

## **Comment 1 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Danny

Last Name: Ledbetter

Email Address: ssbkwik@yahoo.com

Affiliation: Private Citizen

Subject: AB 118 Enhanced Car Scrapage Program

Comment:

To whom it may concern, I am writing in opposition to AB 118. I am an old car advocate and hobbyist. The old car hobby is a culture and a way of life much like those who enjoy the game of Golf. Would you close down Golf courses simply because people use their vehicles to get to them? I own a 1966 year model vehicle which is driven less than 1500 mile's per year. The impact from this vehicle on the environment is moot as compared to a brand new 2010 model car. One airplane flight of a state legislator pollutes more than a thousand car's such as mine in a year. It is essential that we in the old car hobby are able to access available existing part's to maintain our car's. AB 118 is simply one more BAD idea produced by people who could find something constructive to spend their time on such as alternative fuel development or knitting. Sincerely, Dan Ledbetter

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-03 11:10:26

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 2 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Frank

Last Name: Smathers

Email Address: thunder1road@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: AB 118 UNNECESSARY

Comment:

California is currently suffering with a massive fiscal crisis. Budgets are being slashed for schools, healthcare, police, and other vital services. With that in mind, why would our state government even consider spending millions of dollars to buy worthless clunker cars? The argument that eliminating these old clunkers will significantly reduce air pollution is a false argument.

The percentage of older pre-1985 cars that are currently in use as "daily drivers" is less than 2 percent of the total fleet. Most of the pre-1985 cars get bad mileage. No one is driving these cars because they are obsolete and unaffordable to drive at today's gas prices. If you go out and check the street in front of the state capital, you will have to wait a long time to see a pre-1985 car in use.

These cars are mostly high-mileage vehicles that are worn out and due to go to the junkyard soon - even without a payment from the state of California. The cost of a major mechanical repair to these old cars is much greater than the value of the car. Many of these cars are parked because they are no longer functional. Why should the state pay thousands of dollars for a car that isn't worth a hundred dollars? Additionally, the owners of these cars can already get tax credits for donating their old car to charity.

AB 118 doesn't make much sense, financially, or environmentally. Potentially, the bill could benefit car dealers by giving free state tax dollars to car buyers but the state will probably have to borrow the money to fund the program. Also, the bill might benefit speculators who would buy up old clunkers for a few hundred dollars apiece - which would then be turned in for taxpayer funded vouchers worth thousands more than the price of an old junk car.

Two thumbs down on this clunky clunker bill. Please use the money to fund essential state services.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-03 11:12:39

No Duplicates.

### **Comment 3 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Andrew

Last Name: Jensen

Email Address: jensenaw@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Cost /Benefit Ratio too High, Kill Fleet Mod. Program AB 118

Comment:

Older cars are being taken out of the fleet every day as they age-out. Increasing fuel prices are speeding up the process. California can't afford the enactment of the Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program right now. The cost-benefit ratio is currently way too high. Things have changed since the enactment of AB 118 in 2007. Please do not enact the Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program.

A Concerned San Francisco Resident

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-03 11:23:56

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 4 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Luis  
Last Name: Vieira  
Email Address: luis@lmv.us  
Affiliation:

Subject: Car Scrapage Program  
Comment:

Why is it that you are concentrating on eliminating the very few cars that are on the road and ignore the cars that there is more of?

I don't know about you, but I hardly ever see a car pre 1976 on the road. When I actually get to see one, it is a very well kept and tuned vehicle that is a work of art, a show piece.

Why don't you go after the new cars that modified right when they come home from the dealer? These are not checked for what 4 years?

As the saying goes "common sense isn't so common".

Please do the right thing and stop wasting my tax dollars on something that won't really help the air quality and do something that will, like nuclear power plants.

Sincerely

Luis Vieira  
Tracy CA

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-03 11:38:39

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 5 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Walter

Last Name: Foster

Email Address: lndbtchr@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: AB118 Car Scrap

Comment:

I oppose this program because; first the State of CA is broke and does not have the money. Second, I am tired of being taxed so the poor, mostly illegal immigrants, can upgrade their transportation. Third, It's a proven fact these programs are not anywhere near cost effective. Fourth, the amount of pollutants reduced by this program is so small it cannot be measured.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-03 13:14:40

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 6 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Nicole

Last Name: Hickey

Email Address: thehickeyfamily@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation:

Subject: enhanced fleet modernization.

Comment:

I strongly oppose any attempt to waste tax payer's money on this half baked idea. We are in a budget crisis due to wasteful spending on things like this. Stop funding extreme environmental ideas with tax payer money. I oppose this idea. Any politician who supports it will not get my vote in the next election.

Sincerely

Nicole Hickey

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-03 13:37:21

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 7 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Andwele

Last Name: Hall

Email Address: Yellow4g63@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Lets stop

Comment:

Wasting money 30 million when the state is in a budget crunch?

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-03 14:53:43

No Duplicates.



## **Comment 8 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: stephen

Last Name: hovey

Email Address: shoveycpa@charterinternet.com

Affiliation:

Subject: proposal to scrap pre 1976 cars.

Comment:

it is extremely difficult for me to imagine your agency proposing spending 30+ million dollars annually on any program at a time when the state can't pay it's current bills. in addition your proposal will have minimal if any effect on air quality. also, the people that you are targeting are probably currently part of the 11% or so(20-25% in some counties) of the unemployed. where do they get the money to buy a new car when they can't feed their families?it doesn't appear that your agency ever considers what these proposals do to real people who buy the way when they are working pay your salaries. your duty to the citizens is not regulations that do little to improve air quality at the expense of thousands of families that rely on some of these vehicles for their livelihood.it is also a back door attempt at eliminating classic cars which are a billion dollar a year industry for california.your proposal, although well meaning does significant harm to thousands of californians that are already struggling. i would ask that you reconsider and remove this item from submission.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-03 16:09:55

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 9 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: ian

Last Name: voermann

Email Address: karstenvoermann@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Fiscal Responsibility

Comment:

Folks,

Spending \$30 M to subsidize the removal of little used older vehicles - the ones most likely to be scrapped - appears to be at odds with California's current fiscal reality.

Alternative means of eradicating 'gas guzzlers' that contribute to improving California's finances would be: 1. Raising gas taxes; and 2. Increasing registration fees for large/heavy vehicles. These would affect overall driving and purchasing habits for the entire population, and thus would have a much larger impact.

The \$30 M earmarked for scapping the older 'guzzlers' contributing to smog etc., could then be applied towards reducing taxes on low income Californians, who might otherwise be unfairly harmed by the gas tax increases.

I urge you to select one of the two revenue enhancing options above rather than spending more public funds on a problem that will go away on its own, as these old vehicles decay.

- Ian Voermann

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-03 16:19:01

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 10 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Doug

Last Name: Bithell

Email Address: dvbithell@roadrunner.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Proposed AB 118

Comment:

Proposed AB 118 Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program Regulation  
(Car Scrap)

I am appossed to AB 118 as it is a waste of taxpayers money and is harmful to a great pastime of rstoration of cars. This hobby is useful to providing history and helps the economy. Please spend my tax dollars for productive bills not destructive and useless bills.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-03 17:11:31

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 11 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Stacie  
Last Name: Albright  
Email Address: stacie@staciealbright.com  
Affiliation: SEMA

Subject: Car scrap program  
Comment:

I am against the car scrap program as I am a classic car owner and this would limit my ability to get parts or buy more cars in the future. I also know several others who oppose this type of blanket legislation in order to get rid of the classics. There are so few on the road now that it is hardly worth considering.

Thank you.

Stacie Albright  
P.O. Box 127  
Mokelumne Hill CA 95245

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-03 17:40:22

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 12 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Candi

Last Name: Cowan

Email Address: Rpu@goldrush.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Waste of taxpayers money.

Comment:

Please stop using my hard paid (yes I am one of the working) for this Unamerican program. I buy and collect older cars, keep them tuned and clean running. I will not be able to afford my hobby if these programs are implented, I will not be able to help preserve America's automobile history. America has a car hobby that is rich and diverse and you are destroying its history by all these programs. Quit targeteing our automobile heritage. You will find out how it feels one day when the government targets something that you love and cherish. Then they destroy it.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-03 18:14:11

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 13 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: ian

Last Name: voermann

Email Address: karstenvoermann@contentguard.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Killing Jobs in CA, saving them in Korea

Comment:

Folks,

Adding to my prior comment: California has a thriving car customization industry. And no new car manufacturing.

And, California is now spending \$30 M to kill all of the custom shops (since it's pretty hard to work on modern cars vs. old ones, hence all of the older customs). This will therefore reduce California's tax base further, and increase its fiscal problems.

And the benefit? People will spend money on new cars...which are disproportionately not even made in the US.

How does this make sense?

Raise gas taxes, or registration fees on large cars (all, don't just pick on the old ones) instead.

- Ian.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-03 18:33:51

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 14 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: William  
Last Name: Norvas, Jr.  
Email Address: whnjr@sbcglobal.net  
Affiliation: none

Subject: CARSCRAP 09  
Comment:

After reading the proposal I have a couple of constructive comments.

First of all is there any data that will support the fact that this proposal will actually have a positive effect? I personally do not think it will.

Most people who have an older car, that is paid for and mechanically sound would not be able to take the \$1,000. to \$1,500. to put towards the purchase of a new or newer car and incur the cost of a monthly payment.

Secondly with the current financial state of the State of California, this does not seem like the most opportune time to allocate 30 million dollars to this kind of project.

Finally, as a car collector and restorer. Most of the people that I know or am associated with, who have and or drive cars that are pre 1976 usually are very concerned with the operation of their vehicles and keep them in top operating condition. Another thing is these vehicles are probably not driven very many miles each year. These vehicles are usually driven to shows or local cruise ins. Eliminating these few vehicles would not have a substantial impact or be cost effective. The after market that supplies many of the parts that these cars use would be affected negatively also.

Thank you for hearing my opinion.

Sincerely,

William H. Norvas Jr.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-03 20:15:23

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 15 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: joseph

Last Name: lynch

Email Address: lynchsbtfa@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: AB 118

Comment:

I THINK THIS WILL BE A BAD IDEA FOR ALL PEOPLE IN CALIFORNIA. ALOT OF PEOPLE I KNOW CANT AFFORD A NEWER CAR EVEN WITH THE VOUCHER. ALOT OF PEOPLE CAN ONLY AFFORD OLDER CARS. BECAUSE THE CAN FIX AND REPAIR THEM ON THERE OWN. NOT EVERYONE CAN AFFORD TO PAY A DEALERSHIP OR INDEPENT SHOP TO HOOK A SCANNER UP TO TELL THEM THERE CAR NEEDS AN O2 SENSOR OR A TPS SWITCH. ALSO OLDER PEOPLE ON FIXED INCOME LIKE MY DAD CANT AFFORD A NEWER TRUCK IF IT WHERE GAVE TO HIM.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-03 21:55:22

No Duplicates.



## **Comment 16 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: stafford

Last Name: galen

Email Address: ingotauto@gmail.com

Affiliation: SEMA

Subject: against ab 118

Comment:

targeting pre-76 autos again? very small % on road. vehicles of this vintage are generally well taken care of, hobby cars. others are not even on the road! this equals NO POLLUTION! they are also a major source of parts to REBUILD other cars. recycling is cleaner than making new. many people are employed in & about the "old car hobby", providing lots of jobs. lastly, people like to see old cars, they are part of american history, & should not be scapegoated as a solution to solve a very complex, multilayered problem! scrapping these cars & giving people \$1500 to put down on a new car, with payments strapped to it, doesnt pan out. how about tax breaks for new car buying, now thats an incentive! OPPOSE AB 118! thank you for your time.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-03 22:05:42

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 17 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Dale

Last Name: Mowery

Email Address: 528crt@gmail.com

Affiliation: NORCAL CORVETTES

Subject: AB 118 Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program Regulation (Car Scrap)

Comment:

I truly believe your intentions of scraping peoples cars is un-just this is turning in to a communist state. I have lived here all my life and right now I feel the government is stepping out of line by trying to make us sell our cars at a un-real price. I know many people who have 10 times that amount in thier cars and take them to car shows. You are trying to destroy our history of cars our passion to restore a older car to it's originail condition. You have no right to make us do this you are unable to balance a budget you take bribes (i.e. contubutions) from the tree huggers and special interest groups. I ask you can you look me in the eye and say that 1000.00 is a fair amount for a 1970 Hemi Cuda fully restored or that 1500.00 is a fair amount for my 1969 Camero Z28. Both these cars sold for over 250,000.00 ea. I ask that you re-think this and look at other ways of cleaner air.

Regards,  
Dale Mowery

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-03 23:15:40

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 18 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Mark

Last Name: Woodson

Email Address: arbcagov@customclassics.org

Affiliation:

Subject: Scrap program does NOT help pollution

Comment:

Not only do you NOT help reduce pollution which is caused more by industry than cars, but you cause a LARGE source of state income to dry up in the form of lost sales of aftermarket parts to restore classics.

Another very major reason to scrap this bill-a person driving an older car can NOT afford a new car.

giving them LESS than the down payment on a new car PLUS the negative of monthly payments is a sure fire way to do to the car industry what the mortgage brokers did to the housing industry.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-04 00:17:21

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 19 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: David  
Last Name: Sanguinetti  
Email Address: sangox8@yahoo.com  
Affiliation: 831-227-8950

Subject: Oppose AB 118 Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program Regulation  
Comment:

To whom it may concern,

As a Collector Car Hobbyist, I oppose AB 118 as a way to reduce and discourage the collection of vintage automobiles and eliminate the availability of vintage parts to maintain those vehicles. The number of pre 1976 vehicles is inconsequential in comparison to the real creators of green house gas and targets a group who are committed to quality preservation of our heritage with cars.

Sincerely,  
David Sanguinetti

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-04 06:45:43

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 20 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Ron

Last Name: Scherer

Email Address: rs67ron@netscape.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Car Scrap - AB 118

Comment:

The program sounds voluntary. I hate to lose classic cars to the crusher, but my real beef is where in the hell is C.A.R.B. getting \$30 mil a year to flush away on this? The state is going broke. The Governor should pull the plug on this one.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-04 08:12:56

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 21 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Alan

Last Name: Christoffels

Email Address: achristoffels@charter.net

Affiliation:

Subject: classic cars

Comment:

I happen to be one of those people who have an affinity for the older classic cars. I understand your desire to remove those vehicles that are polluting the environment. I disagree with your plan to influence people to scrap their cars just simply because I believe we already have enough laws and regulations to handle this problem. What you will be doing is depriving someone such as myself of a vehicle that can be restored to mint condition and operated safely and cleanly and provide enjoyment and a sense of pride. Thank you Alan Christoffels

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-04 10:09:35

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 22 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Oliver

Last Name: Marks

Email Address: om@olivermarks.com

Affiliation: none

Subject: classic cars and classic car parts

Comment:

Please be aware that not all cars and trucks are equal: there are great swathes of mediocre cars from the late 70's, 80's, 90's up to the present day with relatively few recyclable or reusable parts, and of little value to collectors and enthusiasts.

Prior to that time however vehicles were built to last and have valuable components. In principle I agree with the scrappage scheme, however in practice great care must be taken to ensure irreplaceable classic components and vehicles are not destroyed.

California has a thriving trade in the restoration and customization of classic cars; it will make the state a poorer place if lack of discrimination allows the destruction of these assets in two ways.

Firstly it is an economic mistake and will deprive many of a livelihood and secondly it will make California, famous for its car culture, (and one of the reasons I immigrated here from Europe) a less interesting place.

There is a thriving tourist trade around classic vehicles and countless spinoffs.

Please be responsible in your stewardship of valuable national heirlooms which are being cared for with their own money by enthusiasts and devotees.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-04 18:10:51

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 23 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Gary

Last Name: Hunter

Email Address: coachhunter10@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Oppose AB 118, Common Sense??????

Comment:

I am strongly opposed to AB 118. My wife and I are hobbyist and advocates of the collector car hobby. We own a 57 Chevrolet and a 64 Falcon, both have gone through restoration. In the many years we have had the cars, we have not driven them over 1000 miles a year(the norm) . They have been appraised for \$28,000. and \$74,000. You want to give us \$1500. You would be taking away our investments that we have planned on in our later years. Our cars are not the problem , compared to 1976 and up models driven 15,000 miles per year!! What about Buses, Trucks, Airplanes (I won't get into the Airplane use by an elected official). You know, AB 118 is just another pass the buck failure at the true causes of the problems with our environment. Oh, and lets spend millions in the worst fiscal crisis I have witnessed. You want to go after the 2%!! AB 118 is Wrong. Where is your common sense????

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-05 09:08:48

No Duplicates.



## **Comment 24 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: David

Last Name: Perry

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: Enhanced Fleet Modernization

Comment:

please see attached

Attachment: [www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/24-david.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/24-david.pdf)

Original File Name: David.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-05 10:32:47

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 25 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: John

Last Name: Cudworth

Email Address: jcudworth@bowermaster.com

Affiliation: American Citizen and Taxpayer

Subject: Car Scrap

Comment:

I strongly disagree with spending tax payers dollars to "retire" older vehicles. I totally disagree with paying someone money to buy their older vehicle without regard to the condition of the engine or the emissions that it produces. This is just another way for our government to take our tax dollars and waste them. In the financial condition the State is in at this time, we do NOT need to be giving away hard earned tax dollars to buy up older vehicles! There are a lot better uses for the tax dollars.  
I will not support this action!

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-05 12:36:24

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 26 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: keith

Last Name: feigel

Email Address: mig815@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: comment on proposal

Comment:

At a time when this state is struggling with finances this proposal is a waste of taxpayer funds. Automobiles properly maintained (even hummers) will successfully pass pollution control tests. Dream up something that will create jobs and leave "scrapping" to people who enjoy scrapbooking.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-05 13:03:00

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 27 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: mark

Last Name: clark

Email Address: d64clark@aol.com

Affiliation: none

Subject: enhanced vehicle scrappage program

Comment:

I oppose this bill, for a number of reasons: the first being that \$ 1000.00 - \$1500.00 to a low income person will not help them buy a better car the same with \$2500.00 to a new car dealer these are low income people. this small amount of money won't help them. this program is \$ 30 MILLION DOLLARS wrong time given the current state of economy.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-05 15:35:23

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 28 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Richard

Last Name: Ochoa

Email Address: rdgochoa@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: AB 118

Comment:

I strongly oppose AB 118. It hits us car enthusiasts very hard! We take pride in keeping our vintage vehicles in tip top shape. We will not allow this proposal to be passed! Please instead of scraping vintage cars why not encourage this nation to put in environmental friendly engines into vintage vehicles rather than scraping it.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-06 00:17:10

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 29 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Marquez

Email Address: rpmarquez@sanbrunocable.com

Affiliation:

Subject: AB118 Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program Regulation (car scrap)

Comment:

I think spending Millions of dollars every year on a program like this makes no sense. Most older cars are not driven but once every two to three weeks. I have three older cars myself that are all kept in tune because i want them running their best. I am not alone in this. Everyone i know that has an older car keeps there car in good running condition. All of us want clean air. As little as we drive our cars we are not hurting the air quality that much ,that we should spend 30 million a year on. we could use that money elsewhere. thanks Bob

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-06 11:28:12

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 30 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Pierce

Last Name: Hawke

Email Address: beardosa@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Car scrap

Comment:

Please rescind any ideas of scrapping older vehicles; as it is, they are becoming scarce as it is and typically not driven as many miles as a 15 YO or newer model.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-06 13:23:41

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 31 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Douglas

Last Name: Walker

Email Address: pieguydw@comcast.net

Affiliation: Contemporary Historic Vehicle Associatio

Subject: Vehicle Scrappage

Comment:

I am against this program to enhance the scrapping of 1976 and older vehicles. Our state is in financial difficulties and it won't help to spend this money. These older vehicles are not seen on our highways very often, so the pollution is minimal. The older vehicles are a valuable source of parts for the old car restoration hobby a very lucrative industry in our state and country. When restored they pollute minimally and are low annual mileage cars. Therefore removeing from them would not produce a benifical effect.

Thank you for your time,  
Douglas Walker

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-07 20:57:27

No Duplicates.



## **Comment 32 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Doug  
Last Name: Settle  
Email Address: dds701@msn.com  
Affiliation:

Subject: CARSCRAP09  
Comment:

This is another bad bill!  
Don't we have more pressing issues than worrying about classic cars that are well maintained, driven few miles per year and when they are its primarily for Charity Events where the proceeds contribute to Cancer Awareness, Cops For Kids, Police Activity leagues, Boys and Girls Club and Toys Tots just to name a few!

I have a cement/aggregate plant on Highway 18 about 30 miles up the road, Victorville, CA. that spews out more lead than all the classic cars in California combined, how about taking a look at them?

Please advise me of your findings and recommendation from your prompt investigation of this plants lead output.

Sincerely,  
D Settle

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-07 21:52:21

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 33 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Patrick

Last Name: Dilling

Email Address: p.dilling@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Vehicle Scrappage Program

Comment:

I have read with great concern that ARB is proposing to spend \$30 Million per year to provide incentives to scrap pre 1976 vehicles. Are you so totally out of touch with what is going on with California's budget that you think this is how we should spend our limited resources? People are losing jobs and needed benefits that this \$30 million could go a long way towards resolving. Given the age of these vehicles, there are not very many of them still in frequent use, thus the impact to air quality will not see \$30 Million worth of benefit. Please reconsider this proposal.

Thank You

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-08 09:12:44

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 34 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Angela

Last Name: Schoof

Email Address: angelaleigh73@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Opposed to Scrappage Program

Comment:

I am opposed to this vehicle scrappage program.

The automotive aftermarket, including automotive repair shops and the companies that manufacture and sell auto parts, bring a significant amount of revenue to the state.

Repairing an older vehicle is the best form of "green" because you are re-using your possessions, instead of discarding and replacing them. It takes fewer resources to keep an older vehicle in good condition and on the road, than it takes to build and transport a new vehicle.

Older cars that are kept in good condition are not the problem. This allows cars that pass smog checks to be eligible. The intent of these programs should be to get cars that don't work off the road, not to pay for cars in good condition.

These programs do not take the collector and classic cars into consideration. Preserving the automotive heritage of our country is important.

Also, in the current financial position our state is in, I do not think we should be using tax dollars in this way. Use the tax dollars to educate our children, keep the state parks open, and keep the citizens safe.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-08 09:53:11

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 35 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Joseph  
Last Name: Henchey III  
Email Address: henchman3@verizon.net  
Affiliation:

Subject: Car Scrap Program  
Comment:

I have been a car enthusiast for a very long time. I don't understand why these car scrap programs keep coming up. It's doing nothing to help the environment and it appears to me to be some kind of "feel good gesture" on the part of the government. These cars, pre-1976, can be a huge resource of spare and re-usable parts for people like myself who are involved in the car hobby. By scrapping them, we lose this resource. I am so tired of these programs coming up again and again. Don't you people get it?

Please reconsider this crazy idea and stop resurrecting a useless program that is doing nothing for the environment.

Thank You

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-08 10:16:34

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 36 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Gary

Last Name: Tebbett

Email Address: gtebbett@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation:

Subject: I am opposed to this legislation

Comment:

How can anyone seriously consider spending 30 Million Dollars on a program like this in light of the budget deficit in this state. This money should be spent on schools or medical coverage of children.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-08 10:20:38

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 37 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Karen

Last Name: McDermott

Email Address: Kamaro71@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: AB118

Comment:

In this time of severe state funding shortages, I have several questions.

1. What percentage of the existing state automobile population are the targeted cars ?
2. How many of these cars do you expect to remove from the road?
3. What percent of the emmissions do you expect this ruling to remove?
4. And finally, what will this ruling cost in terms of each vehicleremoved?

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-08 10:52:19

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 38 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Grant

Last Name: Warren

Email Address: warrenbroskustom@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Scrap program

Comment:

By passing these regulations you are killing the car restoration community. Classic cars and trucks has been the glue that holds my famiy together. The more you take off the street the more expensive it becomes to aquire them, thus slowly killing our hobby and way of life.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-08 11:10:07

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 39 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: sean

Last Name: mckinley

Email Address: johnny1290@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Well intentioned, but poor results

Comment:

This plan will just make it impossible for disadvantaged Californians to own their own car, since any old wreck will be worth \$1000-\$1500 if this passes! There are also few of these cars on the road in regular use anyhow. Dismantling these classic cars will also make the jobs of hobbyists trying to build a classic car infinitely more difficult. Please do not pass this!

Thank you.

sincerely,

Sean McKinley

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-08 12:27:27

No Duplicates.



## **Comment 40 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Douglas

Last Name: Hibler

Email Address: dhibler@yahoo.com

Affiliation: SEMA

Subject: Car Scrapage bill

Comment:

At a time when the states financial troubles are such that it is cancelling educational and other important programs, why should it spend money buying up old cars to crush under a program that does very little to eliminate emissions and simply costs the state more funding.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-08 14:32:46

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 41 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Larry

Last Name: Frantzen

Email Address: larryfrantzen@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Proposed AB 118

Comment:

I am the owner of a classic car which I drive less than 1500 miles a year. I am continually updating it to keep emissions down by such things as installing electronic ignition, rebuilding the engine to reduce smoking, etc. I estimate the car is worth \$10,000 and might consider scrapping it if I was offered what it was worth, but \$1,500 is not going to do it. I am also opposed to smog credits. Let the companies that are polluting clean up their own act at their expense, not mine. I agree that there are older cars that do not need to be smogged but cause massive pollution and I think these junkers should be targeted, but please leave us senior citizens alone whose main enjoyment is their car and who use it mainly for car shows and parades. There must be some way to differentiate the vehicles that are kept up from those that are not.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-08 15:54:58

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 42 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Clifford

Last Name: Law

Email Address: accord6@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Car Scrapage

Comment:

I would like CARB to propose that all pre-1976 models to have a catalytic converter that has a medium-light to medium constriction. They would need to do 2 tests the first time and one test thereafter. One before the cat is installed and one after the cat is installed to verify that the cats are working properly. I believe they should be tested every 2 years like all California autos. Thirdly, the test should only verify that the cat is working properly.

My reasoning is it will satisfy both parties. Cleaner air for CARB and the rest of Californians and also alleviate pressure to know the specific cat tests with lower emissions than pre-installed cat. As long as owners have the cat on, they don't have to worry about anything else. The emission tests done are just to verify that it is making lower emissions in general.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-08 16:16:04

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 43 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Larry

Last Name: Brogdin

Email Address: Larry@dynacorn.com

Affiliation: Taxpayer & Watchdog

Subject: Stop Wasting Time and MY Money

Comment:

No matter what this proposed "program" is called, it should be scrapped. Having read AB 118, the cost of administration would be far too high even IF the proposed benefits were tangible. This is another re-write of someones bad idea based on flawed data. By the way, how does giving an additional \$1000 to \$1500 toward a "New" vehicle to a low income person make any sense at all?

Instead of reverse engineering the math to try and prove that this will make a difference to an upside down budget, simply pick a model year (1979 for example-a 30 year ago milestone) and all vehicles from that model year back to 1974 (a 5 year spread of vehicles) and allow them smog exemption for \$50 per year (due to many gross polluters in that 5 year window). 1974 through 1969 drops to \$40 per year for exemption. 1969 through 1965 to \$30 per year. This fee in addition to the standard license fees.

Pre-1965 vehicles will remain exempt and qualify for "special" plates (that could have an added fee attached) to keep the collectors content. Thank You for your attention in this matter.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-08 18:02:31

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 44 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Richard

Last Name: Gilbertson

Email Address: serviceman@dc.rr.com

Affiliation: None

Subject: Scraping vintage, classic, and custom automobiles

Comment:

The vintage, classic, and custom cars represent such a small percentage of the fuel used in the state of California as to have absolutely no effect on the air quality in our state. Destroying automobile purely on the age of the automobile is discrimination in it's purest sense. Please do not pass any such bill. It would call for wholesale destruction of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of classic and vintage automobiles just because they are old.

Next will you want to kill every human over the age of 40, just because they are old? Some of us consider our classic cars our children and will protect them the same as we would an offspring.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-08 18:26:54

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 45 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Black

Email Address: one4michaelg@mindspring.com

Affiliation:

Subject: carscrap09

Comment:

This proposal is ridiculous. It is costly to working people and tax payers alike-with negligible enviromental benifits.

I oppose this, and urge your agency to do the same.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-08 19:18:30

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 46 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Carol

Last Name: Polchenko

Email Address: avgrammy@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Car Scrap

Comment:

What you people are trying to do is sounding like Communism. We bought these old cars and fixed them up because we love them and they bring back our youth and the good old days. We have fun taking them to car shows and talking to folks that also remember the good old days and we make a lot of new friends this way. These cars are made of metal, not plastic, so if God forbid there were an accident, we would survive, unlike the modern day Rice Rockets that the kids drive like maniacs.

You are trying to take away our rights and that is un-American. We will fight you on this every step of the way. These cars are our babies and we have thousands of dollars invested in them. You will take my car over my cold dead body.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-09 07:08:53

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 47 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: John

Last Name: Rose

Email Address: rvrose66@msn.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Pre 1976 Vehicles

Comment:

This is absolutely crazy. There are very few pre 1976 cars on the road and the ones that are are in mint condition. How do you change the rules mid stream? As an owner of several of these cars its not as though they are daily drivers. This is a hobby for me as well as other owners. This is another example of BIG BROTHER wataching and wanting to control our lives.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-09 07:09:56

No Duplicates.



**Comment 48 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: John

Last Name: Quilter

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: Enhanced Fleet Modernization

Comment:

please see attached

Attachment: [www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/49-john.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/49-john.pdf)

Original File Name: John.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-09 10:11:30

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 49 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Edward  
Last Name: Hauser  
Email Address: stiltrukin@hotmail.com  
Affiliation:

Subject: AB 118  
Comment:

Here are my thoughts on this CARB latest plan to do away with our hobby. Our hobby generates 36 million dollars thru car shows every year and gives this money to charities, schools, police and fire fighters, and boosts the local economy. The state of Calif is bankrupt and here we have a state agency that has an extra 96 million dollars to buy these collector cars that spend most of their time in storage. We have Police and Firemen getting laid off, schools cutting back, and parks being closed and our Air Recourse's Board has billions to throw away on their own whims. There is something wrong here and it needs fixed now. The government waste, and lack of responsibility on the Air Recourse's board. Our Governor also needs a wake up call as he is the only one the air board reports to.

Removal of these cars also takes away our spare parts for our project cars as well as having a project car. This removal will do nothing to clean our air up, as we are less than 1.4% of the total cars registered in Calif, and these cars are driven less than 1000 miles a year plus many are trailered to car shows.  
Ed Hauser

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-09 11:22:18

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 50 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Randy

Last Name: Clark

Email Address: hotrods@hotrodscustomstuff.com

Affiliation: Business Owner

Subject: The Proposed Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program Regulation (Car Scrap).

Comment:

To: California Air Resources Board

From: Hot Rods & Custom Stuff

Subject: The Proposed Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program Regulation (Car Scrap).

Once again, we would like to voice our opposition to proposed vehiclescrappage program increases. Not only will this proposal hurt already struggling businesses in California, it proposes to spend an additional 30 million dollars or so annually—money the state does not have. All to achieve a result based on a faulty premise, that pre-1976 vehicles produce the lion's share of pollution in the state.

It is a false premise because it assumes that all or most of these vehicles are driven on a daily basis. This is not the case except for a handful of these vehicles. Most of them are driven only to shows or on occasional weekend cruises. Our business caters to the owners of these older vehicle and we know this to be a fact. We not only perform full restorations here, we service these classic cars and speak with their owners daily.

Here are some facts not in your report.

1. The restoration of one classic automobile can generate as much as \$20,000 in tax revenue to the state and keep a dozen people employed for a year.
2. Many makes and models of pre-1976 autos are highly sought after collectible cars which will change hands many times, generating tax revenue in each instance. When no longer restorable, their parts are salvaged to restore others, generating more tax revenue. When these vehicles no longer have value to the industry they or their remains end up being scrapped by their owners.
3. Pre-76 California cars are among the most highly valued because, as your report states, "California's mild climate contributes to the longer survival rates...". In other words, they tend to be easier to restore, which generally means less rust repair which requires welding (carbon emissions). And many of these vehicles are purchased by out of state buyers where the climate is not so friendly. So, restored or not, many leave the state anyway.
4. Restoration and repair of these vehicle helps support a large

after-market parts industry comprised of companies large and small.

5. Many towns, like here in Escondido, have revitalized their downtown summer business by sponsoring cruise nights that encourage locals to bring out their classic cars and show off these pieces of rolling Americana, much to the delight of local restaurants and other small business.

6. Car shows and swap meets generate large amounts of revenue which will go away when there are no more classic cars left to restore.

The economic benefits of the classic car industry are many, and the environmental impacts few, when objectively analyzed.

And yet, each year, CARB attempts to exercise its bureaucratic muscle and short-sightedness to put an end to the economic activity that revolves around the restoration and salvage of these vehicles.

Instead, it would rather dole out millions of dollars we don't have in order to provide the Chinese with cheap steel to build their economy (yes, that's where most metal from the scrappers goes).

We urge the board to drop this scrappage proposal. If it is truly concerned about the economy forcing people to drive older cars longer, do something about California's outrageous licensing fees, runaway taxes, and excessive regulations (environmental and otherwise), that make new cars too expensive to buy each and every year. Or perhaps CARB could focus its efforts on trying to clean up the environmental disaster it foisted on Californians in the form of MTBE as a fuel additive.

Need we say more?

Randy g. Clark  
Hot Rods & Custom Stuff  
2324 Auto Park Way  
Escondido, CA 92029

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-09 12:17:19

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 51 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Mike

Last Name: D

Email Address: freightshakerclass@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Opposed to AB 118

Comment:

The automobile is an American way of life. It's an American culture. AB 118 is un-American, wrong, and a waste of money again. California is known for it's car craze. First California wants to ban black cars, and now California wants to take our cars away. \$1,000 per vehicle or \$1,500 per vehicle if they meet low-income requirements? \$2,000 or \$2,500 per vehicle depending on income level? That's not even a down payment on a new car. Pre 1976 vehicles are classics and are very well taken care of. Did you know that majority of classics have a modern engine? Pre 1976 vehicles are not daily drivers, are driven short miles, and mostly used in car shows, e.g., Route 66 Rendezvous in San Bernardino. Please, I ask that California remove AB 118. I oppose AB 118. Thanks and have a great day.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-09 13:50:10

No Duplicates.

**Comment 52 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: T. Alan

Last Name: Perterson, D.D.S.

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: EFMP

Comment:

please see attached

Attachment: [www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/53-alan.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/53-alan.pdf)

Original File Name: Alan.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-09 14:54:15

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 53 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Gary & Diane  
Last Name: Straughn  
Email Address: gdstraughn@cox.net  
Affiliation: Collector car enthusiast

Subject: Oposition to AB 118  
Comment:

Assembly

My wife & I are collector car enthusiasts, and are opposed to this AB (118), as it could result in requiring additional emission testing for pre- 1976 cars, that currently are exempt. We maintain our cars both mechanically & asthetically. They are NOT gross polluters. Please do not pass this bogus legislation!  
Gary & Diane Straughn

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-10 11:44:52

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 54 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Chris  
Last Name: Horn  
Email Address: cdhonline@gmail.com  
Affiliation:

Subject: EFMP=Bad Idea  
Comment:

Greetings.

I am opposed to this program, as it targets a very small section of the vehicle population. The emissions from these older cars, which are used largely for car shows and other enthusiast activities, are a speck on the wall in terms of overall pollution. In addition, when these vehicles are scrapped, it reduces the inventory of available parts and accessories for older cars.

I welcome the opportunity to chat further about this.

Chris Horn  
Alhambra, CA

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-10 14:25:10

No Duplicates.



## **Comment 55 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Mark

Last Name: Morton

Email Address: markalla@pacbell.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Car Scrap

Comment:

Special Interest Vehicles, cars acquired specifically to celebrate their art/craft/historical properties, should not be included in a 'clunker' type bill.

A large hobby and industry would be impacted while showing a net improvement after energy/money invested that would not be proportional to the effort.

It (the hobby/interest) by its' nature will shrink and die on its' own.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-11 06:48:51

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 56 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Martin  
Last Name: Jansen  
Email Address: marankie@sbcglobal.net  
Affiliation:

Subject: AB118 (car scrap)  
Comment:

Gentlemen,

I am writing to oppose Assembly Bill 118, Enhanced Fleet modernization Program (Car Scrap)

As owner of 2 very valuable pre 76 collector cars, I oppose any changes to do with the emission program requirements for these cars.

These collector cars are representative of a strong car Collector hobby Industry in California, which contributes significantly to the state's tax revenues and employs a significant number of people in manufacturing (parts) sales (mail order and across counter specialty car parts stores) and service (car restoration shops).

It also provides enormous enjoyment for car people like me, who by the very nature of the older cars are frequently senior citizens. Like most collectors, my hobby cars are only driven on the weekends for short distances or specialty car events, and operate under the limitations of collector car insurance. Just like most of us, for every day driving I use my modern car.

Lastly, with the grim state that California's budget is currently in, the last thing we need is another program to spend more of the taxpayer's money, or take more money out of California school programs to pay for this limited benefit program. Older clunker cars will die out all by themselves. They do not need this (proposed AB118) expensive help to do so just a few months or years earlier.

Thank you for your consideration,

Martin Jansen

29406 Promontory place,

Agoura Hills CA 91301

=====

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-11 08:55:43

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 57 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Dale

Last Name: Lee

Email Address: leed3@cox.net

Affiliation: Assn of California Car Clubs

Subject: Please oppose AB118 Vehicle Scrappage Program

Comment:

To Mary Nichols, Chairperson California Air Resources Board:  
Congratulations on being honored at the 2009 California Air Quality Awards. I am attending this event in Los Angeles on June 12th. Mary, please reconsider the impact on owners of older 1976 autos that would be affected by this bill. Per DMV (Dennis Clear), only 338,750 vehicles are 1976 or older out of the total of 22,882,226 vehicles currently registered in the State. Many of these older classics are seldom driven, used only for car shows or parades, and are kept in upgraded condition with newer engines, smog systems installed etc. Their impact on smog generation is miniscule since they are seldom driven, often stored, and never used for daily commuting. I want clean air for California too, but eliminating older classic cars is not the answer. Regards, Dale Lee, Director Southern California Association of Car Clubs.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-11 12:09:07

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 58 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Stuart E.

Last Name: Ryce

Email Address: sryce@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program Regulation

Comment:

The danger of this proposal is the potential mass loss of history of the automobile prior to 1976 if the vehicles encouraged to be removed from the road end up shredded. I'm not against encouraging the general population from being more environmentally conscience, but to the admirers and collectors like myself, the fear is that parts for restorations get destroyed wholesale and unavailable in the future. I'd be much more inclined to support a government that would implement a provision that this wholesale shredding would be discouraged and recycle or junk yards be encouraged. Therefore I am strongly against this program and will be watching closely which of our legislators votes yea or nay. The yea's will have lost my future vote and every effort will be made to replace them.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-12 20:35:32

No Duplicates.

**Comment 59 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Carl

Last Name: Nielson

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: Car Scrap

Comment:

please see attached

Attachment: [www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/60-carl\\_nielson.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/60-carl_nielson.pdf)

Original File Name: Carl Nielson.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-16 13:55:46

No Duplicates.

**Comment 60 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Kurt

Last Name: Zimmerman

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: Smog Laws

Comment:

please see attached

Attachment: [www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/61-kurt.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/61-kurt.pdf)

Original File Name: Kurt.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-17 10:55:22

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 61 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: G.W.

Last Name: Neumann

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: Vehicle Scrappage Program

Comment:

please see attached

Attachment: [www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/62-g.w.\\_neumann.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/62-g.w._neumann.pdf)

Original File Name: G.W. Neumann.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-17 13:07:15

No Duplicates.



## **Comment 62 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: David

Last Name: Wheeler

Email Address: Roberts068@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Scrapage of pre-76 vehicles

Comment:

SB42 recognized that pre-76 vehicles represent a very small portion of the vehicle miles traveled and continue to decrease with attrition. Most pre-76 vehicles that are driveable are worth far more than your scrap incentive. This is an ill-conceived plan that will achieve no improvement in air quality. Even if all pre-76 vehicles were eliminated from the roadways, there would be a negligible impact as most are not driven daily. In this era of cutbacks, taxpayer money should be spent on programs that work, not on supporting somebody's agenda.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-19 11:47:17

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 63 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Bruce

Last Name: Champie

Email Address: champie@humboldt.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Car scrap

Comment:

Dear members of the board,I urge you not to pass laws that will make it unlawful to drive historic automobiles.My old car has been a big part of my life,it's part of my family.I don't drive it very much,but I consider it a highlite of my life to enjoy a drive in our beautiful state in my old hotrod.Vintage cars,in good repair,and the gearheads who love them,deserve a place on the road.  
Thank you,Bruce Champie

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-20 22:24:26

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 64 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Andrews

Email Address: 62pluckedchicken@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Good Intentions.. short sighted results

Comment:

For a bankrupt state to set aside 30 million dollars, for a non-problem is either grand-standing or ignorance by the bill author.

Pre 1976 automobiles account for a small, and ever shrinking, percentage of cars on the road already.. hence not the smog menace that requires 30 million dollars of tax-payer money.

the impact of destroying these cars in the name of the environment is... well.. just plain short-sighted...

the environmental cost to recover the scrap metal from these cars far out weights anything you may be saving.. their ie the trucking costs to move them to a crushing, smelting location, the cost of melting down and fabrication of the metal to make it useful, and the finally , the energy and environmental cost of making something useful again.. another car?? ever hear of carbon debt?

Not to mention what are you going to do with the foam. plastic and vinyl from these cars?? dot the landscape with even more landfills.. or pay another state to pollute their land?

Finally the "Let them eat cake" attitude.. somehow you believe you are doing the low-income families a favor, by paying them \$1800 for their car, and/or taking all affordable used cars off the market..

that would be all good if new cars cost between \$2000 and \$4000 by taking all affordable automobiles off the road, you are in effect tell low-income families "you don't deserve a car"...

All I can say.. is cleaning up smog is a good cause... but this is the most ill-conceived piece of legislation I've seen in a long time. 30 million dollars, could be better spent elsewhere.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-21 09:14:36

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 65 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Clifton

Last Name: Gully

Email Address: pacer19@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: AB 118 carscrap09

Comment:

i am opposed to AB 118. There are few cars running around that are pre-1976. the impact that this proposal will have is very insignificant. the amount of pollutants from pre-1976 cars is very small, especially when compared to the huge amount of pollutants from modern cars, factories, coal plants, etc. it would be irrelevant to remove these pre-1976 because they are classic cars, which are generally maintained and in great running order, thus not polluting much anyway. Give it time, and the pre-1976 vehicles that are not being restored will phase out due gas prices and registration and insurance prices.

It will be a great harm to car enthusiast (like myself), hotrodders, car collectors, and car history itself to remove these cars from the road. Many classic cars have been modified for performance for the simple reason that they did not have to pass smog, because there was no smog on these classic cars. now to add smog onto these cars is a crime because the majority of them might not pass, thus leaving these cars not drivable on public roads. some people spent their whole lives building these classic cars, and it would be terrible for them to never get to drive them just because of some stupid logistical reason.

Furthermore, California is in a budget crisis. Paying people to remove their cars is not the answer. i agree that we all need to reduce air pollutants, but there are better ways of doing so than trying to remove these classic cars.

As i mentioned before, there is not enough of these classic pre-1976 cars to have any real effect on the environment anyway. trying to remove them is not the answer, nor will it have any real effect.

I am opposed to AB 118. i urge you and everyone else to oppose and reconsider this proposal.

Thank you,

Clifton Gully

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-21 14:12:42

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 66 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Stearns

Email Address: bstearns@ncbb.net

Affiliation: Association of California Car Clubs

Subject: Pre-1976 Vehicles subject to EFMPR

Comment:

With the financial condition of the State of California, it is a mistake to spend \$30 million a year on a program that will provide little if any solution to the air quality problems in California. The incentives offered mainly provide an opportunity to get a discount on purchasing a newer vehicle which most dealerships will give to a consumer anyway. The pre-1976 vehicles are primarily used for shows and driven very few miles a year. If these vehicles are destroyed, it will limit OEM parts that car enthusiasts use for restorations. In 2007, when the governor signed AB118 to use \$200 million to clean the air, the state was not in the financial bind it is today. With layoffs in public safety, I would prefer to have police and fire readily available to protect the property and lives of my family than spend money on a program that uses assumptions from a computer model to determine any air quality emissions reductions. As a concerned tax payer and car enthusiast, I respectfully request that this EFMPR program be scrapped,

Thank you

Bob Stearns

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-22 18:07:28

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 67 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Jack

Last Name: Lindsay

Email Address: jack\_lindsay@msn.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Car Scrappage

Comment:

As an avid car hobbieist I oppose the car scrappage program as it will limit parts, especially polution control components, necessary to keep older cars on the road.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-23 05:59:00

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 68 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Sean  
Last Name: Mohajer  
Email Address: aqmsauto@yahoo.com  
Affiliation: 866-994-9998

Subject: AB 118 comments  
Comment:

Attachment: [www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/69-ab\\_118\\_final.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/69-ab_118_final.pdf)

Original File Name: AB 118 Final.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-23 07:46:40

No Duplicates.



## **Comment 69 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Fred  
Last Name: Evenson  
Email Address: fevenson@sbcglobal.net  
Affiliation: ACCC

Subject: Car Scrappage  
Comment:

The car hobby is probably one of the best recyclers around. The targeted autos in this proposal are the sought after cars to be recycled, both to be restored and to be used for donor parts cars. The car hobby also improves the economy by buying parts and services to do the restoration work.

The car hobby also donates thru the hundreds of car shows up to 36 million a year to charities such as Vets, Crippled Children, Prostate cancer research, United Way, Schools, Law enforcement, Fire depts.

You want to spend 97 million on a group of cars that are not part of the problem, as they are only 1.4% of the registered cars, and a lot of these cars are restored, recycled and in prime running condition. And they are only driven a few hundred miles a year, to shows etc.

Fred Evenson

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-23 09:01:58

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 70 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Frank

Last Name: Hileman

Email Address: fhileman@bellsouth.net

Affiliation:

Subject: AB 118 EFMPR (Car Scrap)

Comment:

Please see the attached letter and comments.

Attachment: [www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/71-comments\\_ab118\\_regulations\\_flh\\_\\_june\\_2009\\_-.zip](http://www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/71-comments_ab118_regulations_flh__june_2009_-.zip)

Original File Name: Comments AB118 Regulations FLH (June 2009)-.zip

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-23 09:42:42

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 71 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Lee

Last Name: Lieberg

Email Address: liebergl@socal.rr.com

Affiliation: Association of Calif Car Clubs

Subject: Classic Car Preservation

Comment:

I feel that in light of the economic freefall that California is experiencing it is unconscionable that scrapping old cars would take priority over children's health insurance, public education, public safety or any number of vital services being eviscerated through budget cuts. This is especially true in light of Congress's imminent creation of a national scrappage program, which provides a far greater credit than the California proposal for new car purchases. In fact, due to the new federal program, it only makes sense that all state funds dedicated to providing a credit for scrapping a vehicle should be used for other items needed. I also believe that the emissions reductions that will be realized by this program are based on faulty assumptions on how often these older vehicles are driven and their contribution to the state's emissions inventory. The fact that the proposal does not require that vehicles be subject to and fail a Smog check test in order to qualify represents a blatant attempt to lure into the scrappage program the pre-1976 collector cars that help drive the restoration market and the passions of many in the automotive hobbyist community.

Don't waste MY money on these frivolous "feel good" programs that really benefit almost none of us.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-23 15:17:25

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 72 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Will

Last Name: Barrett

Email Address: wbarrett@alac.org

Affiliation: American Lung Association in California

Subject: Support for EFMP regulation

Comment:

Please find the attached letter of support for the EFMP regulation with proposed amendments offered by environmental and public health organizations.

Attachment: [www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/73-supportefmpwithamendments6.23.09.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/73-supportefmpwithamendments6.23.09.pdf)

Original File Name: SupportEFMPwithAmendments6.23.09.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-23 17:10:34

No Duplicates.

## Comment 73 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.

First Name: Leonard  
Last Name: Trimlett  
Email Address: ltrimlet@pacbell.net  
Affiliation:

Subject: AB 118 EFMP (Car Scrap)  
Comment:

Your proposal to expand the number of vehicles eligible for scrappage is seriously flawed for several reasons.

1. There are approximately 692 thousand Pre-1976 vehicles in a California Fleet of 25 million vehicles (data courtesy of Inspection and Maintenance Review Committee). That is about 2% of the fleet.
2. Pre-1976 vehicles are for the most part non-emission controlled vehicles for which emission tests do not apply. That is less than 7 tenths of 1% of the fleet...trivial. That makes for a high cost proposal when calculating cost per ton of pollution removed.
3. When looking at the makeup of this segment of the fleet, it includes Horseless Carriage Vehicles, Hotrods and classic cars that are trailered to Car Shows, classic cars under construction, and cars that are garaged most of the year but brought out just for car shows.
4. It costs anywhere from \$40K to \$150K to put together a good show car. These cars will never make it to scrappage. Many of these vehicles never make it out of the project stage because it takes much planning, research and problem solving to make these vehicles roadworthy. I go to car shows a lot. The only vehicles that are "CLUNKERS" as you call them are ones where they are characterized by rust or fit the term "RATROD". Of the group of 692 thousand cars, I would estimate the number of "TRUE CLUNKERS" at maybe 5000 (most of which are only seen at shows). Contrary to CARB assumptions they are for the most part NOT daily drivers.
5. I can speak from personal experience. I purchased my 1965 Mustang in 1998 and still have it today. Since 1998 that Mustang has been on the road about 18K miles. That averages out to about 1800 miles per year on the road. That is not a lot when one considers that the average Vehicle Miles Travelled per year is 16K. My second hobby vehicle is a 1964 One Ton Panel Van. Since December 2008 (when I purchased it), the vehicle has chalked up maybe 150 miles. It has spent most of its time becoming roadworthy at restoration shops. Neither will reach scrappage.
6. My other two vehicles are a 1990 Chevy Van and a 1994 Toyota Pickup (both of which are included in the Daily Driver Category). These vehicles together get about 15 thousand miles per year.
7. My conclusion is that your numbers on Total Vehicle Miles Driven for the Pre-1976 vehicles are grossly over estimated. In talking to other hobbyists I find that I am not alone but rather the norm. If you calculate the cost per ton to implement targeting Pre-1976 using real numbers (not the assumptions you current use) I believe that you will find that the proposed regulation is prohibitive in cost.
8. Next, if you look at the proposal, the vehicles must be totally

scrapped which leaves nothing for dismantler parts to put the restoration vehicles back together. This is something that I find highly objectionable.

9. Next, when these vehicles are scrapped they must be totally crushed. Then an "Emission Reduction Credit" is issued that only industry can buy (not the individual). These "Emission Reduction Credits" are tradeable in the Commodities Market for anywhere from \$1000 to \$25000. Only industry can buy these. It transfers "The Right To Pollute" from the "Vehicle Owner" to industry. I find this to be pure hypocrisy.

10. Using CARB Proposed Regulation Statements this would affect 15000 vehicles per year at a cost of possibly \$2000 per vehicle. This is an approximation of \$30,000,000 per year....At a time when the State cannot even meet their existing financial commitments. For example the BAR CAP Program is going broke because so many people have taken advantage of the Assistance Program as a result of the economy. To help consumers that want to keep their car running would make far more sense than scrapping cars and transferring "The Right To Pollute" to industry. \$30 million would go a long way to keep the CAP program operating.

11. This regulation is also duplication in that the function in question is already covered by the CAP Program.

12. Next, when following the news, California has a huge deficit in case you weren't aware. The Legislature is having a free-for-all on the budget and trying to decide what are the least painful spending cuts to implement. They and the Governor have made huge cuts in essential services such as Public Safety, Fire, number of state employees, college funding, etc. These are essential to daily life. "CAR SCRAPPAGE" is NOT. "Car Scrappage" is at the bottom of the food chain in today's economy.

13. This Proposal is Entitled "Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program" which means that you want to subsidize the "New Car Industry". This makes the assumption that the average person to take advantage of this is a low income person. The average low income person that takes advantage of this program most likely will not be able to afford to buy a new car but will probably find another low cost used vehicle. To believe you are helping the new car industry by this proposal is hypocrisy.

With these comments in mind I urge you to scrap the "Scrappage Regulation" and use the money for something more productive.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-23 22:19:25

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 74 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Randy

Last Name: Blum

Email Address: rbingb@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Don't pass AB 118

Comment:

This bill is detrimental to those who collect and restore older cars. California has a large contingent of car collectors who depend on the availability of used parts to keep their own cars running. Most of these owners drive their cars only occasionally, as I do. I drive less than 2500 miles a year on my older car. I have other newer cars which are daily drivers, as most car collectors do.

The amount of pollution from such occasional use is inconsequential compared to other polluting entities. As those older cars that are driven daily age, they will automatically be phased out and be taken off the road. There is no need for regulation to drive those vehicles to the crusher and eliminate the opportunity to recycle the parts to car aficionados.

Don't pass this bill.

Randy Blum

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-24 07:54:12

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 75 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Stephen  
Last Name: McDonald  
Email Address: stevem@sema.org  
Affiliation: SEMA

Subject: AB 118 Enhanced Modernization Program Regulation (Car Scrap)  
Comment:

Attached are SEMA's comments to the CARB proposal regarding "AB 118 Enhanced Fleet Modernization program regulation (Car Scrap).

Attachment: [www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/76-ca-scrappageregcomm2009.doc](http://www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/76-ca-scrappageregcomm2009.doc)

Original File Name: CA-ScrappageRegComm2009.doc

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-24 11:48:44

No Duplicates.



**Comment 76 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 45 Day.**

First Name: Sean

Last Name: Mohajer

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: AQMS- Motive

Comment:

please see attached

Attachment: [www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/77-sean.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/77-sean.pdf)

Original File Name: Sean.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-24 15:11:44

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 1 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09). (At Hearing)**

First Name: Charlie

Last Name: Peters

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: Clean Air Performance Professionals

Comment:

please see attached

Attachment: [www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/78-charlie.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/78-charlie.pdf)

Original File Name: Charlie.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-06-30 15:01:48

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 1 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 15-1.**

First Name: Patrick

Last Name: Dilling

Email Address: p.dilling@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: We can't afford Car scrap

Comment:

The ARB and the legislation sponsor seem to be oblivious to the fact that the State of California is in financial crisis. There are far more important things to spend my tax dollars on than buying old cars and then paying someone to crush them. I fully support legitimate efforts to provide cleaner air. This initiative however is ridiculously expensive for the good it might achieve. Let's use our money where it is most needed.

Respectfully

Pat Dilling

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-12-09 15:33:28

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 2 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 15-1.**

First Name: Nicole

Last Name: Hickey

Email Address: thehickeyfamily@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation:

Subject: against AB 118

Comment:

Stop trying to get us out of our cars. We are already in debt and wasting money on this could not come at a worse time. I will vote against anyone who supports this kind of nonsense.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-12-09 15:53:18

No Duplicates.

### **Comment 3 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 15-1.**

First Name: Robin

Last Name: Cole

Email Address: coronet440@comcast.net

Affiliation: several clubs

Subject: Scrappage

Comment:

I am so tired of new bills attempting to destroy and remove classic cars under the guise of being green. Destroying an older car (while creating a carbon footprint to do that) and replacing it with a new favorite like the Pruis, is a environmental error. Just look into how the Pruis battery is created. 50 old classics wouldn't damage the environment the way a couple of Pruis batteries do. Then wasting tax payer money to pay to scrap cars in order to subsidize a car like the Pruis is an even bigger waste-show some thought instead of acting -think ! The classics are not the enemy. Stop giving standing factories and boats credits to continue to put out pollution if it is pollution and emissions you really want to get rid of. Stop subsidizing a special few car manufacturerers at the expense of already made cars

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-12-10 13:42:58

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 4 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 15-1.**

First Name: Edward  
Last Name: Hauser  
Email Address: stiltrukin@hotmail.com  
Affiliation: ACCC

Subject: AB118  
Comment:

This bill has so many things wrong with it, I don't where to start. The credit program upsets me the most. As far as a voucher, the dealers would probably give you that discount anyway. Removing these cars from the streets will not change the air quality enough to even measure. How about issuing a SB100 for every vehicle turned in. Another vehicle build that would "stimulate" the economy and put another charity producing vehicle on the road. That would really help our hobby, but it makes too much sense to work. This state is nearly broke (again) and here we are spending this kind of money an a worthless program like this!

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-12-11 08:56:04

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 5 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 15-1.**

First Name: Rex

Last Name: Roden

Email Address: rexroden@zetabb.com

Affiliation:

Subject: AB118

Comment:

Here we go again. I have a hard time understanding what the folks at CARB are thinking when it comes to clean air. They want to destroy a billion dollar industry in one swoop by outlawing our hot rods. Do they realize what harm this could do the already fragile California economy. It has the potential to eliminate jobs in the fields of body/paint, fabrication, and parts both new and used. If we have to scrap our hot rods it will also cause harm to the insurance industry that insures our cars. I see this as no win for anyone who owns an old car.

In addition, the \$30 million will not come close to covering the cost of this program...Just ask the Feds, the Cash For Clunkers program ended up costing the government \$23,000 per car once all the admin costs and bureaucratic costs were computed.

Please tell everyone you know to oppose this insanity and oppose this bill...

Rex Roden

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-12-11 15:24:03

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 6 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 15-1.**

First Name: Stacie

Last Name: Dominick

Email Address: dominick@goldrush.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Car Scrap

Comment:

I don't agree with the car scrap program. This will create a huge gap in the availability of parts for classic car enthusiasts that restore and cherish a part of our American history. These same enthusiasts keep their cars in tip top running order so I don't see the purpose of this waste of time and money. Who is going to pay for this?? Us? Again??  
NO TO CAR SCRAP!

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-12-12 12:00:28

No Duplicates.



## **Comment 7 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 15-1.**

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Black

Email Address: one4michaelg@mindspring.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Adoption of Proposed AB 118 Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program Regulation (Car Scrap)

Comment:

I urge the board to immediately stop the imposition of AB 118 Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program Regulation (Car Scrap) for the following reasons:

1. The CARB scientist who researched the data that drives this rule was found to have lied about his education credentials, and qualifications to act as a credible authority in the research used as justification for this rule.

2. The economy in this state will not support this radical regulation that will drive thousands of citizens from their jobs, and force businesses to relocate to other states.

The board should approve normal equipment replacement as units are replaced on a wear-out basis.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-12-13 15:57:55

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 8 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 15-1.**

First Name: Steve

Last Name: Douglas

Email Address: sdouglas@autoalliance.org

Affiliation:

Subject: Enhanced Fleet Modernization - AB 118 Comments

Comment:

The Alliance Of Automobile Manufacturers (Alliance) submits the enclosed testimony in response to the revised regulatory proposal implementing the Enhanced Fleet Modernization (EMF) component of AB 118.

The Alliance actively participated in the extensive negotiations involving AB 118 and publicly supported its enactment. Historically, the Alliance has strongly supported Fleet Modernization programs, which promote safety and fuel economy while, simultaneously, reducing air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.

The Alliance supports the revised regulatory proposal with one significant reservation. Specifically, the Alliance objects to Section 2623(f) and requests deletion of subdivision (f) in its entirety. The automobile industry is beleaguered. Sales of new vehicles nationally have plummeted from historic highs (approximately 16 million, annually) to 10 - 11 million vehicle sales, annually. Manufacturing capacity has been reduced. Dealerships have closed.

2010 may be more promising, but daunting challenges remain. For example, financing is increasingly hard to obtain and expensive to procure. Consumers who wish, or need, to purchase a new vehicle in 2010 will confront limited financing opportunities. Certainly, no artificial impediment to the purchase of a new vehicle (and retirement of an old vehicle) should be erected.

The Alliance considers subdivision (f) to be an imprudent impediment to an optimally-functioning EFM program. The intent of the EFM program is to create incentives to purchase new vehicles (and retire old vehicles). There is no provision in AB 118 that suggests incentives by other jurisdictions detract from the AB 118 program. Nothing in AB 118 compels rationing of incentives. To the contrary, the express purpose of AB 118 is to accelerate Fleet Modernization and avoid the inane and counter-productive limitations of other "scrappage" programs. Why discourage a robust EMF program by instituting artificial constraints? Do not constrain the Enhanced Fleet Modernization program (emphasis added) by imposing the limitation contained in (f).

The Alliance notes that nothing in the proposed regulations is permanent. If deletion of (f) produces objectionable results, we will support an adjustment. However, in the absence of evidence demonstrating an objectionable result, we request deletion of (f).

Thank you for your willingness to consider our position.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-12-22 11:50:37

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 9 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 15-1.**

First Name: Pierce

Last Name: Hawke

Email Address: beardosa@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reconsider this scrappage program

Comment:

Long story short: please consider cancelling the vehicle scrappage program since there is a demand for older vehicles that people can not only afford to purchase but, can harvest parts off of other cars/trucks that are already out of service (but not crushed) to keep the former running.

Note I have NO issue with smog tests provided they test only the Evap systems and tailpipe emissions for vehicles 30 years old and newer. Equipment 'legality' should be moot if what comes out the back is within guidelines predicated upon the year of the sheetmetal. Although for 1996+ vehicles; the OBD-II port should tell the tale :)

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-12-26 18:38:53

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 10 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 15-1.**

First Name: Jonathan

Last Name: Morrison

Email Address: jmorrison@cncda.org

Affiliation:

Subject: CNCDA Comments on 15-Day EFMP Amendments

Comment:

Please find attached CNCDA's comments concerning the proposed 15-day amendments to the EFMP Regulations.

Attachment: [www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/89-cncda\\_15-day\\_comments\\_on\\_efmp\\_regulations.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/89-cncda_15-day_comments_on_efmp_regulations.pdf)

Original File Name: CNCDA 15-Day Comments on EFMP Regulations.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2009-12-28 10:18:27

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 1 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 15-2.**

First Name: Jonathan

Last Name: Morrison

Email Address: jmorrison@cncda.org

Affiliation:

Subject: CNCDA Comments on 2nd 15-day Amendments

Comment:

Please find attached CNCDA's comments concerning CARB's 2nd set of 15-day amendments to the EFMP regulation.

Attachment: [www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/90-cncda\\_2nd\\_15-day\\_comments\\_on\\_fleet\\_mod\\_regs.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/90-cncda_2nd_15-day_comments_on_fleet_mod_regs.pdf)

Original File Name: CNCDA 2nd 15-Day Comments on Fleet Mod Regs.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-04-02 14:55:39

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 1 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 15-3.**

First Name: Richard  
Last Name: Tebbano  
Email Address: RMTebbano@gmail.com  
Affiliation:

Subject: Suspension of carpool stickers  
Comment:

I live in North Hollywood and work in Long Beach. I purchased a Prius in 2005 and obtained a carpool sticker for my commute. It has cut my commuting time in half. I do not understand the rationale for suspending the program. The carpool lanes are not congested and individuals continue to make the choice to drive solo. It is obvious to me that the legislators and governor do not care about the economy and air quality. They can not relate to the average California who has to deal with the traffic - especially in Los Angeles. If they drove in this traffic on a daily basis they would make sure programs like this would continue. There is no good reason to suspend this program and I am opposed to it.

Dr. Richard Tebbano

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-07-27 07:08:07

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 2 for Car Scrap Program (carscrap09) - 15-3.**

First Name: Jack

Last Name: Broadbent

Email Address: Non-web submitted comment

Affiliation:

Subject: Bay Area AQMD

Comment:

please see attached

Attachment: [www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/92-broadbent.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/lists/carscrap09/92-broadbent.pdf)

Original File Name: Broadbent.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-07-29 14:03:05

No Duplicates.