Comment 1 for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (ceqa2010) - Non-Reg.

First Name: Richard
Last Name: Lyon
Email Address: rlyon@cbia.org
Affiliation: CBIA

Subject: documents being hand delivered due to size...
Comment:

```
Good day, CARB Representative:

Please note: The documents CBIA will be submitting are 335MB and
so, per my discussion with Ms. Mary Ellis, Clerk of the Board, I
will hand deliver the documents to the CARB visitor center for
sumbmission this morning and follow-up with a call.

Attached is a letter to CARB.

In the interim if you have any quesitons or would like additional
information, please contact me at 916 340 3351.

Thank you.

Christy Sinclair
Legislative Assistant
CBIA
```

Attachment: www.arb.ca.gov/lists/ceqa2010/3-builder_carb_letter_final_9-16_ltrhd.pdf

Original File Name: Builder CARB letter Final 9-16_ltrhd.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-09-22 09:23:07

No Duplicates.

Comment 2 for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (ceqa2010) - Non-Reg.

First Name: Richard
Last Name: Lyon
Email Address: rlyon@cbia.org
Affiliation: CBIA

Subject: CEQA Submission
Comment:

```
Please find attached a letter and index of the items to be hand
delievered.

Christy Sinclair
916 340 3351
```

Attachment: www.arb.ca.gov/lists/ceqa2010/4-cbia_cqea_cmnts_to_carb_sb375___index.pdf

Original File Name: CBIA CQEA Cmnts to CARB SB375 & Index.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-09-22 09:40:47

No Duplicates.

Comment 3 for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (ceqa2010) - Non-Reg.

First Name: Zev
Last Name: Yaroslavsky
Email Address: zev@bos.lacounty.gov
Affiliation: LA County Board of Supervisors

Subject: Proposed regional greenhouse gas targets for SB 375
Comment:

```
Please find attached a letter regarding "proposed regional
greenhouse gas targets for SB 375."

Thank you.
```

Attachment: www.arb.ca.gov/lists/ceqa2010/5-sb_375_letter.pdf

Original File Name: SB 375 Letter.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-09-22 10:10:33

No Duplicates.

Comment 4 for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (ceqa2010) - Non-Reg.

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Bullock
Email Address: mike_bullock@earthlink.net
Affiliation:

Subject: The Proposed Reductions are Neither Just nor Reasonable
Comment:

The attached document's conclusions are as follows.

Targets will have to be more stringent than the AB 32 and S-3-05 target trajectories if we are going to fulfill our world leadership responsibility and give the world a chance at avoiding climate destabilization. The 2020 Target of -7% (per-capita from VMT) can only result in an AB 32 level reduction if both “Pavley” and the LCFS factors are used. The 2035 reduction target of -13% would have to instead be 35.15%, to just meet the straight-line trajectory of S-3-05 for 2035, and this is assuming the Pavley reductions continue on the “Pavley 1” trajectory all the way to 2035. This assumption about “Pavley” may be overly optimistic. The science-supported 2035 reduction is 45%.

After reading the attached document, do you agree with these conclusions? If not, why not? Since CARB is proposing reductions that are needlessly weak and will show the world that S-3-05 is being ignored in California by its ARB, don't you agree that this will tell the world that the state with the highest rate of dring in the world is not going to change and so anything they do to curb GHG they do knowing that California is refusing to do its part?

The best, largely overlooked strategies to reduce VMT are a comprehensive and variable road use fee pricing system, as is being installed by Skymeter; unbundling the cost of car parking; good bicycle projects and bicycle education; putting a stop to all freeway expansions; and reconfiguring sales taxes for freeways or freeway/transit combinations to instead be 100% for transit. These strategies could easily be implemented by 2020 and would easily decrease driving by a sum of at least 45%. The strategies to do this are primarily those that increase fairness for families that drive less than average.

This shows that mitigation for RTPs that dump large amounts of all kinds of pollution into the atmosphere is feasible but is being ignored. Do you agree and if not why not?

Given this set of conclusions, it is clear that the reductions proposed for SANDAG are neither just nor reasonable. By extension, this is true for the reductions proposed for the other MPOs.

Do you agree with the above statement and if not, why not?

Attachment: www.arb.ca.gov/lists/ceqa2010/6-sept20carb_targets_strategies.doc

Original File Name: Sept20CARB_Targets_Strategies.doc

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-09-22 10:06:54

No Duplicates.

There are no comments posted to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (ceqa2010) that were presented during the Board Hearing at this time.