2. BEV Forecast Sources & Assumptions

Source	Availability	Justification
CEC, IEPR, AATE 3 vehicle forecast scenario	Publicly available through public agency	AATE Scenario 3 recommended for TEPP because it is included in the "single forecast set" used by CPUC, CEC, and California Independent System Operator (CAISO).

2.1.1. Limitations

While the TEPP Modeling I&A was designed to identify and vet the best available data relevant to support future transportation analyses, some known limitations are described below to guide researchers and analysts in the best usage of the data.

2.1.1.1. Limitations

The TEPP Modeling I&A values will run to 2045, while the adopted IEPR forecast values run to 2040. To incorporate BEV adoption figures for the complete TEPP analysis period, the TEPP Modeling I&A will use CEC's 2041-2045 IEPR data, which is an extension of the IEPR forecast modeling results, but not a part of the adopted IEPR forecast.

2.1.1.2. Geographic Granularity

The IEPR forecast provides vehicle stock projections at the IOU level (e.g., Pacific Gas and Electric Company service area). However, the purpose of the CDM is to determine power demand impacts along granular highway corridor segments – for example, down a one-mile stretch of Interstate 5. To meet this need, the TEPP Modeling I&A will need to provide more geographically granular estimates for vehicle domicile locations (e.g., at ZIP Code Tabulation Areas (ZCTA), or at census tract level). The I&A will address this limitation from IEPR data through domicile location data for MDHD BEV (see Section 2.3 below) and registration data for LD BEV (see Section 2.4 below). Thus, MDHD vehicle telematics and LD vehicle registration data will be used to disaggregate IEPR IOU BEV forecasts to a more granular geography.

2.2. Input: IEPR LD Mapping

The CEC forecasts light-duty vehicle adoption across many classes including compact cars, mid-size SUVs, and minivans. For purposes of the TEPP, these classes can be combined into either light-trucks or passenger cars, since those vehicle types have significantly different fuel efficiency. The mapping from CEC's broad set of light-duty vehicle classes to those used in TEPP is available in Table 2-3.

Table 2-3. IEPR Light Duty Mapping

IEPR Light Duty Class	TEPP Light Duty Mapping
S Car-Midsize	Passenger Car
P SUV-Compact	Passenger Car
S SUV-Compact	Passenger Car
S Car-Compact	Passenger Car
P Car-Large	Passenger Car
S SUV-Subcompact	Passenger Car
S Car-Subcompact	Passenger Car
P Car-Compact	Passenger Car
P Car-Midsize	Passenger Car
S Car-Sport	Passenger Car
P Car-Subcompact	Passenger Car
S Car-Large	Passenger Car
P Car-Sport	Passenger Car
P SUV-Subcompact	Passenger Car
S SUV-Midsize	Light Truck
S Pickup-Std	Light Truck
S Pickup-Compact	Light Truck
S SUV-Large	Light Truck
P SUV-Midsize	Light Truck
S Van-Minivan	Light Truck
S Pickup-Heavy	Light Truck
S Van-Heavy	Light Truck
S Van-Std	Light Truck
P SUV-Large	Light Truck
P Van-Minivan	Light Truck
P Pickup-Std	Light Truck
S SUV-Heavy	Light Truck
P Van-Std	Light Truck
P Pickup-Heavy	Light Truck

Table 2-4. IEPR LD Mapping Sources & Assumptions

Source	Availability	Justification
CEC, IEPR, AATE 3 vehicle forecast scenario	Publicly available through public agency	For IEPR, the CEC rolls up vehicles by owner (commercial, personal, or other). However, there are significant differences in fuel efficiency between passenger cars and light trucks, which would influence charging needs. This LD mapping allows TEPP to distinguish between light trucks and passenger cars.

2.2.1. Limitations

Multiple light-duty classes are combined into passenger cars or light trucks. Though this may result in the loss of some granularity around charging impacts, the loss is negligible due to the relatively small difference in corridor charging along corridors for these vehicle types.

2.3. Input: Fleet Vehicle Location: Telematics

There is a well-known mismatch between vehicle registration locations and domicile location, especially for fleet vehicles. Therefore, the TEPP Modeling I&A recommends using telematics to determine where fleet vehicles are domiciled. This will give a more accurate estimate of trip origination, highway corridors used for vehicle travel, and where infrastructure should be located to meet those vehicles' charging needs. This data will be used to disaggregate fleet vehicles from the IEPR forecast to more geographically granular locations based on their actual activity.

The telematics data includes a sample of overall fleet vehicles. In order to extrapolate those figures to align with the IEPR forecast, Guidehouse crosswalked vehicle class and vocation information available in the Geotab dataset[12] to associated vehicles with IEPR classes.[13] Then Guidehouse estimated an expansion factor for each Geotab class and vocation combination to match IEPR vehicle estimates. Geotab provided its own expansion factor to extrapolate to state-level vehicle counts, but the Geotab value did not always match IEPR figures. To address discrepancies after applying the Geotab expansion factor, the research team estimated a final adjustment ratio for each class to true-up against IEPR vehicle counts. Then, the team crosswalked the final adjusted Geotab vehicles with associated IEPR classes to TEPP classes.

[12] Geotab vehicle classes are based on GVWR. Geotab vehicle vocations are based on operating patterns including domicile, stop locations, trip distances, duty cycles, and route characteristics

[13] See Corridor Disaggregation Methodology Appendix G. Expansion of Geotab Data of the CDM Workplan for more details regarding this process.

Table 2-5. Fleet Vehicle Domicile Location

Source	Availability	Justification
Geotab[14]	Due to CPUC contractual obligations with Geotab, raw aggregate data inputs from those data sets cannot be made publicly available. These sources and data sets are the best available at the time of this research, and are subject to change.	Including fleet vehicle domicile location will accurately determine where vehicle depots are and where they are likely to charge.

2.3.1. Limitations

The model applied these expansion and adjustment factors to all Geotab vehicles such that the total number of domiciled fleet vehicles matched IEPR state-level forecasts. While this telemetry data does provide confidence in domicile location and trips, there is a drawback in sample size.

A recognized risk associated with any sample-based expansion methodology is the potential for geographic concentration when a limited number of observed vehicles are scaled to represent a larger forecasted population. Guidehouse evaluated this risk during methodology development and determined that the benefits of preserving observed fleet activity patterns outweigh the limitations associated with reliance on registration locations. The methodology therefore prioritizes observed operating behavior while applying expansion factors across thousands of telematics observations statewide, reducing reliance on any individual vehicle or location.

To further mitigate potential over-concentration of expanded vehicle populations, vehicle domicile locations are used as one input to the broader corridor demand modeling framework rather than as the sole determinant of charging demand. Vehicle trips are distributed throughout the transportation network based on observed origin-destination activity, route assignment procedures, and corridor traffic characteristics. As a result, charging demand is informed by both where vehicles are based and where they actually travel, reducing sensitivity to any individual domicile location. This approach better reflects the distributed nature of fleet charging demand across California's transportation system.

[14] Geotab maintains data privacy for telematics data by excluding Origin/Destination details from vehicle trips at more granular levels if there are a limited number of organizations with Geotab devices to ensure that owners of vehicles cannot be discerned from the data sets.

2.4. Input: Personal Vehicle Location: Vehicle Registration

Precise and accurate estimates of charging infrastructure and energy impacts require geographically granular vehicle domicile locations. Registration data provides reliable locations at the ZCTA or census-tract level for personally owned LD BEV (IEPR class 'PVC'). The TEPP Modeling I&A uses vehicle registration data to determine census tract domicile locations for individually-owned LD vehicles.

Table 2-6. Personal Vehicle Domicile Location

Source	Availability	Justification
Mobility Global (formerly known as S&P Global)	Due to contractual obligations with commercial providers raw aggregate data inputs from those data sets cannot be made publicly available. These sources and data sets are the best available at the time of this research, and are subject to change.	Vehicle registration data obtained from the 'Vehicles in Operation National Vehicle Population Profile (NVPP) data dated January 1, 2024, for California, vehicles through class 8, includes geographically granular counts of all personally owned LD vehicles (IEPR class 'PVC') in California by zip code.

2.4.1. Limitations

Fleet vehicles may not be domiciled where they are registered, which would cause incorrect load growth estimates; however, vehicle registration data is a more reliable indicator of domicile location for individually owned LD vehicles.

2.5. Input: Vehicle Use Cases

The TEPP Modeling I&A will create vehicle use cases to model vehicle travel behavior and forecast anticipated BEV load and power demand growth at a localized geographic granularity. IEPR classes GVWR8 IRP and GVWR8 CAIRP are mapped to the long-haul truck vehicle use case, which are expected to mostly charge along highway corridors and have higher VMT than other Class 8 semi-trucks. Like long-haul trucks, bus and delivery truck use cases offer insight into when vehicles are being used and how much power they need to complete their trips.

Vehicle use cases are mapped to specific IEPR vehicle classes as shown in Table 2-7.

Table 2-7. Vehicle Use Cases

Duty	IEPR class	TEPP Vehicle Use Case	Example make	Example model
LDV	CVC (commercial vehicle)	Commercial Light Truck	Rivian	R1
	Other (government and rental)	Commercial Passenger Car	Nissan	Ariya
	PVC (personal vehicle)	Personal Light Truck	Ford	F-150 Lightning
		Personal Passenger Car	Ford	Mustang Mach-E
MDV	GVWR3	GVWR3 Pickup	GMC	HUMMER EV
	GVWR4and5	GVWR4-6 Delivery	Ford	E-Transit
	GVWR6			
	GVWR4and5 Delivery			
	GVWR6 Delivery			
HDV	GVWR7	GVWR7-8 Delivery	Freightliner	eM2
	GVWR7 Delivery			
	GVWR7 COMBO			
	GVWR8 COMBO	Short-Haul Truck	Volvo	VNR2
	GVWR8_SU			
	GVWR8 CAIRP	CA Long-Haul	Freightliner	eCascadia
	GVWR8 IRP	OOS* Long-Haul		
	GVWR8 PORT	Drayage Truck	Kenworth	T680
	GVWR8 REFUSE AND RECYCLING	Vocational Trucks	Peterbilt	520EV
	GVWR8 PUBLIC AND UTILITY			
	GVWR8_SU DUMP			
	Other Bus	Transit Bus	New Flyer	Xcelsior CHARGE NG
	Urban Bus			
	School Bus	School Bus	Blue Bird	Vision Electric

** Out of State*

Table 2-8. Vehicle Use Case Input Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
CEC	Publicly available through public agency	Reduced complexity by consolidating similar vehicles (e.g., GVWR4-6 delivery trucks). Combined IEPR classes have similar VMT and fuel efficiency and are expected to have similar charging needs (charging mostly at night at private charging stations).

2.5.1. Limitations

The justification for combining the IEPR vehicle classes into the use cases shown in Table 2-7 is that it will help reduce complexity and make the results easier to understand. The limitation of this approach is that it may reduce important differentiation across classes. An additional limitation is the combining of government and rental light-duty vehicles into the "Other" category. There are some key differences between these vehicle types, for example, government vehicles are subject to the Advanced Clean Fleets ZEV sales mandates, and rental vehicles have higher VMT than individually owned vehicles.

There are some situations where developing more granularity for vehicle classes in future iterations of the CDM could provide additional insights. For example, LD taxis and rentals have significantly different driving patterns compared to typical commercial vehicles.

Use cases and routes for BEV are at different stages of development, with MDHD being the least developed. The I&A could be updated as the market evolves, and as driving behaviors and public and private charging assumptions change.

3. Charging Infrastructure

This section provides inputs and assumptions to determine the infrastructure necessary to support different vehicle types and their use cases. These assumptions include both charger power level by vehicle use case and charging accessibility (public or private). BEVs are assumed to charge at either private (depot, home, work) or public charging ports. Shared public charging, where multiple fleets or operators charge at the same location, is becoming an increasingly important component of MDHD electrification. Shared charging, including subscriber-based models, provides another option for vehicles operating beyond home depots or for fleets that do not have access to dedicated charging infrastructure. In TEPP, shared public charging is classified as "public charging". Additional details about the allocation of vehicle charging to public or private ports are available in Section 3.2. Charger attribute inputs were compiled from multiple sources, considering data availability and the methodologies utilized to generate the inputs.

3.1. Input: Power Preference and Suitability

The TEPP Modeling I&A will use insights from Guidehouse-conducted commercial fleet manager interviews to inform whether vehicle use cases charge with Level 2 (L2, currently around 12 kW)[15] or DCFC (≥ 50 kW)[16] ports. Guidehouse-led interviews with large fleet managers in California and across the US have indicated a preference for L2 depot charging when possible, due to operational effectiveness, cost, permitting, and expediency. Using the VMT and fuel efficiency values in Sections 4.1 and 4.2, the I&A will calculate[17] whether vehicles would have enough time to recharge using L2 ports. This calculation will incorporate changes in fuel efficiency over time. Even if vehicles are expected to mostly rely on L2 charging, light-duty and medium-duty fleet managers are assumed to have DCFC ports available for emergencies. Consequently, vehicles associated with L2 depot charging are also assumed to occasionally use DCFC and public charging.

Table 3-1. Power Preference and Suitability Input Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
Guidehouse, commercial fleet manager interviews	Publicly available through public agency	Associating charging levels with vehicle use cases increases both precision and accuracy.
NLR EVI Pro-Lite	Publicly available through research agency	EVI Pro-Lite provides charging use case estimates (e.g., L2 Home and DCFC Public) for personally owned vehicles (IEPR class 'PVC').

[15] The long-run L2 charging power is assumed to be 22 kW
[16] While some DC chargers can provide 30 or 40 kW, the TEPP Modeling I&A is using 50 kW for modeling purposes.
[17] This calculation is available in Appendix A

3.1.1. Limitations

This input assumes charging power preferences derived from fleet manager interviews represent the actual average and do not change over time. As the EVSE network expands, NLR's EVI Pro-Lite indicates personally owned LD BEV (IEPR class 'PVC') will use more intercity DC charging for uses like vacation travel. These assumptions are features of the underlying data.

Additionally, because charging power preferences are derived from currently available data sources and interviews, they will not capture changes in technology-driven preferences such as alternative battery chemistries/designs, which are better suited for DCFC[18].

3.2. Input: Vehicles per Charger

For fleet vehicles, the TEPP Modeling I&A incorporates the assumptions of fleet managers' preference for L2 depot charging and that depots will optimize and have more vehicles per DCFC port in the future. Vehicles per charger is a ratio that identifies how charging infrastructure scales with vehicles on the road. In a simplified example, if a fleet has five vehicles that all share the same DCFC port the vehicle to charger ratio would be 5-to-1. The number of vehicles per charger and its active charging utilization[19] are important metrics for investment costs and cost recovery. With low utilization numbers, the port is less active in charging and generally would take longer to recover the costs incurred to install the stations. The Second CEC Assembly Bill (AB) 2127 Report[20] estimated 2023 utilization for 250 kW and 350 kW chargers to be 5% and 2.5%, respectively.[21] The same report suggested utilization would increase over the next ten years to 8.5% and 7% respectively. Assuming average VMT per vehicle does not change, this increase in utilization indicates more vehicles per charger. This progression is aligned with organizational incentives to save on capital costs for charging stations through an increase in utilization.

Individual vehicle per charger values come from current BEV fleet operations across a variety of charging use cases (e.g., LD fleets, school bus depot, medium-duty depot, and drayage). The TEPP Modeling I&A will estimate current vehicle per charger values for public charging by dividing the number of registered MDHD or LD BEVs in California by the number of ports designated for the same duty vehicles from the Alternative Fuels Data Center (AFDC).[22] For example, there are projected to be 1,662,818 LD BEVs in California in 2024, and AFDC indicates there are 12,577 DCFC ports in the state. That results in a vehicle per charger value of 132.

For long-term (i.e., 2045) personally owned LD (IEPR class 'PVC') vehicle per charger ratios, the I&A uses NLR's EVI Pro-Lite assumptions about EVSE availability, vehicle trips, and charger demand. These vehicles per charger values are not stating that a fast charger can support 90 LDV in 2024 (see Table 3-2), but rather that for every 90 LDV, there would be one fast charger. The majority of LDV will not use a fast charger at all, as they are expected to mostly rely on home charging. The

[18] Liu, Yayuan, Yangying Zhu, and Yi Cui. "Challenges and opportunities towards fast-charging battery materials." Nature Energy 4.7 (2019): 540-550.; Li, Matthew, et al. "Fast charging Li-ion batteries for a new era of electric vehicles." Cell Reports Physical Science 1.10 (2020).
[19] https://www.osti.gov/biblio/2203906
[20] The MDHD portion of this report, which provided estimates for more powerful chargers, was powered by LBNL's HEVI-LOAD model.
[21] https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/GetDocument.aspx?tn=251866&DocumentContentId=86859 (page C-2)
[22] https://afdc.energy.gov/stations#/analyze?region=US-CA&maximum_vehicle_class=MD

number of vehicles per charger for both public and private charging is assumed to increase over time for many charging use cases. The logic behind this assumption is that depot fleet managers and public site operators will seek to maximize utilization to improve efficiency and reduce costs. Charger sites will increase utilization by having fewer ports per vehicle as EVs saturate the market.

The complete set of vehicle per charger values along with sources are available in the "Vehicles per Charger" tab of the Library. For example, an article looking at Amazon electric delivery vans indicated there were 10,000 ports for 12,000 vehicles. Amazon's electric delivery trucks would need several hours to recharge with an L2 port or less than an hour with a fast charger. This indicates the electric delivery trucks are most likely using L2 ports and have a 1-to-1 vehicle-to-charger ratio.

Table 3-2 provides examples of vehicle charging applications such as public transportation corridor charging and MD vehicle depots. The Library includes the full set of vehicle per charger values.

Of note in Table 3-2 below, no change is expected in long-term charging for private LD fleet depot DCFC charging (first row in the table) due to private LD fleet managers' preference for L2 over DCFC due to cost, convenience, and simplified permitting compared to DCFC, and preference to rely on DCFC just for emergency backup. L2 charging has been found to be suitable for LD fleet vehicles, which have lengthy dwell times due to duty cycle and relatively low charging needs. This has reduced the need for fleet managers to invest in expensive fast charging.

Conversely, public LD fleet (intercity) DCFC applications are expected to increase in the long-term, as more vehicles are expected to charge along interstate highways. The assumption here, validated by the Second AB 2127 report, is that public DCFC charging will have higher utilization in the future, resulting in a higher vehicle per charge value as shown in the second row of Table 3-2. Intercity charging is currently focused on establishing continuity between cities, even while charger utilization is relatively low. As EV adoption grows and driver confidence in intercity charging availability goes up, utilization is expected to increase. This will present through the number of EVs using intercity charging growing at a faster rate than the number of ports themselves.

Table 3-2. Example Vehicle per Charger Values

Ownership	Charging application	Charging technology	Vehicles per charger current	Vehicles per charger long-term*	Source
Private	LDV Fleet (depot)	DCFC	33	33	Amazon
Public	LDV Fleet (intercity)	DCFC	132	333	† AFDC
Public	Highway Corridor (intercity) (HDV)	DCFC	90.0	100	†
Private	HDV non-Delivery Depot	DCFC	5.0	10	PepsiCo Pilot
Public	Hub (regional) (MDV and HDV)	DCFC	90.0	200	†
Private	Long-Haul Depot (HDV)	DCFC	2.5	5	PepsiCo Pilot
Private	MDV Depot	DCFC	50.0	50	‡
Private	MDV Depot	L2	1.0	1	§

** Long run values assume charging technology maturation in 15-20 years when the vehicle population is roughly 50% electric. Maturation date varies across classes with all MDHD assumed mature in 2037 and LD in 2039 according to IEPR forecast.*

† 50% of 2026 vehicle-to-charger ratio in CA based on Mobility Global (formerly known as S&P Global) registrations and AFDC.

‡ For delivery trucks and school buses, the low annual VMT and fleet manager interviews suggest they will use L2 charging, likely on a 1-to-1 ratio, with some DCFC backup charging.

§ Amazon has an estimated 10K delivery trucks and 12K charging stations.[23]

[23] https://www.aboutamazon.com/news/transportation/everything-you-need-to-know-about-amazons-electric-delivery-vans-from-rivian

Table 3-3. Vehicles per Charger Input Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
Amazon article	Publicly available through commercial entity	This input differentiates the number of vehicles per charger by charging application, allowing for more precision in analysis. Note that although the Second AB 2127 Report, also has analogous inputs, output powered by LBNL's HEVI-LOAD model does not provide the granularity sought by the TEPP analysis.
PepsiCo Pilot	Publicly available through research agency	
AFDC station locator	Publicly available through public agency	
Bloomberg news article	Publicly available through news agency	
PR Newswire article	Publicly available through news agency	
SFMTA	Publicly available through public agency	

3.2.1. Limitations

Since BEV electrification is still nascent, especially for heavier vehicles, some inputs are based on fleet manager preferences, duty cycle estimates, or pilots. Such inputs may require updating as real-word applications scale and provide insight into how, when, and where BEVs charge.

3.3. Input: Charger Power

The TEPP Modeling I&A will use charger power values by charging application. Most L2 charging is currently assumed to use 12 kW power,[24] and is expected to increase to 22 kW such as those available through ABB.[25] DCFC power levels typically range from 50 kW to 3 MW in power output (see Table 3-4). For example, DCFC power assumptions were taken from existing pilot projects such as PepsiCo's Tesla Semi distribution operations. PepsiCo uses 750 kW chargers for their Tesla Semi fleet. Similarly, Amazon has 50 kW charging stations for delivery vans as a backup to their preferred L2 ports.

Charger power is expected to vary by charging application, charger technology and time as illustrated in Table 3-4. The Library includes annual charger power estimates by charging use case. While the CEC's MDHD charging infrastructure dashboard[26] shows that completed stations average 400 kW per port, there are new charging infrastructure under development rated at 1 MW or more per port, known as Megawatt Charging System (MCS). Consequently, the I&A assumes MDHD public charging along corridors to use MCS in the near term.

[24] This is due to the common configuration of 240v ports on 50-amp breakers. Many vehicles have max AC charging speeds of 11.5 kW, determined by the vehicle's onboard inverter - North America EV charging connector types | Enel X Way

[25] https://new.abb.com/ev-charging

[26] Publicly Accessible Medium- and Heavy-Duty Zero-Emission Vehicle Charging or Hydrogen Refueling Station

Table 3-4. Current and Long-Run Charging Power Estimates

Ownership	Charging application	Charging technology	Current rated kW	Long run rated kW*	Source
Public	LDV Intercity	DCFC	150	350	CEC
Private	LDV Depot	DCFC	50	100	Amazon
Private	LDV	L2	12	22	AFDC
Private	MDV Depot	L2	12	22	AFDC
Private	MDV Depot	DCFC	50	300	Amazon NLR
Private	HDV non-Delivery Depot	DCFC	350	1000	Forum Mobility
Private	HDV Delivery Depot	L2	12	22	AFDC
Public	MD & HD Hub (regional)	DCFC	350	1000	AFDC
Private	Transit Bus Depot	DCFC	100	150	FTA Report
Private	School Bus Depot	L2	12	19.2	AFDC
Private	School Bus Depot	DCFC	60	150	School Transportation News
Private	HD Port (Drayage)	DCFC	350	1000	Forum Mobility
Private	HD Long-Haul Depot	DCFC	750	1000	PepsiCo Pilot
Public	HD Highway Corridor (intercity)	DCFC	750	3000	PepsiCo Pilot

** Long run values assume charging technology maturation in 15-20 years when the vehicle population is roughly 50% electric in the IEPR forecast. Values will grow from current-to-long run rated kW in a linear fashion. These values are driven by the IEPR forecast, and do not affect vehicle adoption.*

Table 3-5. Charger Power Input Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
CEC	Publicly available through public agency	This input differentiates charger power by vehicle use cases, allowing for more precision in analysis. Note that although the Second AB 2127 Report also has analogous inputs, output powered by LBNL's HEVI-LOAD model does not provide the granularity sought by the TEPP analysis.
AFDC	Publicly available through public agency	
Amazon	Publicly available through news agency	
NLR whitepaper	Publicly available through research agency	
FTA Research	Publicly available through public agency	
School Transport News	Publicly available through news agency	
Forum Mobility	Publicly available through news agency	
ChargePoint MW Charging announcement	Publicly available through commercial entity	
PepsiCo Pilot	Publicly available through research agency	

3.3.1. Limitations

The key question for charger power is whether assumptions about future charger power will be accurate. MDHD BEV DCFC power levels are expected to increase in the future just as observed in the case of LD BEV DCFC. Initial LD BEV DCFC had a maximum limit of 50 kW, but now is available up to 350 kW.[27,28] Higher charging in the MW range is already being explored but will be slow to install, quite costly, and will require substantial investment in transmission and distribution.[29] It's possible that transmission and distribution challenges or solutions could make future charging either lower or higher than assumed. As successful business models for private and especially public charging emerge, assumptions regarding future charger power in the TEPP Modeling I&A can be further refined.

[27] R&D Insights for Extreme Fast Charging of Medium- and Heavy-Duty Vehicles: Insights from the NLR Commercial Vehicles and Extreme Fast Charging Research Needs Workshop (energy.gov)
[28] Alternative Fuels Data Center: Procurement and Installation for Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure (energy.gov)
[29] The power of moving loads: Cost analysis of megawatt charging in Europe (raponline.org)

4. Grid Impacts

This section provides I&A for estimating the energy demand associated with BEV operations. The energy needed to power electric vehicles can be calculated by multiplying a vehicle's fuel efficiency and VMT (see Figure 4 1 below). That energy will then be allocated to different charging use cases with public charging filling in for trips that are beyond vehicles' range from charging at depots. Trip data will provide an indication of the proportion of a vehicle's VMT that could be expected to require public charging. This energy for public and private charging will then be allocated to time of day according to load shapes by charging use case (e.g., school bus depot or highway corridor charging).

Figure 4-1. Vehicle Energy Calculation

Class (a)	Powertrain (c)	Annual VMT (d)	Fuel Efficiency (e)	Energy (kWh = d*e)
Passenger Car	BEV	10,000 miles	0.3 kWh/mile	3,000

4.1. Input: "Fuel" Efficiency

Fuel efficiency is a measure of the number of miles a vehicle can travel per kWh consumed. Values vary by vehicle use case and duty with smaller vehicles able to drive multiple miles per kWh, while semi-trucks travel less than one.

The TE Modeling I&A will use BEV "fuel" efficiency values from the CEC's IEPR. CEC's IEPR fuel efficiency values do not include regional differentiation or incorporate EPA MOVES4 values. Table 4-1 provides fuel efficiency estimates by vehicle use case.

Table 4-1. Fuel Efficiency by Vehicle Use Case

Duty	Vehicle Use Case	Fuel Efficiency kWh/mile (2024)	Fuel Efficiency kWh/mile (2045)	Source
LD	Light Truck (Personal and Commercial)	0.433	0.410	CEC
LD	Passenger Car (Personal and Commercial)	0.281	0.287	CEC
MDHD	GVWR3 Pickup	0.586	0.586	CEC
MDHD	GVWR 4-6 Delivery	1.061	1.032	CEC
MDHD	GVWR 7-8 Delivery	1.068	1.016	CEC
MDHD	Short-Haul Truck	1.804	1.764	CEC
MDHD	Vocational Truck	1.807	1.755	CEC
MDHD	CA Long Haul Truck	1.818	1.773	CEC
MDHD	OOS Long Haul Truck	0.000	1.773	CEC
MDHD	School Bus	1.804	1.804	CEC
MDHD	Transit Bus	1.634	1.634	CEC
MDHD	Drayage	1.786	1.750	CEC

Table 4-2. Fuel Efficiency Input Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
CEC	Publicly available through public agency	These inputs provide transparent, publicly accessible, and traceable fuel efficiency figures derived from telemetry data.

4.1.1. Limitations

The key limitation around fuel efficiency is the accuracy of future estimates. These estimates are based on historical improvements and anticipated research and development investments but are still uncertain, especially toward the end of the study analysis. Current estimates also are dependent on the existing vehicle mix, including drag coefficient and weight. These may change over time as consumer preferences, technology, and OEM designs change.

4.2. Input: Vehicle Miles Traveled

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) represents the number of miles a vehicle is expected to travel during a given year. For the initial implementation, the TEPP Modeling I&A will use annual VMT values that are specific to California from CEC's IEPR 2026 forecast. VMT estimates will be used to calculate per-vehicle energy impacts. They indicate the number of miles a vehicle travels in a year. VMT, along with other indicators of vehicle lifetime costs such as fuel efficiency, fuel price, and maintenance cost, determines operating expenditure estimates. VMT plays a crucial role in the downstream effects of estimating overall Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) and powertrain market share.

VMT will be the same by vehicle use case regardless of what fuel a vehicle uses (BEV, Hydrogen, Diesel, etc.).

Table 4-3. Vehicle Miles Traveled Input Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
CEC, IEPR, AATE 3 vehicle forecast scenario	Publicly available through public agency	AATE Scenario 3 recommended for TEPP because it is included in the "single forecast set" used by CPUC, CEC, and California Independent System Operator (CAISO).

4.2.1. Limitations

While the industry has credible VMT estimates for light-duty BEVs, there is more uncertainty regarding assumptions for electrified MDHD BEVs. This is due to the lack of real-world evidence for larger electrified MDHD BEVs and how their trip lengths, on average, may be impacted over time.

4.3. Input: Driving Range

The TEPP Modeling I&A will use electric driving range values by vehicle use case from the DOE's AFDC. Driving range indicates the expected miles a vehicle can travel based on its battery size, capacity, and efficiency. Driving range will play a key role in determining how far BEVs can travel (in miles) before needing to recharge.

Table 4-4 provides assumptions on the driving range for electric vehicles by duty and use case. Research for this I&A did not find any future projections for MDHD range. Subsequently, this I&A chose to keep MDHD range static while the market matures and determines successful business models. Future updates to the I&A could adjust range values once there is more clarity around whether MDHDs charge at depots or public stations, the co-evolution of charging preference with public charging targeted to MDHDs, and whether fleet managers are willing to pay more for increased driving range.

Table 4-4. BEV Driving Range by Duty and Vehicle Use Case

Duty	Vehicle Use Case	2024 Driving Range (Miles)	2030 Driving Range (Miles)	Source[30]
LDV	Personal	250	350	AFDC (2024); BNEF (2030)
LDV	Commercial	250	350	
MDV	GVWR 4-6 Delivery	200	200	
MDV	GVWR3 Pickup	200	200	
HDV	GVWR 7-8 Delivery	150	150	
HDV	Short-Haul Truck	150	150	
HDV	Vocational Truck	150	150	
HDV	CA Long Haul Truck	500	500	
HDV	OOS Long Haul Truck	300	300	
HDV	School Bus	120	120	
HDV	Transit Bus	200	200	
HDV	Drayage	275	275	

Table 4-5. BEV Driving Range Input Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
AFDC	Publicly available through public agency	Data sets provide driving range values for most BEVs in the US.
BNEF	Publicly available through research agency	Data sets provide driving range values for most BEVs in the US.

[30] 2024 values are from AFDC and 2030 values are from BNEF. The 2030 BNEF values were the latest identified through researching future driving ranges.

4.3.1. Limitations

This input assumes that driving range is similar for passenger cars and light trucks based on research reviewing vehicle model specifications provided by AFDC. Range is determined by variables such as weight, drag, elevation, and driving speed, which contribute to efficiency, and battery capacity. There is considerable variation in driving range across MDHD BEV types and use cases. For example, the Tesla Semi has an estimated range of 500 miles while the Freightliner eCascadia has an estimated range of 230 miles.[31] It may be a challenge to capture variation in driving range within the same vehicle use case, especially as cargo weight can vary dramatically. Eventually, long-haul trucks are expected to have a range closer to 500 miles in order to drive on cross-country routes. Like other inputs, this will also depend on technology improvements over time, which are inherently uncertain. It's also possible that future LDVs will have different driving ranges based on use case. Delivery trucks that only drive 100 miles in a day may have less range (and associated lower battery costs) than personal vehicles where customers expect similar range to ICEVs.

4.4. Input: Trip Data

The TEPP Modeling I&A will incorporate trip data from two key sources. Firstly, individually owned (IEPR class 'PVC') trip data comes from Oak Ridge National Laboratory's (ORNL) National Household Transportation Survey. Secondly, LD and MDHD fleet trip data is sourced from more than 100,000 vehicles in Geotab's telemetry data set. These data sets provide the distribution of trips for different vehicle types and use cases. The distribution of VMT by trip length identifies trips that could not be conducted on the basis for allocating energy to depot or public charging, in a process explained in Section 4.5. Trip data combined with domicile/registration location and traffic data determines where vehicles are traveling along highway corridors and where they would likely need to recharge.

Table 4-6. Trip Data Input Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
Oak Ridge National Lab National Household Transportation Survey (NHTS)	Publicly available through public agency	Represents the best-known source for personal vehicle trip data.
Geotab	Due to contractual obligations with commercial providers raw aggregate data inputs from those data sets cannot be made publicly available. These sources and data sets are the best available at the time of this research, and are subject to change.	Represents the best-known source for commercial vehicle trip data

[31] https://afdc.energy.gov/vehicles/search

4.4.1. Limitations

The trip data is based on ICEV trips, so it assumes that electric BEV will make similar trips.

4.5. Input: Public vs Private Charging Allocation

To determine whether vehicles will use public or private charging, the TEPP Modeling I&A will use values from NRL, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and Federal Transit Authority (FTA), supplemented with additional telemetry data from Geotab. As identified earlier, fleet managers interviewed by Guidehouse indicated a preference to charge at depots to ensure operational effectiveness. However, an analysis of vehicle trip distance and expected driving range using Geotab's telemetry data indicated a proportion of trips for different vehicle use cases (e.g., LD fleet vehicles, transit buses and delivery trucks) are expected to require recharging mid-trip. This charging is assumed to occur at public stations. In Table 4-7, for example, HD BEV delivery trucks are assumed to charge 90% at private depots and 10% at public ports.[32] The complete set of charging allocation assumptions are available in the Library.

According to NLR's EVI Pro-Lite tool, currently 99% of charging for personally owned vehicles (IEPR class 'PVC') occurs at local charging ports (e.g., home, work, market[33]), while 1% uses intercity charging such as Telsa's superchargers (TEPP designates charging use case this as LDV intercity in Table 3-4). This proportion of intercity charging is expected to increase to 3% by 2045 as more high-speed charging ports are installed and used along highway corridors. Most charging for long-haul trucks is expected to come from public charging ports since they don't return to depots in the same day and trips may extend multiple days, or even weeks. The analysis indicated a 29% / 71% split between private and public charging for long-haul vehicles. HDV BEV completing shorter trips such as short-haul trucks have an 89% / 11% private versus public charging allocation. Pilot projects from transit buses have reflected 82% of charging at private bus depots and 18% at public chargers. Advances in charging infrastructure for these buses allows for wireless charging at bus stops, so these vehicles can get a top-off on their regular route. School buses are assumed to charge primarily at private depots, given that these vehicles have significant down-time outside of school hours. Current assumptions for delivery trucks, and specialized vocational vehicles (e.g., refuse trucks) is that most recharging will occur at private depots. Recent port electrification plans indicate some drayage vehicle charging will occur at ports. This value could be updated based on interviews with fleet managers to determine their charging preferences (depot vs public) and charging infrastructure availability.[34,35]

[32] All vehicle charging allocation should sum up to 1.
[33] Market charging is at locations such as pharmacies or grocery stores
[34] aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/technology-research/annual-reports-and-plan-updates/2023annualreport_2024planupdate_final.pdf?sfvrsn=8
[35] California Ports Will Invest $25 Million to Boost Truck Charging Infrastructure

This input is based on ICEV trip data and assumes that BEV driving behavior remains similar to that of ICEVs. For that reason, most allocation values do not change between 2024 and 2045. However, that reasoning does not hold for personal vehicles where driving behavior for BEVs and ICEVs is expected to change along with the installation of more intercity charging. This input assumes an increasing proportion of personal[36] long-distance travel will use EVs and is in-line with the CEC's California Electric Vehicle Infrastructure for Long-Distance Travel.[37]

[36] Personally owned vehicles (IEPR class 'PVC')
[37] California Electric Vehicle Infrastructure for Long-Distance Travel

Table 4-7. Example Allocation of Vehicle Energy to Public and Private Ports

Vehicle Duty	Vehicle Use Case*	Charging Use Case	Charger Ownership	2024 Charging Allocation	2045 Charging Allocation	Source
LDV	Commercial	Intercity	Public	3%	3%	Geotab
LDV	Personal	Intercity	Public	1%	4%	NLR[38]
HDV	GVWR 7-8 Delivery	Delivery Truck Depot	Private	90%	90%	Geotab
HDV	GVWR 7-8 Delivery	Hub	Public	10%	10%	Geotab
MDV	GVWR 4-6 Delivery	Delivery Truck Depot	Private	96%	96%	Geotab
MDV	GVWR 4-6 Delivery	Hub	Public	4%	4%	Geotab
HDV	Drayage	Port Depot	Private	50%	50%	FHWA
HDV	Drayage	Hub	Public	50%	50%	FHWA
HDV	CA Long-Haul Truck	Long-Haul Depot	Private	29%	29%	FHWA
HDV	CA Long-Haul Truck	Highway Corridor	Public	71%	71%	FHWA
HDV	Short-Haul Truck	HDV Depot	Private	89%	89%	FHWA
HDV	Short-Haul Truck	Hub	Public	11%	11%	FHWA
HDV	Transit Bus	Transit Bus Depot	Private	82%	82%	FTA Research Report
HDV	Transit Bus	Hub	Public	18%	18%	FTA Research Report

** Rows are shaded to indicate charging for the same vehicle. For example, HDV delivery trucks are assumed to charge 94% at depots and 6% at public ports.*

[38] Evi Pro Lite (NLR.gov)
2024 value assumed 100% access to home charging
2045 results assumed 50% access to home charging

Table 4-8. Allocation of Vehicle Energy Input Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
NLR	Publicly available through public agency	These sources represent the best known for vehicle trip data which provide the underlying assumptions for public vs depot charging. Note that although the Second AB 2127 Report also has analogous inputs, outputs powered by LBNL's HEVI-LOAD model does not provide the granularity sought by the TEPP analysis.
FHWA	Publicly available through public agency	
FTA	Publicly available through public agency	
Geotab	Due to contractual obligations with commercial providers raw aggregate data inputs from those data sets cannot be made publicly available. These sources and data sets are the best available at the time of this research, and are subject to change.	

4.5.1. Limitations

Assumptions about private vs public charging preference are based on expected BEV duty cycles. However, duty cycles are not a perfect indicator. Fleet managers could change duty cycles to prioritize depot charging, reducing the need for public charging. Conversely, lengthy permitting and grid installation periods may force fleet managers to rely on public charging as opposed to their stated preference for depot charging. For LD, it is unclear whether individuals will have similar driving patterns with BEV as they do for ICEV, and the extent to which drivers will utilize DCFC charging at highway corridors for local trips.

4.6. Input: Load Shapes

The TEPP Modeling I&A includes the CEC's hourly power demand load shapes for BEV by use case (e.g., long-haul truck and transit bus), and by month and day of week (weekday/weekend). Load shapes allocate energy to the hour of day.

Hub and long-haul depot load shapes are based on NLR data, and all other use cases will be based on 2026 IEPR data, which blends charging technologies (L1, L2, and DCFC).

Table 4-9. Load Shape Input Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
CEC	Public	These inputs provide transparent, publicly accessible, and traceable hourly load shape data broken out by use case and TAC area (Transmission Access Charge

4.6.1. Limitations

MDHD EV load shapes are based on ICEV trips and assume BEVs will have similar driving behavior as their ICEV counterparts. LD load shapes assume future intercity charging will be similar to current-day behavior.

Empirically derived load shapes are based on actual charging session data, and as such, are a product of technological, behavioral, social systems that can change over time. Changes in electric rates, battery technology, charger technology, commute behavior, etc. can all affect load shapes in important ways.

These load shapes also blend charging technologies (L1, L2, DCFC), which may make more granular analysis challenging.

4.7. Input: State of Charge (SOC)

The TEPP Modeling I&A includes inputs for customer charging preferences with respect to state of change (SOC[39]). SOC, together with the vehicle's driving range (Section 4.3) and distance-to-destination trip data (Section 4.4), will influence the vehicle's demand for charging along a highway corridor.

The influence of state of charge of a vehicle on the vehicle owners' public charging behavior has been simulated or evaluated in academic settings for personally owned vehicles[40] with no clear generalizable conclusion that can be found at this time. Charging behavior has also been shown to be influenced by socioeconomic attributes, risk tolerance, and "charging inertia," as well as trip and vehicle related variables.[41] As fleet driving needs and charging behavior are region dependent, Guidehouse recommends using available data gathered from the state of California to inform charging behavior assumptions. In this I&A, SOC assumptions are consistent across commercial LD and MDHD vehicles. Personally owned vehicles are assumed to be more variable, with SOC dipping below 20%. For commercial vehicles, research indicates fleet managers require charging before vehicle SOC reaches 20%.

The "Advanced Plug-in Electric Vehicle Travel and Charging Behavior Final Report," conducted by UC Davis and funded under CARB Contract 12-319 provides a reference for the average state of charge associated with public DCFC charging in the state of California.

The probability of charging at public stations associated with the state of charge of the vehicle can be used to inform the likelihood of public charging need and corresponding load estimates. The 'Modeling Charging Behavior of Battery Electric Vehicle Drivers: A Cumulative Prospect Theory Based Approach' study conducted by Oak Ridge National Laboratory provides a reference for the density of charging associated with a vehicle's initial state of charge. Guidehouse leverages this study's density curve to directly inform the probability distribution of public charging given states

[39] SOC represents an electric vehicle battery's energy levels as a percentage, and is analogous to the fuel gauge of a gasoline-powered vehicle

[40] https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1361920922003169

[41] https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1155/2024/9926334

of charge for individually owned vehicles. Given the relative lack of public charging data for commercially owned vehicles, Guidehouse developed a probability distribution of public charging. Guidehouse deduced the probability of charge at different states of charge for commercially owned vehicles by modifying the individually owned probability distribution to fit the constraints identified in the North American Council for Freight Efficiency (NACFE) study.

Table 4-10. Charging Behavior Source, Availability, and Justification

Assumption Item	Value	Source	Availability	Justification
Average state of charge (SOC) at start of public charging session	35%	UC Davis	Publicly available through public agency	Provides California-based evidence for state of charge associated with actual public charging behavior
Probability of charging below 20% SOC	<1%	North American Council for Freight Efficiency (NACFE)	Publicly available through research agency	Provides reference for state of charge associated with truck trips based on real-world trucking demonstrations
Probability of charging above 90% SOC	<1%	North American Council for Freight Efficiency (NACFE)	Publicly available through research agency	Provides reference for state of charge associated with truck trips based on real-world trucking demonstrations

4.7.1. Limitations

The 'Advanced Plug-in Electric Vehicle Travel and Charging Behavior Final Report' covers personally owned vehicles, not commercially owned vehicles. As studies indicate that public charging preferences are driven by a variety of factors including socioeconomic and risk tolerance factors rather than SOC, there is uncertainty with the extent to which SOC and charging behavior data can solely be used to predict likelihood of public charging.

4.8. Input: Tract Drayage Operations

Since drayage operations typically use semi-trucks with higher annual VMT values (e.g., 45,000 miles), they represent a vehicle class with potentially large public charging needs. Furthermore, since the drayage market has a higher prevalence of small fleets and owner-operators,[42] this segment is expected to rely more on public charging than large corporate shipping companies with well-financed fleet depots.

[42] Companies with 20 trucks or fewer account for 72% of the operators and one-quarter of the drayage trucks serving the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach - https://labusinesscouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/LABC-ACF-Report-Full-Report-5.pdf

Geotab vehicle classes and vocations do not specifically identify drayage operations, so the I&A uses US Census business type and employment data to determine where drayage vehicles would be domiciled. This approach identifies ZCTA's with NAICS codes that indicate drayage operations (e.g., 483113 – costal and great lakes freight transportation) and allocates drayage vehicles from the IEPR forecast to those geographic areas. The accompanying I&A Library includes the full table of Census Tract to NAICS Code mapped values under its 'Tract Drayage Operations' tab.

Table 4-11. Drayage Operations Source, Availability, and Justification

Assumption Item	Source	Availability	Justification
Drayage operations location	Census	Publicly available through public agency	Provides an indication of where drayage operations occur, and associated vehicles would be domiciled.

4.8.1. Limitations

Drayage operations employment data does not necessarily indicate where drayage vehicles would be domiciled, so there is some uncertainty about the accuracy of allocating vehicles to these census tracts. A future research consideration to address this uncertainty could be to interview drayage operators to understand where drayage vehicles are actually domiciled, as compared to where they may be registered.

5. Geospatial Layers

This section provides I&A for thirteen[43] geospatial layers that provide geographic granularity and locational characteristics for California highway corridor segments and nearby communities. The layers include geospatial data, air quality indicators, utility service territories, environmental and social justice attributes, and charging infrastructure.

5.1. Input: California Counties

TEPP will address corridors for 58 California counties.

Table 5-1. California Counties Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
Census Tiger Lines	Publicly available through public agency	This is a commonly used geographic information system (GIS) shapefile for county borders.

5.1.1. Limitations

No known limitations for county boundary files. Technical documentation of these files is available through the U.S. Census.[44]

5.2. Input: Freight Analysis Framework 5 Model

The TEPP Modeling I&A will include the Federal Highway Administration's Freight Analysis Framework, Version 5 (FAF 5) Model, specifically the FAF 5 Network Links and FAF 5 Estimates of Truck Flow for Year 2022 – Base Line Scenario and will use the FAF5 annual projections of traffic volume out to 2050. The FAF 5 Network Links is a geodatabase that includes all roads in the National Highway System and the National Highway Freight Network, showing traffic flows by highway corridor segment at five-mile increments. This geodatabase will be combined with the FAF 5 Estimates of Truck Flow for Year 2022 – Base Line Scenario to associate the roads with daily truck trips flow (AADT). The resulting linear shapefile will identify a comprehensive road network in California and the travel patterns of MDHD BEVs along those roads.

[43] Additional geospatial layers could be added based on stakeholder feedback.
[44] TIGER/Line Shapefiles and TIGER/Line Files Technical Documentation (census.gov)

Table 5-2. FAF 5 Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
FHWA	Publicly available through public agency	The FAF 5 highway network provides a comprehensive picture of the corridors along which traffic moves by all modes of transportation.

5.2.1. Limitations

FAF 5 uses vehicle weight (million ton-miles) as a proxy for VMT. This may lead to false precision for long haul truck VMT. For example, the ton-miles for a fully loaded truck would be different from the ton-miles of an empty truck along the same route, even though the VMTs should be equal.

5.3. Input: LD Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)

The TEPP Modeling I&A will include 2024 Traffic Volumes (Annual Average Daily Traffic) shape file of the California Department of Transportation state highway network. This shape file will provide traffic patterns along California highway segments for LD vehicles.

Table 5-3. LDV AADT Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
Caltrans	Publicly available through public agency	This is a commonly used geographic information system (GIS) shapefile for county borders.

5.3.1. Limitations

This data set includes all duties and is not limited to LD. However, since the vast majority of vehicles on the road are LD, it provides a good indication of LD traffic volumes.

5.4. Input: Investor-Owned Utilities/Publicly Owned Utilities Service Areas

The TEPP Modeling I&A will include IOU and Publicly Owned Utilities (POU) geographic layers. Knowledge of these territories will identify which highway corridor segments are associated with specific IOUs and POUs.

Table 5-4. IOU/POU Service Areas Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
CEC	Publicly available through public agency	Up-to-date GIS shapefiles for IOU and POU service areas required to indicate territory lines.

5.4.1. Limitations

Distribution service territories are typically drawn as an approximating representation of the customers and customer meters served by the utility. These can change over time and may not encompass all the physical assets of the IOU or POU.


5.5. Input: Disadvantaged Communities

The TEPP Modeling I&A will include geospatial layers provided by California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment[45] that identifies DACs and Tribal Communities based using CalEPA's designation of disadvantaged communities for the purposes of SB 535, specifically:

1. Census tracts receiving the highest 25 percent of overall scores in CalEnviroScreen
2. Census tracts lacking overall scores in CalEnviroScreen 4.0 due to data gaps, but receiving the highest 5 percent of CalEnviroScreen 4.0 cumulative pollution burden scores
3. Census tracts identified in the 2017 DAC designation as disadvantaged, regardless of their scores in CalEnviroScreen 4.0
4. Lands under the control of federally recognized Tribes

Figure 5 1 provides an example of the user interface based on this geographic data.

Figure 5-1. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Dashboard



Source: CalEnviroScreen

[45] SB 535 Disadvantaged Communities - OEHHA

Table 5-5. DAC Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
CalEnviroScreen from California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)	Publicly available through public agency	This geospatial data for disadvantaged communities is provided by California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's (OEHHA). Disadvantaged communities are identified in the data using CalEPA's designation of disadvantaged communities for the purposes of SB 535, which is based on CalEnviroScreen's scoring.

5.5.1. Limitations

Disadvantaged Communities' boundaries may shift over time, and these DAC shapefiles may not reflect current conditions.

5.6. Input: CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Top Quartiles

The TEPP Modeling I&A will include a geospatial layer that specifically identifies the census tracts that scored in the top quartile of CalEnviroScreen 4.0, uses a methodology consistent with California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA).

Table 5-6. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Top Quartiles Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
CalEnviroScreen from California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)	Publicly available through public agency	CalEnviroScreen is a state resource used to identify regions with high localized air pollution impacts using a methodology consistent with California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). The latest version of CalEnviroScreen, CalEnviroScreen 4.0, is used in generating this geospatial layer.

5.6.1. Limitations


Boundaries of regions with high localized air pollution may shift over time, and this shapefile may not reflect current conditions.

5.7. Input: AB 1550 Low Income Designation

The TEPP Modeling I&A will include geospatial layers from California Climate Investment Priority Population Mapping Tool 4.0[46] that identifies low-income communities for the purposes of California Climate Investments.

Figure 5 2 provides an example of the user interface based on this geographic data.

Figure 5-2. California Climate Investments Priority Population Mapping Tool 4.0



Source: California Air Resources Board

Table 5-7. DAC Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
California Climate Investments Priority Population 4.0	Publicly available through public agency	This geospatial data for low income designation is provided by California Climate Investments and is consistent with CalEPA's designation of disadvantaged communities for the purposes of SB 535, CalEnviroScreen 4.0 and the California Department of Housing and Community Department's Revised 2021 State Income Limits.

[46] **California Air Resources Board (CARB).** *California Climate Investments Priority Populations Mapping Tool (Version 4.0).* https://gis.carb.arb.ca.gov/portal/apps/experiencebuilder/experience/?id=5dc1218631fa46bc8d340b8e82548a6a&page=Priority-Populations-4_0

5.7.1. Limitations

Boundaries of regions with low income designation may shift over time, and this shapefile may not reflect current conditions.

5.8. Input: PM2.5 and Ozone Non-Attainment Areas

The TEPP Modeling I&A will include Particulate Matter 2.5 (PM2.5) and Ozone Non-Attainment Areas (NAA) geographic layers that will be used to associate highway corridor segments with non-attainment areas. According to the EPA, this is defined as any area that does not meet (or that contributes to ambient air quality in nearby area that does not meet) the national primary or secondary ambient air quality standards for National Ambient Air Quality (NAAQ)[47]. It is not uncommon to have PM 2.5 or Ozone NAA in or near DACs.

Table 5-8. PM2.5 and Ozone NAA Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
EPA	Publicly available through public agency	The EPA maintains PM 2.5 and Ozone NAA GIS shapefiles.

5.8.1. Limitations

Non-Attainment Areas may shift over time, and these NAA shapefiles may not reflect current conditions.

[47] Ozone Designation and Classification Information | US EPA

5.9. Input: Land Use / Zoning

The TEPP Modeling I&A will include geospatial layers describing land use and zoning, to identify corridor segments where charging may be more likely to locate.

Table 5-9. DAC Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
Existing SANDAG Land Use[48]	Publicly available through public agency	This layer will be used for SDG&E territory. This geospatial data is provided by San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) describing land use based on SANDAG's Regional Demographic, Economic and Land Use Models. The dataset is developed through an annual land use and housing unit inventory. The data serves as the base year inputs to SANDAG's Regional Demographic, Economic and Land Use models.
Additional Land Use Layers to be identified for PG&E and SCE	-	PG&E and SCE shall be required to file a Tier 1 Advice Letter proposing a land use / zoning layer that can be used for their territories.

5.9.1. Limitations

Land use and zoning information may shift over time. SANDAG updates this geospatial file annually in accordance with their annual land use and housing unity inventory. Data sources identified for PG&E and SCE may not update on the same cadence.

5.10. Input: Planned & Existing Public Infrastructure

The TEPP Modeling I&A will include a geographic spatial layer that identifies where (latitude/longitude coordinates) planned and currently existing public charging infrastructure will be, and are currently, located. The advanced filters applied will include available and planned station status for electric fuel types in California. This layer will include the number of ports, associated charging power, and accessibility (public/private).

[48] San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), *GeoPortal Item: [interactive GIS dataset]*. https://geo.sandag.org/portal/home/item.html?id=e9321d784a6b4ef5b89af2e0679fb8c8

Table 5-10. Planned & Existing Public Infrastructure Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
AFDC	Publicly available through public agency	Understanding current and pending charging infrastructure identifies current nodes in the charging network and where there may be gaps for optimal charging locations. AFDC keeps updated BEV infrastructure data sets.

5.10.1. Limitations

Planned and existing public infrastructure that are submitted to ADFC may not include all publicly available charging stations. Port status and reliability is not included.

5.11. Input: Truck Stops

The TEPP Modeling I&A will include a geographic layer that identifies the location of existing California truck stops. These have the potential to offer insight into where electric semis might recharge at public stations along highway corridors.

Table 5-11. Truck Stops Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
Find my fuels	Publicly available through commercial entity	More comprehensive list of California truck stops that complements those included in CTC's SB 671 Clean Freight Corridor Assessment

5.11.1. Limitations

Use of this layer as a proxy for electric vehicle charging stations assumes electric long-haul and short-haul trucks have similar trips as diesel-powered semis. The layer also assumes that utilities have the necessary electrical infrastructure in place (transmission/distribution) to energize potentially rural and inaccessible truck stops.

This input layer also focuses on existing truck stop locations, many of which are known to have inadequate parking infrastructure. This input assumes that trucks will expand parking to make space for overnight charging and associated revenue. Future updates to the TEPP Modeling I&A could consider planned and potential truck stops and input from truck stop and fleet manager interviews.

5.12. Input: Rest Stops

The TEPP Modeling I&A will include a geographic layer that identifies the location of California rest stops. These have the potential to offer insight into where personally owned cars (IEPR class 'PVC'), and potentially fleet vehicles might recharge at public stations along highway corridors.

Table 5-12. Rest Stops Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
Caltrans	Publicly available through public agency	Rest stops provide an indication of where public charging for long-distance trips may occur.

5.12.1. Limitations

While rest stops currently provide refueling ICEVs, it is unclear to what extent they would be used for recharging BEVs, and especially MDHD BEVs.

5.13. Input: Fleet Depots

The TEPP Modeling I&A will include a geographic layer that identifies the location of major California fleet depots. These have the potential to offer increased precision for where electric vehicles are domiciled and subsequently where their routes start and end.

Table 5-13. Fleet Depots Source, Availability, and Justification

Source	Availability	Justification
RigDig by Fusable	Due to contractual obligations with commercial providers raw aggregate data inputs from those data sets cannot be made publicly available. These sources and data sets are the best available at the time of this research, and are subject to change.	Improved accuracy in fleet domicile location offers better precision in determining where public charging infrastructure should be located to facilitate fleet routes

5.13.1. Limitations

Fleet depot data is historically sparce and can sometimes report an office location rather than the depot serving the vehicle. While accurate fleet depot data would improve the precision of related depot and public charging, this enhancement is limited by data quality. In previous investigations, fleet depot data required validation with substantial manual web searches and satellite image analysis.

The data source proposed by this report has relatively robust MDHD fleet depot data, but LD fleet depot data is much more limited. Though there are several commercially available data sets that can be used to determine MDHD fleet depot locations, there currently are no known comprehensive data sets for LD depot locations.

Guidehouse

Appendix A. Power Preference and Suitability Calculation

The spreadsheet below outlines the calculation used to determine whether individual vehicle classes would be suitable for charging using L2 ports or if they would require DC charging.

Table APP-1. Calculation for Vehicle Classes Suitable for Charging Using L2 ports or DC charging

Year	Duty	Class	Average Yearly VMT	kWh per mile	Annual Energy (kWh	Consumption per weekday (kWh)*	Charge hours with 12 kW L2 port	Assumed available hours to charge for L2†	Compatible with L2 charging
2024	LDV	Personal PC	10,713	0.29	3,107	11.95	12	1.00	Yes
2024	LDV	Personal LT	10,713	0.47	5,035	19.37	12	1.61	Yes
2024	LDV	Commercial PC	8,828	0.29	2,560	9.85	12	0.82	Yes
2024	LDV	Commercial LT	8,828	0.47	4,149	15.96	12	1.33	Yes
2024	MDV	GVWR3 Pickup	17,966	0.47	8,444	32.48	12	2.71	Yes
2024	MDV	GVWR 4-6 Delivery	18,004	0.96	17,284	66.48	12	5.54	Yes
2024	HDV	GVWR 7-8 Delivery	33,868	1.22	41,319	158.92	12	13.24	Yes
2024	HDV	Short-Haul Truck	32,365	2.27	73,469	282.57	12	23.55	No
2024	HDV	CA Long Haul Truck	77,044	2.33	179,513	690.43	12	57.54	No

Year	Duty	Class	Average Yearly VMT	kWh per mile	Annual Energy (kWh	Consumption per weekday (kWh)*	Charge hours with 12 kW L2 port	Assumed available hours to charge for L2†	Compatible with L2 charging
2024	HDV	OOS Long Haul Truck	94,489	2.33	220,159	846.77	12	70.56	No
2024	HDV	Drayage	34,695	2.27	78,758	302.92	12	25.24	No
2024	HDV	Vocational Truck	23,487	1.90	44,625	171.63	12	14.30	No
2024	HDV	Transit Bus	20,122	2.22	44,671	171.81	12	14.32	No
2024	HDV	School Bus	9,791	1.33	13,022	50.08	12	4.17	Yes

** This value is estimated by dividing the annual energy by the number of weekdays in the year (260).*
† These are the working assumptions based on analysis of trip data. We will review whether they need to be updated after analyzing more extensive trip data

(END Appendix E)