## Form Letter 1 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Martin Last Name: Tripp

Email Address: recn@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Martin Tripp Santa Clarita, CA 91390

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 10:21:07

## Form Letter 2 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Linda Last Name: Fidell

Email Address: linda.fidell@csun.edu

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Linda Fidell Morro Bay, CA 93442

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 10:25:19

## Form Letter 3 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Albert Last Name: Weckel

Email Address: acweckel@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Albert Weckel Novato, CA 94949

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 10:31:24

## Form Letter 4 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Maria Last Name: Ruiz

Email Address: mdruiz277@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Maria Ruiz Novato, CA 94949

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 10:32:27

## Form Letter 5 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Courtney Last Name: Christoffer

Email Address: christoffer66@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Courtney Christoffer Upland, CA 91786

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 10:39:49

## Form Letter 6 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Joan Last Name: Andersson

Email Address: joanandersson200@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Joan Andersson Berkeley, CA 94708

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 10:47:04

## Form Letter 7 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: J. Michael Last Name: Bossert

Email Address: bossert@csus.edu

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, J. Michael Bossert Sacramento, CA 95825

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 10:53:42

# Form Letter 8 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Elaine

Last Name: Wander Leclaire

Email Address: wanderelaine@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Elaine Wander Leclaire Rodeo, CA 94572

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 10:57:12

## Form Letter 9 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Nan Last Name: Ayers

Email Address: nxayers@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Nan Ayers Richmond, CA 94804

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 11:02:15

## Form Letter 10 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Tom Last Name: Ballard

Email Address: tdbaction@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Tom Ballard Santee, CA 92071

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 11:11:08

## Form Letter 11 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: p Last Name: e

Email Address: axclusiv\_97@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, p e Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 11:12:43

## Form Letter 12 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Merrill Last Name: Berge

Email Address: merrillberge@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Eliminate fossil fuel subsidies, not clean transportation funding! Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Merrill Berge Camarillo, CA 93010

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 11:14:20

## Form Letter 13 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Kenneth Last Name: Pennington

Email Address: kpnn.pol@mac.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Kenneth Pennington Ventura, CA 93001

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 11:14:26

# Form Letter 14 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: VICTOR Last Name: PAGLIA

Email Address: vic\_paglia@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, VICTOR PAGLIA Newport Beach, CA 92663

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 11:28:01

## Form Letter 15 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Nancy Last Name: Joachim

Email Address: nancy.joachimmd@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Nancy Joachim Berkeley, CA 94704

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 11:28:28

## Form Letter 16 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Tamara Last Name: Swanson

Email Address: childrenfirst66@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Tamara Swanson Monrovia, CA 91016

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 11:29:55

# Form Letter 17 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Daryl Last Name: .Gale

Email Address: turtleperson@earthlink.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Crappy California air!

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Daryl .Gale Los Angeles, CA 90013

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 11:30:35

# Form Letter 18 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Meera Last Name: P

Email Address: payment-broth@iclohd.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Meera P Fremont, CA 94539

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 11:31:00

# Form Letter 19 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Judith Last Name: Borcz

Email Address: judy@norquay.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Judith Borcz Redwood City, CA 94062

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 11:33:28

# Form Letter 20 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Marie Last Name: VanderLinde

Email Address: marievl88@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Marie VanderLinde Grand Rapids, MI 49507

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 11:33:47

# Form Letter 21 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Ann Last Name: Nitzan

Email Address: ann.nitzan@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Ann Nitzan Palo Alto, CA 94301

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 11:34:20

# Form Letter 22 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Brian Last Name: Gygi

Email Address: bgygi2@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Brian Gygi Richmond, CA 94804

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 11:39:14

# Form Letter 23 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Katie Last Name: Thibodeau

Email Address: knicole102@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Katie Thibodeau Calabasas, CA 91302

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 11:43:45

# Form Letter 24 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Shirley Last Name: Shelangoski

Email Address: sjs\_159@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Shirley Shelangoski Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 11:43:59

# Form Letter 25 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jane Last Name: Edwards

Email Address: jpedwards@ca.rr.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jane Edwards La Palma, CA 90623

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 12:11:24

# Form Letter 26 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Seren Last Name: Bradshaw

Email Address: seren.bradshaw@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Seren Bradshaw Westwood, CA 96137

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 12:31:36

# Form Letter 27 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Christine Last Name: Fisher

Email Address: chrisfisher42@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard for sustainability

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Christine Fisher Newark, CA 94560

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 12:34:12

# Form Letter 28 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: W.E. Last Name: Miller

Email Address: 3841miller@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

California cannot meet our clean air and climate goals without harnessing the power of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and overhauling this multibillion-dollar program for our zero emissions future. Please act expeditiously to reform the program to achieve our state's ambitious goals.

Sincerely, W.E. Miller Oakland, CA 94602 Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 12:43:17

# Form Letter 29 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Carlton Last Name: Sloan

Email Address: carlton@newworldparty.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please Reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Carlton Sloan Guerneville, CA 95446

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 12:45:23

# Form Letter 30 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Mary Last Name: Baville

Email Address: mary.baville@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Mary Baville San Dimas, CA 91773

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 12:47:38

# Form Letter 31 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Valerie Last Name: Johnson

Email Address: valerieajohnson@earthlink.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Valerie Johnson Mission Hills, CA 91345

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 12:58:28

# Form Letter 32 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Michael Last Name: Cline

Email Address: mrcline@clinefoto.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Michael Cline Indio, CA 92201

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 12:59:10

# Form Letter 33 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Alfredo Last Name: Lopez

Email Address: jovany.lopez@pukuu.org

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard for the betterment of future generations Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Alfredo Lopez Pacoima, CA 91331

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 13:00:26

# Form Letter 34 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Cecelia Last Name: Crane

Email Address: ceceliacrane52@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Cecelia Crane South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 13:00:48

# Form Letter 35 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Ruby Last Name: Miller

Email Address: rubygracemiller@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Ruby Miller Chula Vista, CA 91913

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 13:14:37

# Form Letter 36 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: William Last Name: Bossinger

Email Address: bbossinger1@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, William Bossinger Antelope, CA 95843

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 13:39:05

## Form Letter 37 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Susan Last Name: Boggiano

Email Address: susanboggiano@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Susan Boggiano Oakland, CA 94605

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 13:54:47

## Form Letter 38 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Sharon Last Name: Clark

Email Address: mt.rainier93@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Sharon Clark Auburn, CA 95603

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 13:56:38

### Form Letter 39 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Victor Last Name: Torres

Email Address: viczalasar@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Victor Torres Oxnard, CA 93033

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 14:03:56

### Form Letter 40 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Laura Last Name: Laughlin

Email Address: lauravlaughlin@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Laura Laughlin Sacramento, CA 95831

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 14:10:14

### Form Letter 41 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Pegalee Last Name: Benda

Email Address: pegaleeczek@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Pegalee Benda Sonoma, CA 95476

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 14:10:59

### Form Letter 42 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Joan Last Name: Poss

Email Address: ilsasso2003@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Joan Poss Fresno, CA 93704

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 14:21:27

### Form Letter 43 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Alexander Last Name: Vollmer

Email Address: abvollmer@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Alexander Vollmer San Rafael, CA 94901

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-14 14:21:58

## Form Letter 44 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Gail Last Name: Camhi

Email Address: gailcamhi24@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Gail Camhi Novato, CA 94949

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 06:45:44

## Form Letter 45 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Sabrena Last Name: Rodriguez

Email Address: sabrena.rodriguez@venturausd.org

Affiliation:

Subject: reform LCFS

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

California cannot meet our clean air and climate goals without harnessing the power of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and overhauling this multibillion-dollar program for our zero emissions future.

Sincerely, Sabrena Rodriguez Ventura, CA 93001

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 07:10:41

## Form Letter 46 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Karel

Last Name: Kretzschmar

Email Address: fx3taxi@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Karel Kretzschmar San Francisco, CA 94118

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 09:50:53

# Form Letter 47 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jasmine Last Name: Tokuda

Email Address: Jasmine@JasmineBazaar.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Biofuels are not renewable. Let'sinvest in solar, wind, geothermal and wave energy production instead.

Sincerely, Jasmine Tokuda Alameda, CA 94501

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 09:59:56

## Form Letter 48 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: gerry Last Name: racik

Email Address: grgerrac@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, gerry racik San Diego, CA 92128

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 10:05:56

## Form Letter 49 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Mishwa Last Name: Lee

Email Address: mishwalee@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Please prove that your agency is really dedicated to protecting our & your air. As a SF resident with asthma and a grandmother I care.

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

California cannot meet our clean air and climate goals without harnessing the power of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and

overhauling this multibillion-dollar program for our zero emissions future. Please act expeditiously to reform the program to achieve our state's ambitious goals.

Sincerely, Mishwa Lee San Francisco, CA 94124

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 10:28:06

### Form Letter 50 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Linda Last Name: Ferreira

Email Address: lindalferreira@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Linda Ferreira Santa Rosa, CA 95409

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 10:30:47

## Form Letter 51 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Persephone Last Name: Maywald

Email Address: wherevertherapy@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Persephone Maywald Mckinleyville, CA 95519

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 10:35:27

### Form Letter 52 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Kathryn Last Name: Santana

Email Address: kathryn.qahira@gmil.comt

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Kathryn Santana Concord, CA 94518

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 10:46:18

### Form Letter 53 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: O'Neill Last Name: Louchard

Email Address: oneill@olympus.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, O'Neill Louchard Visalia, CA 93292

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 10:49:39

### Form Letter 54 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Robert Last Name: Thornhill

Email Address: robertthornhill14@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Robert Thornhill Clackamas, OR 97015

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 11:04:24

### Form Letter 55 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: rosine Last Name: simitian

Email Address: rosysim@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, rosine simitian Los Angeles, CA 90065

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 11:23:29

## Form Letter 56 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lorraine Last Name: Gilbert

Email Address: lffngilbert@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lorraine Gilbert Signal Hill, CA 90755

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 11:28:36

## Form Letter 57 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Ruth Last Name: Hardin

Email Address: ruth.crossroads@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Ruth Hardin Urbandale, IA 50322

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 11:36:22

## Form Letter 58 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Katherine Last Name: Aker

Email Address: kathiaker@icloud.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Katherine Aker Tujunga, CA 91042

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 11:48:56

# Form Letter 59 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Madeline Last Name: Covey

Email Address: madelinecovey@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Madeline Covey Palo Alto, CA 94306

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 12:10:48

## Form Letter 60 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: DM Last Name: Myers

Email Address: dmmyers@pm.me

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, DM Myers San Francisco, CA 94146

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 12:28:36

## Form Letter 61 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Janice Last Name: Wood

Email Address: janicehayeswood64@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Janice Wood Lafayette, CA 94549

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 12:30:56

## Form Letter 62 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lori A Last Name: Hammett

Email Address: laluvskats@outlook.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lori A Hammett Albuquerque, NM 87111

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 13:01:27

## Form Letter 63 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jay Last Name: Weiner

Email Address: jaymw@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

I am literally sick of subversion of clean energy funding into more burning fuels. I am living surrounded by fossil fuel monstrosities, Chevron, Valero, etc., with the periodic releases and the flaring on a regular basis. Put the money into electrified transport from renewable sources. Build the solar infrastructure needed for all electric vehicles!

Sincerely, Jay Weiner San Pablo, CA 94806

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 13:07:26

## Form Letter 64 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: wayne Last Name: marien

Email Address: pickled-soled.0z@icloud.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, wayne marien Monterey, CA 93940

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 13:11:52

## Form Letter 65 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Roberto Last Name: EsquivelSr

Email Address: resquivel0831@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Roberto EsquivelSr San Antonio, TX 78212

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 13:17:37

## Form Letter 66 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: David Last Name: Councilman

Email Address: dlcouncilman@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, David Councilman Minneapolis, MN 55426

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 13:38:58

## Form Letter 67 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Joan Last Name: Miller

Email Address: joanleslie6514@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Joan Miller Anaheim, CA 92804

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 13:39:25

## Form Letter 68 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Catherine Last Name: Ronan

Email Address: cmronan@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Stop subsidizing LCFS

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Catherine Ronan Los Angeles, CA 90066

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 13:40:03

## Form Letter 69 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Gilles Last Name: de Brouwer

Email Address: gdebrouwer@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Gilles de Brouwer Cypress, CA 90630

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 13:44:28

## Form Letter 70 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Carell Last Name: Jantzen

Email Address: carell@egan.org

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Carell Jantzen Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 14:08:50

## Form Letter 71 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Darius Last Name: Derakshan

Email Address: dderakshan@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Darius Derakshan Los Angeles, CA 90065

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 14:31:55

## Form Letter 72 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Linda Last Name: Tillery

Email Address: ltillery831@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Linda Tillery Freedom, CA 95019

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 14:43:35

# Form Letter 73 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Constance Last Name: Flannery

Email Address: msflannery@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Constance Flannery San Francisco, CA 94131

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 14:43:37

## Form Letter 74 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Cyril Last Name: Bouteille

Email Address: cyril4j@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Cyril Bouteille Mountain View, CA 94043

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 14:46:01

## Form Letter 75 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Susan Last Name: Brisby

Email Address: sabrisby@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Susan Brisby Lancaster, CA 93536

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 14:55:37

## Form Letter 76 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Joseph Last Name: Razo

Email Address: joe\_razo@verizon.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Joseph Razo Camarillo, CA 93012

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 15:05:15

## Form Letter 77 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Rhys Last Name: Atkinson

Email Address: atkinsongatsby@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Rhys Atkinson Corte Madera, CA 94925

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 15:16:54

# Form Letter 78 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Toula Last Name: Siacotos

Email Address: toulas300@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Toula Siacotos Richmond, CA 94801

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 15:29:48

## Form Letter 79 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Mary Last Name: Stanistreet

Email Address: mkstanistreet@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Mary Stanistreet Ventura, CA 93003

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 16:05:16

## Form Letter 80 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Patricia Last Name: Goodson

Email Address: spiritlady2@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Patricia Goodson Clearlake Oaks, CA 95423

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 16:08:25

## Form Letter 81 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Judy Last Name: Johnson

Email Address: jujojo4343@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Judy Johnson Placerville, CA 95667

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 16:10:34

# Form Letter 82 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Susan Last Name: Whisman

Email Address: whismansusan13@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Susan Whisman Santa Rosa, CA 95409

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 16:15:54

## Form Letter 83 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jean Last Name: Tepperman

Email Address: jeantepper@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jean Tepperman Berkeley, CA 94703

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 16:24:17

# Form Letter 84 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jorge Last Name: Ortiz

Email Address: jorge.g.ortiz@mail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jorge Ortiz Los Angeles, CA 90046

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 16:44:43

## Form Letter 85 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Trudy Last Name: Morgan

Email Address: morganmiller@pacific.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Trudy Morgan Ukiah, CA 95482

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 16:46:34

## Form Letter 86 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Sharon Last Name: Sprouse

Email Address: sharonsprouse999@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Sharon Sprouse Poway, CA 92064

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 16:48:46

# Form Letter 87 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Joan Last Name: Poss

Email Address: ilsasso2003@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Joan Poss Fresno, CA 93704

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 16:52:19

## Form Letter 88 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Rebecca Last Name: Shirley

Email Address: cloudanc@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Rebecca Shirley Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 16:53:50

## Form Letter 89 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Julie Last Name: Vetrie

Email Address: jvetrie@att.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Julie Vetrie Canyon Country, CA 91387

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 17:50:42

## Form Letter 90 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Gilles Last Name: Matin

Email Address: gmarin@chineitsang.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Gilles Matin San Rafael, CA 94903

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 18:01:17

## Form Letter 91 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Captain Richard

Last Name: Gillette

Email Address: captain.rgillette@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Captain Richard Gillette Oakhurst, CA 93644

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 18:20:00

# Form Letter 92 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Julie Last Name: Vetrie

Email Address: jvetrie@att.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Julie Vetrie Canyon Country, CA 91387

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 18:33:18

# Form Letter 93 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Richard Last Name: Matthews

Email Address: rickmmmm@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Richard Matthews San Pedro, CA 90731

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 18:52:22

# Form Letter 94 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Julie Last Name: Vetrie

Email Address: jvetrie@att.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Julie Vetrie Canyon Country, CA 91387

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 18:56:46

# Form Letter 95 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Shirley Last Name: Craine

Email Address: scraine@myyahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Shirley Craine Sacramento, CA 95818

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 18:56:50

# Form Letter 96 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Mike Last Name: Cabourne

Email Address: mcnjc@roadrunner.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Mike Cabourne Fullerton, CA 92831

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 19:08:47

# Form Letter 97 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Wendy R Last Name: Johnson

Email Address: wendyraej@icoud.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Wendy R Johnson Port Angeles, WA 98363

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 19:31:45

# Form Letter 98 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Eva Last Name: Lopez

Email Address: evalopez24910@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Eva Lopez Gualala, CA 95445

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 19:40:00

# Form Letter 99 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Thomas Last Name: Luce

Email Address: tomfluce@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Thomas Luce Berkeley, CA 94703

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 19:42:34

# Form Letter 100 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Brianna Last Name: Egan

Email Address: briannajuice@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility. We must put all our focus and funding on electrification projects, including electrifying bus fleets and rail transportation. Let's not be swayed by dirty energy or hydrogen boondoggles either.

California cannot meet our clean air and climate goals without harnessing the power of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and overhauling this multibillion-dollar program for our zero emissions

future. Please act expeditiously to reform the program to achieve our state's ambitious goals.

Sincerely, Brianna Egan Redlands, CA 92373

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 19:46:35

# Form Letter 101 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Terry Last Name: Robinson

Email Address: trobinson@surewest.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Terry Robinson Citrus Heights, CA 95610

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 19:54:42

# Form Letter 102 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Shannon Last Name: Kemena

Email Address: skemena@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Shannon Kemena Elk Grove, CA 95758

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 19:58:59

# Form Letter 103 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Janet Last Name: Maker

Email Address: jamaker2001@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Janet Maker Los Angeles, CA 90024

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 20:00:53

# Form Letter 104 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Glenn Last Name: Tannous

Email Address: gctannous@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Glenn Tannous Glendale, CA 91205

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 20:05:34

# Form Letter 105 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jordis Last Name: Moore

Email Address: jordimoore2@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jordis Moore San Ramon, CA 94583

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 20:08:38

# Form Letter 106 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Katy Last Name: Schlecht

Email Address: k.m.i.schlecht@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Katy Schlecht Salinas, CA 93901

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 20:17:45

# Form Letter 107 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Debbie Last Name: Scannell

Email Address: debbie@scannell.us

Affiliation:

Subject: WHEN IS THIS HAPPENING? Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Debbie Scannell San Gabriel, CA 91775

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 20:17:45

# Form Letter 108 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: BethAnn Last Name: Coombs

Email Address: bafcoombs@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, BethAnn Coombs Sacramento, CA 95841

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 20:22:49

# Form Letter 109 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lisa Last Name: Breslauer

Email Address: lbreslauer@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lisa Breslauer Woodland, CA 95695

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 20:30:24

# Form Letter 110 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Marilyn Last Name: Ditmanson

Email Address: mditmanson@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Marilyn Ditmanson Chico, CA 95973

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 20:34:50

# Form Letter 111 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Elvira Last Name: Malabanan

Email Address: lvei\_peregrino@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Elvira Malabanan Manteca, CA 95337

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 20:57:30

# Form Letter 112 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Bonita Last Name: Werner

Email Address: bonniewerner@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Bonita Werner Riverside, CA 92507

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 20:59:48

# Form Letter 113 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Georgia Last Name: Carver

Email Address: carvergl@att.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Georgia Carver Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 21:09:51

# Form Letter 114 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: jeffrey Last Name: A sapin

Email Address: jsapin@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, jeffrey A sapin Altadena, CA 91001

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 21:12:31

# Form Letter 115 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jessica Last Name: Powers

Email Address: auburna@msn.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jessica Powers Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91739

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 21:35:56

# Form Letter 116 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Susan Last Name: Brown

Email Address: sbrown.politics@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Susan Brown Sacramento, CA 95814

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 22:16:29

# Form Letter 117 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Glenn Last Name: Smith

Email Address: glenntrumpet@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Glenn Smith Nevada City, CA 95959

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 22:21:44

# Form Letter 118 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Marg Last Name: Hoy

Email Address: mahoyle@icloud.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Marg Hoy Escondido, CA 92025

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 22:27:38

# Form Letter 119 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Patricia Last Name: Flowers

Email Address: protutor619@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Patricia Flowers Imperial Beach, CA 91932

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-15 22:48:45

# Form Letter 120 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Pamela Last Name: Bailey

Email Address: pmikkels@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Pamela Bailey Talent, OR 97540

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 00:00:17

# Form Letter 121 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Valerie C Last Name: Stidean

Email Address: vstidean@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Valerie C Stidean San Bernardino, CA 92404

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 00:00:29

# Form Letter 122 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: AJ Last Name: Cho

Email Address: amenoartemis@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, AJ Cho San Leandro, CA 94579

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 00:00:31

# Form Letter 123 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Rick Last Name: Ehrhart

Email Address: rick\_ehrhart@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Rick Ehrhart San Jose, CA 95125

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 00:00:49

# Form Letter 124 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Geoff Last Name: Regalado

Email Address: gregalado74@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Geoff Regalado Burbank, CA 91503

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 00:01:01

# Form Letter 125 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Michelle Last Name: Biondini

Email Address: chelle47m@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Michelle Biondini San Francisco, CA 94134

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 00:01:02

# Form Letter 126 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Robin Last Name: Karp

Email Address: robinka22@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Robin Karp San Diego, CA 92139

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 00:01:18

# Form Letter 127 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Cynkay Last Name: Morningsong

Email Address: sacredescapades@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Cynkay Morningsong Santa Rosa, CA 95407

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 00:16:35

# Form Letter 128 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Robert Last Name: Howard

Email Address: RobertJefferyHoward@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Robert Howard Modesto, CA 95350

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 00:35:04

# Form Letter 129 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Sally Last Name: Allen

Email Address: sallyjallen@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Sally Allen Citrus Heights, CA 95621

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 02:12:39

# Form Letter 130 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Carol Last Name: Weissberg

Email Address: shoshannah@socal.rr.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Carol Weissberg Chatsworth, CA 91311

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 03:15:23

# Form Letter 131 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Janet Last Name: Melton

Email Address: janetmelton@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Janet Melton Kelseyville, CA 95451

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 05:55:16

# Form Letter 132 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jennifer Last Name: Nunn

Email Address: funtopiatoys@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jennifer Nunn Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 06:06:44

# Form Letter 133 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Patricia K. Last Name: Eagan

Email Address: eddies-suited-0r@icloud.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Patricia K. Eagan Truckee, CA 96161

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 06:24:44

# Form Letter 134 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Alfonso Last Name: Monsivais

Email Address: alfonso.monsivais@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Alfonso Monsivais Covina, CA 91722

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 06:27:46

# Form Letter 135 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Kelly Last Name: Seiler Vocke

Email Address: kelly.seilervocke@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Kelly Seiler Vocke San Diego, CA 92129

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 06:31:41

# Form Letter 136 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Emmanuel Last Name: Avila-Cortes

Email Address: e.avilacortes2017@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Emmanuel Avila-Cortes Moreno Valley, CA 92555

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 07:09:43

# Form Letter 137 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Stan Last Name: Souza

Email Address: srobertsouza@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Stan Souza Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 07:17:24

# Form Letter 138 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Carlos Last Name: Flores

Email Address: indio510.cf@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Carlos Flores Los Banos, CA 93635

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 07:28:30

# Form Letter 139 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Chris Last Name: Olson

Email Address: chrisjeffersolson@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Chris Olson Beaverton, OR 97007

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 07:29:18

# Form Letter 140 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: suzanne Last Name: bastian

Email Address: ascendme@mcn.org

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, suzanne bastian Gualala, CA 95445

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 07:36:35

# Form Letter 141 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Marla Last Name: Armstrong

Email Address: armstrongmarla@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Marla Armstrong Riverside, CA 92501

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 07:38:38

# Form Letter 142 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Cate Last Name: C

Email Address: catecalson@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Cate C Alameda, CA 94501

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 07:52:47

# Form Letter 143 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Brianna Last Name: Knickerbocker

Email Address: briannaknickerbocker@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Brianna Knickerbocker Reseda, CA 91335

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 08:14:56

# Form Letter 144 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Eileen Last Name: Fagan

Email Address: eileenfagan@att.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Eileen Fagan Valley Center, CA 92082

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 08:22:12

# Form Letter 145 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Naghmeh Last Name: Katsianos

Email Address: naghmeh@roadrunner.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Naghmeh Katsianos Highland, CA 92346

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 08:51:41

# Form Letter 146 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Susan Last Name: Briggs

Email Address: svb3290@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Susan Briggs Newport Beach, CA 92660

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 09:09:07

# Form Letter 147 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Maribel Last Name: Andonian

Email Address: mrandonian@mac.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Maribel Andonian Monterey, CA 93940

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 09:09:25

# Form Letter 148 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Evelyn Last Name: Isaak

Email Address: designut@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Evelyn Isaak Penngrove, CA 94951

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 09:10:37

# Form Letter 149 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Rosy Last Name: simitian

Email Address: rosysim@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Rosy simitian Los Angeles, CA 90065

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 09:12:29

# Form Letter 150 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Helen kate Last Name: Mcallister

Email Address: hkmcallister3@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Helen kate Mcallister Hidden Valley Lake, CA 95467

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 09:23:33

# Form Letter 151 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Helen kate Last Name: Mcallister

Email Address: hkmcallister3@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Helen kate Mcallister Hidden Valley Lake, CA 95467

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 09:39:53

# Form Letter 152 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Gloria Last Name: Albert

Email Address: gloria@wellnessworksusa.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Gloria Albert Santa Monica, CA 90403

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 09:53:41

# Form Letter 153 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Nan Last Name: Ayers

Email Address: nxayers@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Nan Ayers Richmond, CA 94804

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 09:54:15

# Form Letter 154 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Michelle Last Name: McCurdy

Email Address: momccurdy@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Michelle McCurdy San Diego, CA 92124

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 10:06:34

# Form Letter 155 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lee Last Name: Sparling

Email Address: lsparling2@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lee Sparling San Ramon, CA 94583

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 10:12:38

# Form Letter 156 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Paula Last Name: Milan

Email Address: pmilan311@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Paula Milan Sacramento, CA 95820

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 10:18:46

# Form Letter 157 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Michael Last Name: Lewy

Email Address: mlewy94708@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Michael Lewy Berkeley, CA 94708

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 10:57:07

# Form Letter 158 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Tina Last Name: Baker

Email Address: GoTWeener@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Tina Baker Apple Valley, CA 92307

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 11:04:59

# Form Letter 159 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Sandra Last Name: Levas

Email Address: sandylevas@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Sandra Levas Los Banos, CA 93635

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 11:10:16

# Form Letter 160 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Peggy Last Name: Holmes

Email Address: pegjane6@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Peggy Holmes Pinole, CA 94564

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 11:12:33

# Form Letter 161 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Judy Last Name: Kahle

Email Address: ourplanethome-care@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Judy Kahle Fairfield, CA 94533

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 11:15:58

# Form Letter 162 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Elizabeth Last Name: Floersch

Email Address: ktnaflac@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Floersch Goodlettsville, TN 37072

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 11:34:16

# Form Letter 163 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Larry Last Name: Fuller

Email Address: ljjf@ptd.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Larry Fuller Cathedral City, CA 92234

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 11:37:39

# Form Letter 164 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lori Last Name: Kegler

Email Address: lori.kegler@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lori Kegler San Pedro, CA 90731

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 11:42:49

# Form Letter 165 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Nat Last Name: Childs

Email Address: nat@asis.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please update the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Nat Childs Quartzsite, AZ 85359

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 11:43:57

# Form Letter 166 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Eva Last Name: Lopez

Email Address: evalopez24910@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Eva Lopez Gualala, CA 95445

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 11:43:58

# Form Letter 167 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Shirley Last Name: Craine

Email Address: scraine@myyahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Shirley Craine Sacramento, CA 95818

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 11:56:34

# Form Letter 168 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: David Last Name: Kinkaid

Email Address: glibishe@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, David Kinkaid San Diego, CA 92110

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 12:42:36

# Form Letter 169 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: George Last Name: Fosselius

Email Address: gfosselius@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, George Fosselius El Cerrito, CA 94530

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 12:48:24

# Form Letter 170 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Susan Last Name: Whisman

Email Address: whismansusan13@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Susan Whisman Santa Rosa, CA 95409

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 13:32:43

# Form Letter 171 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Richard Last Name: Brandes

Email Address: richardbrandes@mac.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Richard Brandes Newbury Park, CA 91320

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 13:35:55

# Form Letter 172 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Anne Last Name: van Oppen

Email Address: annevo5@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Anne van Oppen Wrightwood, CA 92397

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 13:59:22

# Form Letter 173 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jimmy Last Name: Francis

Email Address: lenfra@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jimmy Francis Temecula, CA 92592

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 14:01:51

# Form Letter 174 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Carol Last Name: Bistick

Email Address: linagata8@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Carol Bistick San Anselmo, CA 94979

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 14:39:03

# Form Letter 175 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Denis Last Name: Berardo

Email Address: denisb@writeme.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Denis Berardo Long Beach, CA 90807

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 14:58:34

# Form Letter 176 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Alexander B. Last Name: Vollmer

Email Address: abvollmer@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader.

The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s.

There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

California cannot meet our clean air and climate goals without harnessing the power of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and

overhauling this multibillion-dollar program for our zero emissions future. Please act expeditiously to reform the program to achieve our state's ambitious goals.

Sincerely, Alexander B. Vollmer San Rafael, CA 94901

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 15:12:46

# Form Letter 177 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: George Last Name: Fosselius

Email Address: gfosselius@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, George Fosselius El Cerrito, CA 94530

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 15:18:52

# Form Letter 178 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Bea Last Name: Szk

Email Address: beata359@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Bea Szk Mountain View, CA 94043

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 15:20:38

# Form Letter 179 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Thomas Last Name: Carlton

Email Address: tomcarlton2001@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Thomas Carlton Culver City, CA 90232

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 15:25:41

# Form Letter 180 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: George Last Name: Fosselius

Email Address: gfosselius@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, George Fosselius El Cerrito, CA 94530

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 15:42:51

# Form Letter 181 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: George Last Name: Fosselius

Email Address: gfosselius@comcast.ner

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, George Fosselius El Cerrito, CA 94530

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 16:04:58

# Form Letter 182 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lynn Last Name: Howard

Email Address: lynnulaff@me.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lynn Howard San Diego, CA 92109

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 16:09:17

# Form Letter 183 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Kelly Last Name: Rose

Email Address: ladykellaroo@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Kelly Rose Eastsound, WA 98245

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 16:12:23

# Form Letter 184 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Pamela Last Name: Spevack

Email Address: pspevy@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Pamela Spevack Oakland, CA 94602

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 16:14:29

# Form Letter 185 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Luis Last Name: Garcia

Email Address: lcgarcia6817@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Luis Garcia Sacramento, CA 95821

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 16:29:35

# Form Letter 186 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Moon Last Name: Guerrero

Email Address: 1moongypsy@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Moon Guerrero San Francisco, CA 94115

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 16:42:39

# Form Letter 187 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jenifer Last Name: Elliott

Email Address: rednowlight@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jenifer Elliott Salinas, CA 93908

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 16:43:55

# Form Letter 188 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Nancy Last Name: Ballot

Email Address: vote4ballot@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Nancy Ballot Stockton, CA 95207

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 17:26:54

# Form Letter 189 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Alicia Last Name: Hager

Email Address: aliciahager53@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Alicia Hager Kenosha, WI 53144

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 17:56:24

# Form Letter 190 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Chuck Last Name: Fisher

Email Address: cfisher57@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Chuck Fisher San Pablo, CA 94806

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 18:01:40

# Form Letter 191 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Atta joy Last Name: Hess

Email Address: attajoyh@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Atta joy Hess Coulterville, CA 95311

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 18:30:38

# Form Letter 192 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Cecelia Last Name: Crane

Email Address: ceceliacrane52@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Cecelia Crane South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 18:47:55

# Form Letter 193 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lori Last Name: Kegler

Email Address: lori.kegler@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lori Kegler San Pedro, CA 90731

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 18:56:34

# Form Letter 194 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Constance Last Name: Flannery

Email Address: msflannery@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Constance Flannery San Francisco, CA 94131

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 19:08:40

# Form Letter 195 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Rebecca Last Name: Leon

Email Address: rlleon@verizon.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Rebecca Leon Browns Valley, CA 95918

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 19:28:35

# Form Letter 196 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jackie

Last Name: Meissenhalter

Email Address: jmeissenhalter@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jackie Meissenhalter Napa, CA 94558

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 19:36:54

# Form Letter 197 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Derek Last Name: Derek

Email Address: mcdowdy@ymail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Derek Derek Nevada City, CA 95959

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 20:02:26

# Form Letter 198 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Deborah Last Name: Raley

Email Address: sewunique111@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Deborah Raley Watsonville, CA 95076

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 20:29:50

# Form Letter 199 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: SUSAN Last Name: O'Connell

Email Address: oconnellsusan7@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, SUSAN O'Connell Camarillo, CA 93010

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 20:38:06

# Form Letter 200 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jack Last Name: Anderson

Email Address: jakanderson@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jack Anderson Mount Shasta, CA 96067

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 20:46:02

# Form Letter 201 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jane Last Name: August

Email Address: janeaugust100@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jane August Topanga, CA 90290

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 21:09:03

# Form Letter 202 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: crystal Last Name: lacey-hall

Email Address: clacey2011@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, crystal lacey-hall Lakewood, CA 90713

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 21:13:17

# Form Letter 203 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Laura Last Name: Collins

Email Address: lkielman@att.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Laura Collins Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 21:22:29

# Form Letter 204 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Suzanne Last Name: Batobato

Email Address: chinamay@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Suzanne Batobato Salinas, CA 93907

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 21:32:36

# Form Letter 205 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Carol Last Name: Tiffin

Email Address: caroltiffin@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Carol Tiffin Rancho Mirage, CA 92270

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 21:54:20

# Form Letter 206 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Stella Last Name: Casillas

Email Address: stellastar105@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Stella Casillas Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-16 22:23:46

# Form Letter 207 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Pamela Last Name: Check

Email Address: sunshinewmn7@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Pamela Check Chico, CA 95973

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 00:00:14

# Form Letter 208 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Mary Last Name: Phillips

Email Address: mphillips6677@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Mary Phillips Fresno, CA 93727

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 00:00:29

# Form Letter 209 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lori Last Name: Kegler

Email Address: lori.kegler@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lori Kegler San Pedro, CA 90731

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 00:00:44

# Form Letter 210 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: D B Last Name: Purinton

Email Address: 1.hapints@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, D B Purinton Bellflower, CA 90706

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 00:00:51

# Form Letter 211 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: P T Last Name: Stanton

Email Address: 1.hapints@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, P T Stanton Bellflower, CA 90706

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 00:00:55

# Form Letter 212 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Susan Last Name: Lewitt

Email Address: nativebutterflies213@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Susan Lewitt San Diego, CA 92117

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 00:31:03

# Form Letter 213 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Bonnie Last Name: Long

Email Address: bonnie8888@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Bonnie Long Long Beach, CA 90803

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 01:08:23

# Form Letter 214 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Geoff Last Name: Regalado

Email Address: gregalado74@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Geoff Regalado Burbank, CA 91503

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 01:41:02

# Form Letter 215 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Peter Last Name: Lee

Email Address: peterboothlee@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Peter Lee San Francisco, CA 94118

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 04:23:48

# Form Letter 216 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jinx Last Name: Hydeman

Email Address: earthwoman69@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jinx Hydeman Trabuco Canyon, CA 92679

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 05:52:42

# Form Letter 217 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Gary Last Name: Kuehn

Email Address: gary.kuehn66@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Gary Kuehn Newhall, CA 91321

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 06:01:58

# Form Letter 218 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Michael Last Name: Vargas

Email Address: mjvmsw@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Michael Vargas San Francisco, CA 94124

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 06:05:49

# Form Letter 219 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Frances Last Name: Luevano

Email Address: wickedkittyz@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Frances Luevano Woodland, CA 95695

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 06:06:39

# Form Letter 220 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Robert Last Name: Freidenberg

Email Address: kalb3@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Robert Freidenberg Petaluma, CA 94954

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 06:30:54

# Form Letter 221 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: John Last Name: Sanders

Email Address: natoma764@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, John Sanders San Francisco, CA 94103

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 06:33:06

# Form Letter 222 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lisa Last Name: Larsen

Email Address: lisalarsen323@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lisa Larsen Lancaster, CA 93536

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 06:56:52

# Form Letter 223 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Marie Last Name: Perry

Email Address: marie\_perry\_65@yahoo.comoo

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Marie Perry Ceres, CA 95307

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 07:29:36

# Form Letter 224 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Gloria Last Name: Sefton

Email Address: gloriasefton@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Gloria Sefton Trabuco Canyon, CA 92679

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 07:39:57

# Form Letter 225 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Shirley Last Name: Craine

Email Address: scraine@myyahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Shirley Craine Sacramento, CA 95818

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 07:51:26

# Form Letter 226 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Javier Last Name: Hernandez

Email Address: jicaras2000@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Javier Hernandez Santa Clara, CA 95050

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 08:02:33

# Form Letter 227 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Shari Last Name: Miller

Email Address: shari2435@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Shari Miller Vallejo, CA 94590

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 08:05:45

# Form Letter 228 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Melissa Last Name: Davis

Email Address: mld.round2020@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Melissa Davis Mendocino, CA 95460

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 08:10:45

# Form Letter 229 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Nancy J Last Name: Burdge

Email Address: njbz@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Nancy J Burdge San Diego, CA 92124

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 08:20:24

# Form Letter 230 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Carla Last Name: Minock

Email Address: carla.minock@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Carla Minock Palm Desert, CA 92260

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 08:24:27

# Form Letter 231 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Catherine Last Name: Stewart

Email Address: catherinenitya@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Catherine Stewart Alpine, CA 91901

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 08:24:39

# Form Letter 232 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lynda Last Name: Marin

Email Address: lmarin@cruzio.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lynda Marin Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 08:29:24

# Form Letter 233 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Pegalee Last Name: Benda

Email Address: pegaleeczek@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Pegalee Benda Sonoma, CA 95476

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 08:32:56

# Form Letter 234 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Ingrid Last Name: Ward

Email Address: coqui.1964@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Ingrid Ward Riverside, CA 92503

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 08:35:47

# Form Letter 235 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Elizabeth Last Name: Mata

Email Address: lzziemata88@gmail.comI

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Mata Fresno, CA 93726

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 08:40:18

# Form Letter 236 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Paula Last Name: Fielding

Email Address: paulafayfielding@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Paula Fielding Carmel Valley, CA 93924

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 08:53:21

# Form Letter 237 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: David Last Name: Feuer

Email Address: david8feuer@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be crazy to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, it would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, David Feuer Los Angeles, CA 90034

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 08:53:46

# Form Letter 238 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lowell Last Name: Boardman

Email Address: lowell.boardman@me.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lowell Boardman Ojai, CA 93023

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 09:18:16

# Form Letter 239 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: susan Last Name: smith

Email Address: susansmith@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, susan smith Grass Valley, CA 95949

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 09:25:06

# Form Letter 240 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Harlene Hanna

Last Name: Cohen

Email Address: haco@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Harlene Hanna Cohen Oakland, CA 94610

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 09:28:21

# Form Letter 241 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Helen kate Last Name: Mcallister

Email Address: hkmcallister3@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Helen kate Mcallister Hidden Valley Lake, CA 95467

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 09:37:40

# Form Letter 242 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Ruth Last Name: Nichols

Email Address: ruthknichols@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Ruth Nichols Sacramento, CA 95820

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 09:57:14

# Form Letter 243 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Belinda Last Name: Woodruff

Email Address: amttlytrs@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Belinda Woodruff Tujunga, CA 91042

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 10:08:25

# Form Letter 244 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Josie Last Name: Lazo

Email Address: josieleven11@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Josie Lazo San Francisco, CA 94110

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 10:10:10

# Form Letter 245 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Heftsibah Last Name: Cohen

Email Address: chaplainjen@me.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Heftsibah Cohen Redlands, CA 92373

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 10:11:54

# Form Letter 246 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Constance Last Name: Flannery

Email Address: msflannery@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Constance Flannery San Francisco, CA 94131

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 10:16:23

# Form Letter 247 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Janet Last Name: Merrill

Email Address: janetgoldmanmerrill@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Janet Merrill San Pedro, CA 90732

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 10:20:26

# Form Letter 248 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Giovanna Last Name: Sensi

Email Address: fiber-frolics@att.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Giovanna Sensi Benicia, CA 94510

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 10:24:32

# Form Letter 249 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Aura Last Name: Lopez

Email Address: lopezaura1920@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Aura Lopez Hesperia, CA 92345

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 10:33:33

# Form Letter 250 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jessie Last Name: Vermont

Email Address: JV3624@GMAIL.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jessie Vermont Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 10:34:33

# Form Letter 251 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Nadine Last Name: La Fleur

Email Address: drlafleur@drnlafleur.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Nadine La Fleur Santa Barbara, CA 93103

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 10:42:36

# Form Letter 252 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Alisa Last Name: Etchells

Email Address: alisadetchells@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Alisa Etchells Bakersfield, CA 93311

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 10:53:33

# Form Letter 253 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: RoseMarie

Last Name: Di Giovanni-Norton Email Address: caspers1111@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, RoseMarie Di Giovanni-Norton Kuna, ID 83634

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 11:01:43

## Form Letter 254 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Julie Last Name: Oak

Email Address: leftwardho@julieoak.com

Affiliation:

Subject: We must reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

For the peoples health and our children's future, let's do everything possible to eliminate air pollution. Thank you.

Sincerely, Julie Oak Soquel, CA 95073

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 11:11:31

## Form Letter 255 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Gloria Last Name: Albert

Email Address: gloria@wellnessworksusa.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Gloria Albert Santa Monica, CA 90403

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 11:13:50

# Form Letter 256 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jackie

Last Name: Meissenhalter

Email Address: jmeissenhalter@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jackie Meissenhalter Napa, CA 94558

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 11:22:52

## Form Letter 257 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Rick Last Name: StJohn

Email Address: rinsfcausa@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Rick StJohn San Francisco, CA 94109

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 11:24:24

## Form Letter 258 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Patricia Last Name: Tolley

Email Address: triciatolley@msn.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Patricia Tolley Easton, MD 21601

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 11:24:50

## Form Letter 259 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Glenn Last Name: Reid

Email Address: ger2344@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Glenn Reid Belmont, CA 94002

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 11:46:47

## Form Letter 260 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Karil Last Name: Daniels

Email Address: karil@mac.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Karil Daniels San Francisco, CA 94110

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 11:56:12

## Form Letter 261 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lily Last Name: Leung

Email Address: lilyffll90@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lily Leung Alameda, CA 94502

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 12:01:00

## Form Letter 262 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: chance Last Name: goss

Email Address: cmg215be@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, chance goss San Francisco, CA 94109

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 12:08:11

## Form Letter 263 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Ann Last Name: Ceglia

Email Address: dayasdoodles@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Ann Ceglia Petaluma, CA 94952

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 12:28:02

## Form Letter 264 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Debbie Last Name: Woods

Email Address: dwoods1961@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Debbie Woods Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 12:43:41

## Form Letter 265 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Ermelinda Last Name: Rayos

Email Address: ermelindarayos45@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Ermelinda Rayos La Puente, CA 91744

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 12:55:14

## Form Letter 266 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Cheryl Last Name: Kelly

Email Address: kelly\_cheryl25@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Cheryl Kelly Riverside, CA 92508

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 13:08:50

## Form Letter 267 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: George Last Name: Fosselius

Email Address: gfosselius@comcast.ner

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, George Fosselius El Cerrito, CA 94530

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 13:08:54

## Form Letter 268 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Noah Last Name: Tenney

Email Address: noahten@earthlink.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Noah Tenney Oakland, CA 94606

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 13:33:33

## Form Letter 269 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Maile Last Name: Anthopoulos

Email Address: manthopoulos7@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Maile Anthopoulos Beaverton, OR 97008

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 13:58:49

## Form Letter 270 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Catherine Last Name: Sana

Email Address: catsana@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Catherine Sana La Jolla, CA 92037

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 14:24:32

## Form Letter 271 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Gail Last Name: Blank

Email Address: imzadiki@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Gail Blank Coarsegold, CA 93614

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 14:28:01

# Form Letter 272 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Kathlyn Last Name: Hendricks

Email Address: katieh@hendricks.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Kathlyn Hendricks Ojai, CA 93023

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 15:02:36

# Form Letter 273 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Andrea Last Name: Lawson Gray

Email Address: andrealawsongray@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Andrea Lawson Gray San Francisco, CA 94110

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 15:09:31

# Form Letter 274 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Laura Last Name: Fantone

Email Address: elefantone@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Laura Fantone Berkeley, CA 94720

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 15:12:48

# Form Letter 275 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lori Last Name: edward

Email Address: queenbeemom123@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lori edward Carson City, NV 89701

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 15:15:46

# Form Letter 276 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Carl Last Name: Fagerskog

Email Address: redwinecarl@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Carl Fagerskog Crescent City, CA 95531

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 15:19:47

# Form Letter 277 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Karen Last Name: Froiland

Email Address: kfroiland@sonic.net

Affiliation:

Subject: stop funneling billions of dollars every year to big polluters!

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

DO your job as though you cared about the fate of life on Earth. This proposal is appauling and based in greed, nothing else. Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

our state's ambitious goals.

Sincerely, Karen Froiland Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 15:42:25

# Form Letter 278 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Gary Last Name: Farber

Email Address: garyf8642@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Gary Farber Walnut Creek, CA 94598

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 15:43:23

# Form Letter 279 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Shellie Last Name: Vermeer

Email Address: svermeer1@att.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Shellie Vermeer Laguna Hills, CA 92653

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 15:58:38

# Form Letter 280 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Carolina Last Name: Ramirez

Email Address: sweetapple8@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Carolina Ramirez Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 16:12:35

# Form Letter 281 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Eunice Last Name: Mathis

Email Address: esmathis33@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Eunice Mathis Seaside, CA 93955

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 16:26:43

# Form Letter 282 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lisa Last Name: Horn

Email Address: lisalisainla1212@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lisa Horn Tarzana, CA 91356

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 16:27:58

# Form Letter 283 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Brian Last Name: Rothstein

Email Address: litk989@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Brian Rothstein Vallejo, CA 94590

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 16:38:42

# Form Letter 284 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Karen Last Name: Dragge

Email Address: karendragge@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Karen Dragge Torrance, CA 90505

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 16:51:46

# Form Letter 285 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Catherine Last Name: Hirsch

Email Address: chkh@earthlink.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Catherine Hirsch Redway, CA 95560

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 17:12:11

# Form Letter 286 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Brian Last Name: Hanrahan

Email Address: hanraport@verizon.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Brian Hanrahan La Quinta, CA 92253

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 17:35:49

# Form Letter 287 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Rose Marie Last Name: Pietras

Email Address: pietras.rose@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Rose Marie Pietras Berkeley, CA 94709

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 18:04:50

# Form Letter 288 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Sharon Last Name: Procter

Email Address: opuntial@live.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Sharon Procter Marysville, CA 95901

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 18:16:59

# Form Letter 289 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Mark Last Name: Takeuchi

Email Address: marktakeuchi@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Mark Takeuchi Claremont, CA 91711

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 18:24:33

# Form Letter 290 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Cecelia Last Name: Crane

Email Address: ceceliacrane52@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Cecelia Crane South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 18:31:23

# Form Letter 291 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Rita Last Name: Clement

Email Address: ritalclement@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Rita Clement Chula Vista, CA 91914

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 18:42:42

# Form Letter 292 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: gerriann m Last Name: costa

Email Address: gmc52pkup@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, gerriann m costa Tracy, CA 95376

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 19:24:57

# Form Letter 293 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Suzette Last Name: Burrous

Email Address: suzettesagefemme@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Suzette Burrous Sebastopol, CA 95472

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 20:01:26

# Form Letter 294 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Pamela Last Name: Watkins

Email Address: pamelwatkins06@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

California cannot meet our clean air and climate goals without harnessing the power of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and overhauling this multibillion-dollar program for our zero emissions future. Please act expeditiously to reform the program to achieve our state's ambitious goals. As a disabled person why should I give you my vote if I can't get around!!!

Sincerely, Pamela Watkins Menifee, CA 92584

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 20:57:51

# Form Letter 295 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: James Last Name: Haig

Email Address: james@meta-balance.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, James Haig San Rafael, CA 94901

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 21:27:31

# Form Letter 296 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Suzanne Last Name: Batobato

Email Address: chinamay@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Suzanne Batobato Salinas, CA 93907

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 21:29:24

# Form Letter 297 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: June Last Name: Levier

Email Address: jalevier1@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, June Levier Topeka, KS 66608

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 21:54:28

# Form Letter 298 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Deanna Last Name: Williams

Email Address: dwilliam3185@earthlink.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Deanna Williams San Jose, CA 95111

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 22:14:35

# Form Letter 299 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Karen Last Name: Larson

Email Address: macbibee@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Karen Larson Chino, CA 91710

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 22:32:23

# Form Letter 300 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Kent Last Name: Nat

Email Address: nabakent@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Kent Nat Carlsbad, CA 92011

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 22:41:12

# Form Letter 301 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Adriane Last Name: Jones

Email Address: choose2letgo@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Adriane Jones San Jose, CA 95127

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-17 22:53:19

# Form Letter 302 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Tadashi Last Name: Nakadegawa

Email Address: tadashin@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please stop funding for carbon fuels and prioritize ecologically healthy systems

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Tadashi Nakadegawa Oakland, CA 94618

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 00:00:01

# Form Letter 303 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jillana Last Name: Laufer

Email Address: jillana@lauferco.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jillana Laufer Studio City, CA 91604

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 00:00:14

# Form Letter 304 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Garry Last Name: Star

Email Address: gstar42@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Garry Star Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 00:00:16

# Form Letter 305 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Mavis Last Name: Brown

Email Address: mavisb4@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Mavis Brown Fremont, CA 94536

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 00:00:26

# Form Letter 306 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Evelyn Last Name: Thatcher

Email Address: evelynthatcher@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Evelyn Thatcher New York, NY 10024

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 00:00:28

# Form Letter 307 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Karen Last Name: Neubert

Email Address: kneubert.3@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Karen Neubert Los Angeles, CA 90041

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 00:10:40

# Form Letter 308 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lesley Price

Last Name: Price

Email Address: lp.craven@icloud.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lesley Price Price Sonora, CA 95370

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 00:11:42

# Form Letter 309 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: chance Last Name: goss

Email Address: cmg215be@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, chance goss San Francisco, CA 94109

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 01:47:29

# Form Letter 310 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Joan Last Name: Wager

Email Address: joanwager2004@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Joan Wager Berkeley, CA 94708

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 01:56:14

# Form Letter 311 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Julie Last Name: Kitamura

Email Address: julie.kitamura@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Julie Kitamura Salinas, CA 93901

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 02:04:23

# Form Letter 312 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lori Last Name: Worcester

Email Address: craiglori13@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lori Worcester San Marcos, CA 92069

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 03:16:12

# Form Letter 313 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Beth Last Name: Tessler

Email Address: batessler@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Beth Tessler Vallejo, CA 94590

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 03:21:13

# Form Letter 314 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Kelly Last Name: Newman

Email Address: newmankel@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Kelly Newman San Mateo, CA 94401

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 04:09:36

# Form Letter 315 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Shari Last Name: Welsh

Email Address: welshshari@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Shari Welsh Atascadero, CA 93422

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 04:46:50

# Form Letter 316 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: JS Last Name: Morgan

Email Address: thatsgood88@verizon.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, JS Morgan Indio, CA 92203

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 05:29:15

# Form Letter 317 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Claudia Last Name: McDonagh

Email Address: claudiakmcdonagh@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Claudia McDonagh Castro Valley, CA 94546

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 06:08:01

# Form Letter 318 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Robert Last Name: Spruce

Email Address: rdspruce@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Robert Spruce Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 06:20:50

# Form Letter 319 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Claire Last Name: Williams

Email Address: claire\_williams@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Claire Williams Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 06:29:03

# Form Letter 320 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Steve Last Name: Metzger

Email Address: onemetzgersteve@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Steve Metzger Tehachapi, CA 93581

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 06:44:10

# Form Letter 321 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Colene Last Name: Rauh

Email Address: clrauh1@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Colene Rauh Orangevale, CA 95662

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 06:48:05

# Form Letter 322 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Roxanne Last Name: Sztapka

Email Address: roxyslife@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Roxanne Sztapka Lancaster, CA 93535

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 07:04:03

# Form Letter 323 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lora Last Name: Olney

Email Address: loraolney@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lora Olney Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 07:06:31

# Form Letter 324 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: dee Last Name: Soto

Email Address: dstanfmi@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, dee Soto Westlake Village, CA 91361

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 07:07:22

# Form Letter 325 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jason Last Name: Gritti

Email Address: btrue2self@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jason Gritti West Sacramento, CA 95605

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 07:13:45

# Form Letter 326 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Todd Last Name: Becker

Email Address: tcbmac96@outlook.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Todd Becker Westminster, CA 92683

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 07:25:10

# Form Letter 327 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Kindred Last Name: Gottlieb

Email Address: kindredg@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Kindred Gottlieb Los Angeles, CA 90026

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 07:31:25

# Form Letter 328 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Tracey Last Name: Sittig

Email Address: tsittig75@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Tracey Sittig Stockton, CA 95207

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 07:34:12

# Form Letter 329 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Cynthia Last Name: Chaney

Email Address: cynthia.e.chaney@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: FIGHT CLIMATE CHANGE, Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Cynthia Chaney Oceanside, CA 92057

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 07:39:06

# Form Letter 330 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Victoria Last Name: Bouhalkoum

Email Address: vic\_passion@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Victoria Bouhalkoum Sunnyvale, CA 94085

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 07:40:33

# Form Letter 331 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Bonnie Last Name: Kohleriter

Email Address: bkohlerite@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Bonnie Kohleriter Alamo, CA 94507

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 07:43:45

# Form Letter 332 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Peter Last Name: Preston

Email Address: oldguyredux@icloud.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Peter Preston Santa Rosa, CA 95405

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 07:57:18

# Form Letter 333 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Sharon Last Name: Wyche-Frei

Email Address: wychefrei@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Sharon Wyche-Frei Eureka, CA 95503

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 08:00:39

# Form Letter 334 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Kathleen Last Name: Hakker

Email Address: khakker10@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Kathleen Hakker Ramona, CA 92065

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 08:13:50

# Form Letter 335 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Donna Last Name: Karbach

Email Address: dkarbach2000@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Donna Karbach Laguna Woods, CA 92637

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 08:16:30

# Form Letter 336 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lynn Last Name: Webber

Email Address: webber.lynn46@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lynn Webber Spring Valley, CA 91977

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 08:30:05

# Form Letter 337 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Mary Last Name: Arum

Email Address: mlaaccess@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Mary Arum Oakland, CA 94611

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 08:32:21

# Form Letter 338 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Angelica

Last Name: Fernandez Connally

Email Address: angelicaconnally@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Angelica Fernandez Connally Pittsburg, CA 94565

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 08:45:20

# Form Letter 339 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Dorothy

Last Name: Herrera Settlage

Email Address: dorothysettlage@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Dorothy Herrera Settlage Los Angeles, CA 90043

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 09:00:31

# Form Letter 340 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Elizabeth Last Name: Floersch

Email Address: ktnaflac@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Floersch Goodlettsville, TN 37072

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 09:11:14

# Form Letter 341 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Janette Last Name: Wolf

Email Address: janette.wolf@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Janette Wolf Benicia, CA 94510

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 09:15:16

# Form Letter 342 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jinx Last Name: Hydeman

Email Address: earthwoman69@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jinx Hydeman Trabuco Canyon, CA 92679

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 09:17:38

# Form Letter 343 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Giovanna Last Name: Sensi

Email Address: fiber-frolics@att.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Giovanna Sensi Benicia, CA 94510

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 09:28:33

# Form Letter 344 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Inga Last Name: Puccio

Email Address: ladyfalcon67@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Inga Puccio San Francisco, CA 94103

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 09:28:33

# Form Letter 345 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: CINDY Last Name: OSTIC

Email Address: ostic164@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, CINDY OSTIC Sacramento, CA 95838

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 09:36:25

# Form Letter 346 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Nancy Last Name: Amodeo

Email Address: nanwestchester@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Nancy Amodeo Los Angeles, CA 90045

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 09:43:13

# Form Letter 347 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Peter Last Name: Botto

Email Address: mastergeekus@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Peter Botto Stockton, CA 95204

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 09:44:49

# Form Letter 348 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Helen kate Last Name: Mcallister

Email Address: hkmcallister3@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Helen kate Mcallister Hidden Valley Lake, CA 95467

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 10:01:44

# Form Letter 349 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Paul Last Name: Beltz

Email Address: pcbeltz@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Paul Beltz Van Nuys, CA 91401

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 10:07:22

# Form Letter 350 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Rosemary Last Name: Graham-Gardner

Email Address: liaisonsus@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Rosemary Graham-Gardner Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 10:10:39

# Form Letter 351 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Cynthia Last Name: Schultz

Email Address: cynthia.schltz@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Cynthia Schultz East Troy, WI 53120

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 10:15:13

# Form Letter 352 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Robyn Last Name: Barnes

Email Address: one.morning.star@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Robyn Barnes Brownsville, CA 95919

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 10:33:13

# Form Letter 353 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Eileen Last Name: Fagan

Email Address: eileenfagan@att.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Eileen Fagan Valley Center, CA 92082

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 10:40:52

# Form Letter 354 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Robin Last Name: Sloan

Email Address: robbio720@earthlink.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Robin Sloan Novato, CA 94949

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 10:53:56

# Form Letter 355 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Vicki Last Name: Tomola

Email Address: vltomola@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Vicki Tomola Point Arena, CA 95468

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 10:54:50

# Form Letter 356 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Cinda Last Name: Johansen

Email Address: ccjohansen@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Cinda Johansen Folsom, CA 95630

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 10:56:20

# Form Letter 357 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Marie Last Name: McGinley

Email Address: mariesmith0009879@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Marie McGinley Ventura, CA 93003

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 11:02:35

# Form Letter 358 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: cindy Last Name: currie

Email Address: ccurrie778@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, cindy currie Sacramento, CA 95817

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 11:03:20

# Form Letter 359 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Cheryl Last Name: Bly

Email Address: blycheri@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Cheryl Bly Moorpark, CA 93021

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 11:15:55

# Form Letter 360 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Maureen Last Name: Riggs

Email Address: mreenriggs@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Maureen Riggs Concord, CA 94519

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 11:19:53

# Form Letter 361 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Margaret Last Name: Cimafranca

Email Address: mexapina\_39@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Margaret Cimafranca San Jose, CA 95112

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 11:37:56

# Form Letter 362 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Noah Last Name: Tenney

Email Address: noahten@earthlink.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Noah Tenney Oakland, CA 94606

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 11:58:04

# Form Letter 363 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Maura Last Name: Allen

Email Address: mauramallen@mac.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Dear Governor Newsom,

Please reform the program so that we can stay on target and commit to clean air.

Please do not fail us on this! Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

California cannot meet our clean air and climate goals without harnessing the power of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and overhauling this multibillion-dollar program for our zero emissions future. Please act expeditiously to reform the program to achieve our state's ambitious goals.

Sincerely, Maura Allen Berkeley, CA 94705

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 12:03:29

# Form Letter 364 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: chance Last Name: goss

Email Address: cmg215be@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, chance goss San Francisco, CA 94109

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 12:03:50

# Form Letter 365 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Barbara Last Name: Rey

Email Address: nfbbarbara@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Barbara Rey Los Angeles, CA 90022

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 12:11:54

# Form Letter 366 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: delmer Last Name: allison

Email Address: dlallison1947@outlook.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, delmer allison Los Angeles, CA 90040

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 12:47:03

# Form Letter 367 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Elizabeth Last Name: Bondy

Email Address: ebond@arizona.edu

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Bondy Monterey Park, CA 91755

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 13:14:41

# Form Letter 368 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Susan Last Name: Whisman

Email Address: whismansusan13@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Susan Whisman Santa Rosa, CA 95409

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 13:21:15

# Form Letter 369 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Kathleen Last Name: Davis

Email Address: kacysweb@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Kathleen Davis Winters, CA 95694

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 13:44:47

# Form Letter 370 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Meredith Last Name: Priestley

Email Address: merpriestley@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Meredith Priestley Solana Beach, CA 92075

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 13:45:18

# Form Letter 371 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Metin Last Name: Mangir

Email Address: metinmsm@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Metin Mangir Santa Monica, CA 90405

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 14:19:53

# Form Letter 372 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Alexander Last Name: Vollmer

Email Address: abvollmer@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Alexander Vollmer San Rafael, CA 94901

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 14:23:25

# Form Letter 373 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Sharon Last Name: Johnson

Email Address: tigersaregods@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Sharon Johnson North Highlands, CA 95660

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 14:49:45

# Form Letter 374 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Chris Last Name: Leverich

Email Address: chris\_leverich@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Chris Leverich Playa Del Rey, CA 90293

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 15:04:11

# Form Letter 375 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Esther Last Name: Sullins

Email Address: esthrsl@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Esther Sullins Downey, CA 90242

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 15:08:32

# Form Letter 376 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Leslie Last Name: Ferriel

Email Address: leslieferriel@johnlscott.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Leslie Ferriel Vashon, WA 98070

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 15:35:32

# Form Letter 377 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Susan Last Name: Whisman

Email Address: whismansusan13@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Susan Whisman Santa Rosa, CA 95409

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 15:46:07

# Form Letter 378 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Elizabeth Last Name: Abbey

Email Address: Salimaabbey@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Abbey Mill Valley, CA 94941

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 15:54:53

# Form Letter 379 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Bo Last Name: Smitham

Email Address: brosmitham@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Bo Smitham San Diego, CA 92130

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 16:01:45

# Form Letter 380 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Michelle Last Name: Profant

Email Address: michellescotts@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Michelle Profant Goleta, CA 93117

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 16:11:29

# Form Letter 381 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Clare Last Name: Averill

Email Address: clare.averill@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes carbon combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to carbon combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels, instead of electric vehicles and passenger rail, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating carbon combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

California cannot meet our clean air and climate goals without harnessing the power of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and overhauling this multibillion-dollar program for our zero emissions future. Please act expeditiously to reform the program to achieve our state's ambitious goals.

Sincerely,

Clare Averill Joshua Tree, CA 92252

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 16:47:10

# Form Letter 382 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Cecelia Last Name: Crane

Email Address: ceceliacrane52@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Cecelia Crane South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 16:49:28

# Form Letter 383 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Gabriel Last Name: Vega

Email Address: daliyvea@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Gabriel Vega Watsonville, CA 95077

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 17:11:50

# Form Letter 384 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Carolyn Last Name: Dickens

Email Address: angelwingsong@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Carolyn Dickens Richmond, CA 94805

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 17:28:19

# Form Letter 385 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Donna Eckert

Last Name: Eckert

Email Address: dj\_at\_home@att.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Donna Eckert Eckert Fountain Valley, CA 92708

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 17:51:27

# Form Letter 386 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Meredith Last Name: Priestley

Email Address: merpriestley@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Meredith Priestley Solana Beach, CA 92075

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 19:07:29

# Form Letter 387 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Bonnie Last Name: Long

Email Address: bonnie8888@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Bonnie Long Long Beach, CA 90803

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 19:09:13

# Form Letter 388 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Annie Last Name: Duffy

Email Address: annied88@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Annie Duffy Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 19:27:08

# Form Letter 389 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: James Last Name: Haig

Email Address: james@meta-balance.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, James Haig San Rafael, CA 94901

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 19:28:32

# Form Letter 390 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Gloria Last Name: Fama

Email Address: gloriafama28@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Gloria Fama Paso Robles, CA 93446

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 19:42:33

# Form Letter 391 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jeanine Last Name: Shoemaker

Email Address: gmashoemaker61@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jeanine Shoemaker Troy, MO 63379

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 19:44:07

# Form Letter 392 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Linda Last Name: Roesch

Email Address: llro2u@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Linda Roesch Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 20:01:43

# Form Letter 393 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: David Last Name: Almada

Email Address: dralmada2002@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, David Almada Monterey Park, CA 91754

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 20:06:51

# Form Letter 394 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Denis Last Name: Berardo

Email Address: denisb@writeme.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Denis Berardo Long Beach, CA 90807

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 20:27:04

# Form Letter 395 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Sam Last Name: Ford

Email Address: samuel.floethe.ford@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Sam Ford San Jose, CA 95117

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 20:30:11

# Form Letter 396 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Ralph and Lynn

Last Name: Locher

Email Address: lelocher@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Ralph and Lynn Locher Fremont, CA 94539

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 20:40:49

# Form Letter 397 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Teigh Last Name: Taurino

Email Address: c264c2a9@opayq.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Teigh Taurino Los Angeles, CA 90027

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 20:44:18

## Form Letter 398 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Ann Last Name: Rudin

Email Address: arudin84@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Ann Rudin Buffalo, NY 14221

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 21:11:09

## Form Letter 399 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Constance Last Name: Flannery

Email Address: msflannery@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Constance Flannery San Francisco, CA 94131

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 21:30:38

## Form Letter 400 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Ted Last Name: Shapas

Email Address: tshapas@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Ted Shapas Alamo, CA 94507

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 21:38:19

## Form Letter 401 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Susan J Last Name: Davis

Email Address: sjdavis60@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please it is past time that we reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Susan J Davis Los Angeles, CA 90027

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 21:44:13

## Form Letter 402 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Antoinette Last Name: Chandler

Email Address: nanaslittlejuan\_2018@outlook.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Antoinette Chandler Modesto, CA 95354

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 22:37:08

## Form Letter 403 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Garry Last Name: Star

Email Address: gstar42@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Garry Star Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 22:39:15

# Form Letter 404 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Maxine

Last Name: Williams-Gboizo

Email Address: mysteriousmiam@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Maxine Williams-Gboizo Santa Monica, CA 90405

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 22:50:59

## Form Letter 405 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Michelle Last Name: Angelini

Email Address: monique.baby@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Michelle Angelini Los Angeles, CA 90027

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-18 23:59:50

## Form Letter 406 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Miriam Last Name: Rainville

Email Address: matillija@me.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Miriam Rainville Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 00:00:00

## Form Letter 407 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Clarissa Last Name: McLaughlin

Email Address: rissajrossman@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Clarissa McLaughlin Santee, CA 92071

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 00:00:35

## Form Letter 408 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lori Last Name: Kegler

Email Address: lori.kegler@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lori Kegler San Pedro, CA 90731

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 01:48:40

## Form Letter 409 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Donna Last Name: Babao

Email Address: dbabao@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Donna Babao Marysville, CA 95901

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 02:47:28

## Form Letter 410 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Gail Last Name: Hernandez

Email Address: gailgail@outlook.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Gail Hernandez San Francisco, CA 94164

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 03:15:24

## Form Letter 411 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Janet Last Name: Bergamo

Email Address: bergamojanet789@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Pl reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

We must preserve our planet NOW! Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course IMMEDIATELY and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely,		
Janet		_
Piru,	CA	93040

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 04:15:31

## Form Letter 412 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Geraldine Last Name: Card

Email Address: geraldinecard87@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Geraldine Card Exeter, CA 93221

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 04:35:15

## Form Letter 413 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Evelyn Last Name: Isaak

Email Address: designut@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Evelyn Isaak Penngrove, CA 94951

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 06:24:13

## Form Letter 414 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Mary Last Name: Harris

Email Address: maryh4704@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Mary Harris Rolla, MO 65401

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 06:43:50

## Form Letter 415 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Elizabeth K. Last Name: Williams

Email Address: ekw777@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Elizabeth K. Williams Charlottesville, VA 22901

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 06:45:39

# Form Letter 416 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Deborah Last Name: Singletary

Email Address: deborahsingletary@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Deborah Singletary Joshua Tree, CA 92252

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 06:57:26

# Form Letter 417 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jinx Last Name: Hydeman

Email Address: earthwoman69@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jinx Hydeman Trabuco Canyon, CA 92679

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 07:00:59

# Form Letter 418 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: James Last Name: Wagner

Email Address: jameswagner\_sb@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, James Wagner Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 07:11:35

# Form Letter 419 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Shari Last Name: Welsh

Email Address: welshshari@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Shari Welsh Atascadero, CA 93422

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 07:34:36

# Form Letter 420 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Caroline Last Name: Robinson

Email Address: caroline.robinson2000@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Caroline Robinson El Cerrito, CA 94530

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 07:56:48

# Form Letter 421 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lynda Last Name: Marin

Email Address: lmarin@cruzio.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lynda Marin Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 07:57:00

# Form Letter 422 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Marianne and Richard

Last Name: Davis

Email Address: m54wdavis@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Marianne and Richard Davis Encino, CA 91436

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 07:57:17

# Form Letter 423 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Robert Last Name: Lappo

Email Address: rlappo@ca.rr.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Robert Lappo Tujunga, CA 91042

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 08:22:07

# Form Letter 424 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Catheryn Last Name: Sproull

Email Address: catheryn\_sproull@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Catheryn Sproull San Leandro, CA 94578

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 08:28:14

# Form Letter 425 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Patricia Last Name: Matejcek

Email Address: patachek3@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. Continuing to subsidize combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be deplorable to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Patricia Matejcek Freedom, CA 95019

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 08:30:39

# Form Letter 426 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Elaine Last Name: Williams

Email Address: momwelaine50@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Elaine Williams Marion, NY 14505

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 08:32:00

# Form Letter 427 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Frederick Last Name: Hamilton

Email Address: fhami38130@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Frederick Hamilton Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91739

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 08:33:54

# Form Letter 428 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Paul Last Name: Gullam

Email Address: pgullam@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Paul Gullam Santa Maria, CA 93458

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 08:45:07

# Form Letter 429 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Sandra Last Name: Mullins

Email Address: sandibeach53@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Sandra Mullins Joshua Tree, CA 92252

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 09:05:48

# Form Letter 430 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Gerald Last Name: Mantonya

Email Address: arthur500bc@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Gerald Mantonya Sylmar, CA 91342

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 09:21:15

# Form Letter 431 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Constance Last Name: Flannery

Email Address: msflannery@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Constance Flannery San Francisco, CA 94131

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 09:27:53

# Form Letter 432 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Deb Last Name: St Julien

Email Address: dstjulien@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Deb St Julien San Jose, CA 95136

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 09:36:50

# Form Letter 433 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Gerald Last Name: Orcholski

Email Address: gerryjim@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Gerald Orcholski Pasadena, CA 91104

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 09:44:26

## Form Letter 434 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Soraya Last Name: Dosaj

Email Address: soraya\_d@sbcglobal.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Soraya Dosaj Van Nuys, CA 91401

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 09:52:33

## Form Letter 435 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jacqueline Last Name: Barden

Email Address: jacquelinebarden@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jacqueline Barden Alameda, CA 94501

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 10:31:22

## Form Letter 436 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Russell Last Name: NAYLOR

Email Address: warriorpoet789@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Russell NAYLOR Windsor, CA 95492

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 10:35:35

## Form Letter 437 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Bill Last Name: Black

Email Address: bb92116@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Bill Black San Diego, CA 92116

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 10:43:18

## Form Letter 438 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Susan Last Name: Worden

Email Address: cocoa.charlot@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

This is not only important, but urgent.

Sincerely, Susan Worden Rio Vista, CA 94571

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 10:56:10

## Form Letter 439 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Larry Last Name: Johnson

Email Address: gaius37@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Larry Johnson Pomona, CA 91767

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 11:00:15

## Form Letter 440 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Marie Helene Last Name: Luebbers

Email Address: mhluebbers@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Marie Helene Luebbers Tustin, CA 92780

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 11:01:56

## Form Letter 441 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jessie Last Name: Vermont

Email Address: JV3624@GMAIL.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jessie Vermont Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 11:06:26

# Form Letter 442 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Sherry

Last Name: Denton-Noonan

Email Address: sherry\_2468@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Sherry Denton-Noonan Fair Oaks, CA 95628

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 11:08:32

## Form Letter 443 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jessie Last Name: Vermont

Email Address: JV3624@GMAIL.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jessie Vermont Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 11:36:15

## Form Letter 444 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: JOHN Last Name: Harris

Email Address: johnharri9@att.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, JOHN Harris Pittsburg, CA 94565

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 11:37:07

## Form Letter 445 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: CINDY Last Name: OSTIC

Email Address: ostic164@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, CINDY OSTIC Sacramento, CA 95838

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 11:49:43

## Form Letter 446 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Judith Last Name: Marlin

Email Address: g.ames@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Judith Marlin Los Gatos, CA 95032

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 11:49:44

## Form Letter 447 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Susan Last Name: O'Connell

Email Address: oconnellsusan7@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Susan O'Connell Camarillo, CA 93010

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 11:49:52

## Form Letter 448 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jessie Last Name: Vermont

Email Address: JV3624@GMAIL.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jessie Vermont Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 12:00:18

## Form Letter 449 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Nancy Last Name: Nilssen

Email Address: mark\_nancy\_nilssen@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Nancy Nilssen Dublin, CA 94568

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 12:36:32

## Form Letter 450 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Herminia Last Name: Florido

Email Address: herminiaflorido@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Herminia Florido Redwood City, CA 94063

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 12:46:24

## Form Letter 451 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Silvia Last Name: Raum

Email Address: silviaraum@cox.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Silvia Raum Irvine, CA 92620

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 13:00:13

# Form Letter 452 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Joyce Last Name: Chavez

Email Address: jchavez1791@icloud.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Joyce Chavez El Cajon, CA 92020

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 13:02:26

# Form Letter 453 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Michelle Last Name: Deering

Email Address: micdeer@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Michelle Deering Watsonville, CA 95076

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 13:14:40

# Form Letter 454 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Alice Last Name: Romao

Email Address: alicelromao@comcast.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Alice Romao Vallejo, CA 94591

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 13:32:07

# Form Letter 455 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Kyu Last Name: Moon

Email Address: kyujamoon42@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Please make the Summer Gasoline formula mandatory all year round. This is save our state from decline and make sure we have cleaner air so we can all be healthier. This is the easiest first step in saving our state and country.

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

California cannot meet our clean air and climate goals without

harnessing the power of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and overhauling this multibillion-dollar program for our zero emissions future. Please act expeditiously to reform the program to achieve our state's ambitious goals.

Sincerely, Kyu Moon San Diego, CA 92111

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 14:06:05

# Form Letter 456 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Cinzia Last Name: Paganuzzi

Email Address: cinzia\_paganuzzi@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Cinzia Paganuzzi Santa Monica, CA 90405

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 14:19:24

# Form Letter 457 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Brian Last Name: Fikes

Email Address: brianfikes@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Brian Fikes South San Francisco, CA 94080

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 15:46:19

# Form Letter 458 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Deborah Last Name: Tinsley

Email Address: dlt111156@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Deborah Tinsley Lynnwood, WA 98037

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 15:59:58

# Form Letter 459 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Sue Last Name: Porter

Email Address: ssporter43@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Sue Porter Paradise, CA 95969

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 16:17:19

# Form Letter 460 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Candra Last Name: Neff

Email Address: candraneff1@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Candra Neff Sonora, CA 95370

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 16:19:30

# Form Letter 461 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Robert Last Name: Spruce

Email Address: rdspruce@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Robert Spruce Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 16:20:32

# Form Letter 462 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Susan Last Name: Satya

Email Address: ceosusan2010@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Susan Satya Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 16:28:26

# Form Letter 463 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Brenda Last Name: Lee

Email Address: blee020@ca.rr.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Brenda Lee Lakewood, CA 90712

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 16:34:30

# Form Letter 464 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Charlotte Last Name: Belton

Email Address: msqweeneb@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Charlotte Belton Sacramento, CA 95833

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 16:44:22

# Form Letter 465 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Jason Last Name: Gritti

Email Address: btrue2self@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Jason Gritti West Sacramento, CA 95605

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 16:59:35

# Form Letter 466 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: John Last Name: Kaufman

Email Address: jfkaufman1956@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, John Kaufman Mission Viejo, CA 92692

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 17:34:13

# Form Letter 467 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Barry Last Name: Hodges

Email Address: barryhodges10@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Barry Hodges Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 17:47:01

# Form Letter 468 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Brenda Last Name: Lee

Email Address: blee020@ca.rr.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong. Fossil fuel subsidies should have ended long ago so those funds could support clean energy.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

our state's ambitious goals.

Sincerely, Brenda Lee Lakewood, CA 90712

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 18:34:23

# Form Letter 469 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Sharyn Last Name: White

Email Address: eireannach369@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Sharyn White Martinez, CA 94553

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 19:26:23

# Form Letter 470 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Constance Last Name: Flannery

Email Address: msflannery@hotmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Constance Flannery San Francisco, CA 94131

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 19:30:15

# Form Letter 471 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Tamara Last Name: Swanson

Email Address: childrenfirst66@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Tamara Swanson Monrovia, CA 91016

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 19:59:15

# Form Letter 472 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: John Last Name: Houston

Email Address: jhouston@pacific.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, John Houston Ukiah, CA 95482

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 21:11:27

# Form Letter 473 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Carlos Last Name: Hernandez

Email Address: djcarlossf@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Carlos Hernandez Daly City, CA 94014

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 21:15:52

# Form Letter 474 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Richard Last Name: Schaefer

Email Address: mancuts111@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Richard Schaefer Salton City, CA 92275

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 21:38:10

# Form Letter 475 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Suzanne Last Name: Batobato

Email Address: chinamay@aol.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Suzanne Batobato Salinas, CA 93907

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-19 21:50:46

# Form Letter 476 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lauren Last Name: Yates

Email Address: ley529@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lauren Yates Studio City, CA 91604

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-20 00:00:01

# Form Letter 477 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Andrew Last Name: Duport

Email Address: andod68@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

The World is in a crisis, a fight for humanity and its salvation. With that in mind your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

our state's ambitious goals.

Sincerely, Andrew Duport Simi Valley, CA 93065

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-20 00:00:01

# Form Letter 478 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Susan Last Name: Worden

Email Address: cocoa.charlot@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

California can do a whole lot better than this. Take a look at Michigan's programs.

Sincerely, Susan Worden Rio Vista, CA 94571

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-20 01:47:22

# Form Letter 479 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Theresa Last Name: Jones

Email Address: theresaann.jones@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Theresa Jones Los Angeles, CA 90043

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-20 03:11:33

# Form Letter 480 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Lynn Last Name: Howard

Email Address: lynnulaff@me.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Lynn Howard San Diego, CA 92109

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-20 07:54:49

# Form Letter 481 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: renee Last Name: saifer

Email Address: reneesaifer@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, renee saifer Studio City, CA 91604

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-20 13:02:13

# Form Letter 482 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Teigh Last Name: Taurino

Email Address: c264c2a9@opayq.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Teigh Taurino Los Angeles, CA 90027

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-20 15:00:26

# Form Letter 483 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Renee Last Name: LeCroy

Email Address: reneelecroy362@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Renee LeCroy Big Bear City, CA 92314

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-20 16:46:51

# Form Letter 484 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - .

First Name: Christopher

Last Name: Lish

Email Address: lishchris@yahoo.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Christopher Lish San Rafael, CA 94903

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-20 17:28:40

# Form Letter 485 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Angela Last Name: Robinson

Email Address: zanggiegirl22@gmail.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Angela Robinson Federal Way, WA 98003

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-20 20:26:38

# Form Letter 486 for Comment 5 for Proposed Low Carbon Fuel Standard Amendments (lcfs2024) - 45 Day.

First Name: Daryl Last Name: .Gale

Email Address: turtleperson@earthlink.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Please reform the Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board,

Your proposed amendments to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard are a climate policy failure that backslides on the state's role as a climate leader. The program subsidizes combustion fuels to the tune of billions of dollars per year and has no place in our toolkit of climate policies for the 2020s. There is too much on the line for our climate to get this critical program so wrong.

Governor Newsom's budget proposes significant delays and cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars to vital zero-emission transportation programs, which makes it all the more urgent to use the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to more fully support zero-emissions transportation. Historically, California has thrown good money after bad, and devoted 80% of the LCFS's \$3 to 4 billion each and every year to combustion technology. It would be wild to allow these funds to continue to languish on the climate sidelines, instead of anchoring our transition to a zero-emissions future.

The world has changed a lot since the implementation of the LCFS in 2009. Unlike the 2000s, we have a north star goal for our climate and the air we breathe: zero emissions transportation. Continuing to invest the billions in revenue from the LCFS into harmful and polluting biofuels that end up combusted, instead of electric vehicles powered by clean energy, hampers our efforts to fight the climate crisis while enriching oil companies and industrial agriculture.

I urge you to correct your course and modernize the program by reflecting your consensus that the only way to meet air quality standards is through eliminating combustion altogether, not piling on billions of dollars in lavish incentives for combustion each and every year. By focusing on real air pollution solutions, you could add a clean air multiplier to the credits system, especially for public fleets that transport many people at once, would deliver major benefits for California's air quality and throw a lifeline to cash-strapped transit agencies that low-income Californians depend on for mobility.

Sincerely, Daryl .Gale Los Angeles, CA 90013

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2024-02-20 21:07:41