There are no comments posted to Draft Scenarios for Achieving Carbon Neutrality in the 2022 Scoping Plan Update (22spcarbonneutrality) at this time.

Comment 1 for Draft Scenarios for Achieving Carbon Neutrality in the 2022 Scoping Plan Update (22spcarbonneutrality). (At Hearing)

First Name: Muriel Last Name: Strand

Email Address: ecoengr@comcast.net Affiliation: retired Air Resources Engineer

Subject: comments on draft scenarios for 2022 scoping plan

Comment:

Attachment: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/1-22spcarbonneutrality-VDcAZ1ckVWRQCQJx.pdf

Original File Name: CARB scoping scenario comments.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-03-24 08:11:11

Comment 2 for Draft Scenarios for Achieving Carbon Neutrality in the 2022 Scoping Plan Update (22spcarbonneutrality). (At Hearing)

First Name: Laura Last Name: Haider

Email Address: lauragreen.rosenberger@gmail.com

Affiliation: Fresnans Against Fracking

Subject: Carbon Neutrality Harbor Craft Regulations

Comment:

There needs to be more incentives for hydrogen fuel technology for harbor crafts. I support your harbor craft rule. Harbor craft workers would have less respiratory problems, cardiovascular disease, cancer, allergies, and cognitive decline. There are bioaccumulative toxic heavy metals in diesel fuel. Investing in health is a good investment. Less people would be out of work due to health conditions.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-03-24 12:09:42

Comment 3 for Draft Scenarios for Achieving Carbon Neutrality in the 2022 Scoping Plan Update (22spcarbonneutrality). (At Hearing)

First Name: JOHN Last Name: SCOTT

Email Address: JOHNSCOTTUK1949@GMAIL.COM

Affiliation:

Subject: Bay Area Air Quality. SHORT RUN FERRIES

Comment:

<div>Please change the definition of a short-run ferry in the proposed harborcraft regulations, so that a boat that operates with a diesel engine, cannot add multiple legs or add one long leg, in order to avoid the requirements that a short-run ferry, be zero emission. As written, the regulations will cause boat operators to game the regulations by running more and longer routes and this will increase CO2 emissions by thousands of tons in the Bay Area and this is wrong.</div> <div> </div> <div>Zero-emission regulations should reduce CO2 emissions not increase them. Please make it that everyone running a vessel on a short-run route has to follow the same regulations and be zero-emission without loopholes. That's only fair and also will ensure the proposed regulations reduce CO2 emissions created by ferries in the San Francisco Bay.</div> <div> </div>

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-03-24 13:06:48

Comment 4 for Draft Scenarios for Achieving Carbon Neutrality in the 2022 Scoping Plan Update (22spcarbonneutrality). (At Hearing)

First Name: Bob

Last Name: Zimmerman

Email Address: bobzim1934@att.net

Affiliation:

Subject: Public Hearing to Consider Proposed Amendments to the Commercial Harbor Craft

Regulation (Comment:

```
<span style="-webkit-text-size-adjust: auto; font-family:</p>
UICTFontTextStyleTallBody; font-size: 19px; background-color:
#ffffff;">Please change the definition of a short-run ferry in the
proposed harborcraft  regulations so that a boat that operates
with a diesel engine cannot add multiple legs or add one long leg
in order to avoid the requirements that a short-run ferry be zero
emission. As written, the regulations will cause boat operators to
game the regulations by running more and longer routes and this
will increase </span><span dir="ltr"</pre>
style="-webkit-text-size-adjust: auto; font-family:
UICTFontTextStyleTallBody; font-size: 19px;">CO2</span><span</pre>
style="-webkit-text-size-adjust: auto; font-family:
UICTFontTextStyleTallBody; font-size: 19px; background-color:
#ffffff;">emissions by thousands of tons in the Bay Area and this
is wrong. Zero-emission regulations should reduce </span><span
dir="ltr" style="-webkit-text-size-adjust: auto; font-family:
UICTFontTextStyleTallBody; font-size: 19px;">CO2</span><span</pre>
style="-webkit-text-size-adjust: auto; font-family:
UICTFontTextStyleTallBody; font-size: 19px; background-color:
#ffffff;"> emissions not increase them.  Please make it
that everyone running a vessel on a short-run route has to follow
the same regulations and be zero-emission without loopholes. That's
only fair and also will ensure the proposed
regulations reduce </span><span dir="ltr"
style="-webkit-text-size-adjust: auto; font-family:
UICTFontTextStyleTallBody; font-size: 19px;">CO2</span><span
style="-webkit-text-size-adjust: auto; font-family:
UICTFontTextStyleTallBody; font-size: 19px; background-color:
#ffffff;"> emissions created by ferries in the San Francisco
Bay.</span>
```

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-03-24 14:04:57

Comment 5 for Draft Scenarios for Achieving Carbon Neutrality in the 2022 Scoping Plan Update (22spcarbonneutrality). (At Hearing)

First Name: Kyle Last Name: Meng

Email Address: kmeng@bren.ucsb.edu

Affiliation:

Subject: Pollution disparity consequences of CA's GHG cap-and-trade program Comment:

Dear CARB -
We would like to submit our response to Pastor et al's "Up in
the Air" working paper, which critiques Hernandez-Cortes and Meng
(2022). That response paper is attached.
Hernandez-Cortes and Meng (2022) find that California's GHG
cap-and-trade program narrowed criteria air pollution disparities
across California.
best,
Cortes (ASU)
Kyle Meng (UCSB)

Attachment: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/7-22spcarbonneutrality-B28CZ1c7UFxXI1Uw.pdf

Original File Name: HCM_response_to_PMC.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-03-24 15:05:24

Comment 6 for Draft Scenarios for Achieving Carbon Neutrality in the 2022 Scoping Plan Update (22spcarbonneutrality). (At Hearing)

First Name: Muriel Last Name: Strand

Email Address: ecoengr@comcast.net Affiliation: retired Air Resources Engineer

Subject: postscript

Comment:

am experiencing connection issues, so instead of direct... just
a PS to my previous written comments.
i think EJAC may not fully appreciate CARB's constraints legal
and historical
but i think CARB may not fully appreciate the extent to which
BAU is implicit in the lifestyles assumptions that i predict are
inputs into the E3 models.
<assuming the same jobs, commutes, stores, shopping, supply
chains, travel, etc., is not the way to really zero out
carbon.</p>
i believe social engineering must be seriously considered.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2022-03-24 15:16:10