

California Air Resources Board 1001 I Street Sacramento, CA 95814

December 14, 2010

Chairman Nichols and Members of the Board:

Thank you for your concern for our environment. While everybody cares about the environment, please postpone your cap and trade plan and take into account the costs this will impose on our already weak economy, the failure of cap and trade to gain traction elsewhere and the deep opposition of millions of California taxpayers and business owners.

Even your own analysis estimates the cap and trade proposal will result in a loss of GDP, and many other researchers have estimated much greater costs. The cap and trade proposal discusses business owners having the choice of paying cap and trade taxes or alternatively investing in new equipment. The writers of the proposal may think this is a generous proposition by giving the carbon-emitter the choice of what type of additional costs they would like to incur, but the fact is many small businesses are already operating in the red and cannot afford either option. Regular citizens are currently struggling and cannot afford these additional costs.

The cap and trade documents show that CARB continues to imagine that moving forward with this proposal will "show leadership" in the fight against supposed global warming. However, since California began to show leadership with the passage of AB 32 in 2007, every state but New Mexico has declared that it does not want to join us in a cap and trade market and American voters have elected a Congressional majority committed to opposing cap and trade on a national level.

While some have posited that the failure of Prop. 23 is a mandate to go "full speed ahead" with AB 32 implementation, nothing could actually be further from the truth. Over 3 million Californians voted Yes on Prop. 23, even though the effort to suspend AB 32 was outspent by 3-1 and faced with a barrage of deceptive advertisements by opponents.

The 3 million Californians who voted Yes, or nearly 4 in 10 voters, believe now is not the time for costly new global warming taxes. Please remember that you represent the people of California, not just eco-left special interests. This proposal is divisive and endangers the livelihoods of many families while failing to inspire other states to follow. Please reconsider.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Eisenhammer Founder Coalition of Energy Users