From: Donnelly, Jon
To: DEP NJairrulesmobile
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Drayage Trucks
Date: Thursday, October 8, 2020 2:26:58 PM
Attachments: image001.jpg

As the owner of a fleet of tractors that visit the marine terminals of the Port of New York and New Jersey on both sides of the Hudson River, as well as the rail terminals in NJ on a daily basis, Empire Merchants would like to submit our comments on the NJ DEP proposed new regulations and policies specifically related to drayage trucks.

Drayage trucks comprise a small share of NJ's trucking fleet, and most drayage trucks at the Port of NY and NJ are already lower-emission vehicles. According to the NJDEP presentation, only 15% of the medium to heavy weight vehicles in NJ are drayage trucks, yet this is the group being targeted most aggressively by the emissions-reduction proposal being considered. According to the Port Authority of NY & NJ (PANYNJ), almost two-thirds of the trucks that called at the port during the record volume month of August 2020 were engine model year 2007 or newer. Port trucks are unfairly blamed for polluting the local neighborhoods nearby. However, according to the Northeast Newark Regional Truck Study conducted by the PANYNJ in 2015, only 5.1% of the trucks observed entering and exiting the Ironbound section of Newark were port trucks.

New Jersey is NOT California. During the meeting, DEP representatives repeatedly expressed a desire to mirror the types of strict emissions regulations being enacted in California, with aggressive implementation timelines that would directly impact Drayage Trucks. Besides the obvious geographic differences (the ports of LA and Long Beach sit on flat land surrounded by mountains, trapping the emissions and creating the smog that LA is famous for--this feature does not exist in NJ) there are also these issues:

- No competition for freight destination in CA, due to its size, but the East Coast of the US has numerous other ports that could gain market share from the Port of NY & NJ if these regulations become too onerous, including Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Charleston and Savannah. This could lead to lost jobs and reduced tax revenue for the state of NJ.

- Current model EV trucks are 10,000 lbs. heavier than diesel trucks because of the batteries. This means that trucks would have to offset that weight with lower cargo volumes, leading shippers to route their cargo elsewhere to maximize efficiency. This too could lead to lost market share, lost jobs and lost revenue for the state of NJ. Those shippers who continue to do business here because they are domiciled locally will require more containers to haul their cargo, resulting in more trips to the terminals, along with increased traffic, congestion and non-exhaust emissions.

- New Jersey does not have the level of funding required to replace the current trucking fleet with Electric Vehicles yet the NJDEP is proposing a target date for all drayage trucks to be 100% Zero Emission by 2035. This is an unrealistic and unreasonable deadline.

- California ports have two work shifts (AM & PM), while NY/NJ only has one shift during the day. The time window for charging electric trucks would therefore be narrower, putting significant strain on the state's electrical grid.

- Any proposals for phasing out diesel trucks must include studies and data assessments done locally so that there is full transparency on how these timelines would specifically impack New Jersey, both financially and operationally.

- The weather in NJ is different than the weather on the West Coast. Studies have shown that in cold weather, typical of what we see during NY/NJ winters, EV trucks cover 20% less mileage per charge than they do in warmer weather. Trucks would risk getting stranded and adding to traffic woes while also adding non-exhaust emissions.

- Fast charging is also limited during cold weather in order to protect the EV batteries. This would hinder the ability to charge trucking fleets quickly and efficiently during Winter months, presenting challenges to supply chain fluidity as well as the electrical grid.

Grid capacity concerns and lack of funding for upgrades. No one has done an accurate assessment on whether or not NJ's electrical grid can handle 15,000 drayage trucks charging at the same time. According to the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, "for electric 18-wheelers, chargers may need up to 2MW of power each," which "will require changes to primary and secondary power distribution systems…and substation upgrades. For large loads, a new substation may be needed." The California Electric Transportation Coalition did a study on power requirements for electric truck and e-bus charging stations. It found that loads greater than 5 MW need both substation and distribution line upgrades, which can run $10 million or more per site. The State of New Jersey recently approved legislation that allows the state to borrow more than $9 billion in order to address unprecedented funding shortfalls caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. NJ simply cannot afford to fund the grid upgrades that will be necessary until we are clear of this economic crisis.

Non-exhaust emissions are not addressed by any of the NJDEP proposals. Nothing presented by the NJDEP or NJPACT addressed one of the most grave concerns affecting our environment today: dangerous particulate matter that is generated from tire wear, brake wear, road surface wear, and road dust released into the air during on-road vehicle usage, know as Non-Exhaust Emissions (NEEs). According to a 2019 report conduted in the UK by the government's Air Quality Expert Group (AQEG), NEEs are "a very serious and growing environmental problem, one that is being exacerbated by the increasing popularity of large, heavy vehicles such as SUVs, and growing demand for electric vehicles, which are heavier than standard cars because of their batteries." As stated earlier, these heavier vehicles would require more containers and vehicle trips through the port so converting NJ's fleet of diesel drayage trucks to EV trucks will actually make NEEs *worse*, not better. According to the report, NEEs "constitute the majority of primary particulate matter from road transport, 60 percent of PM2.5 and 73 percent of PM10." The AQEG recommended that Zero-Emission vehicles-including EVs- be "immediately recognized as

a source of ambient concertrations of airborne particulate matter." The plan to replace drayage diesel trucks with EV's is ill-advised and ultimately will *increase* NEEs and worsen NJ's air quality, the exact opposite of what these proposals are supposed to accomplish.

Other emissions sources must also be considered and addressed along with the costs of these items to be borne by the drayage carriers before any proposals are finalized and presented.

Respectfully,

Jon M. Donnelly | Director of Purchasing
Empire Merchants LLC
16 Bridgewater Street
Brooklyn, NY 11222
Direct: (800) 338-3880 ext. 9842
jdonnelly@empiremerchants.com