



California Council for Environmental and Economic Balance

101 Mission Street, Suite 1440, San Francisco, California 94105
415-512-7890 phone, 415-512-7897 fax, www.cceeb.org

October 30, 2015

Michael J. Tollstrup, Chief
Project Assessment Branch
Industrial Strategies Division
California Air Resources Board
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Draft Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Reduction Strategy

Dear Mr. Tollstrup,

On behalf of the members of the California Council for Environmental and Economic Balance (CCEEB), we provide you with comments on the Draft Short-Lived Climate Pollutant (SLCP) Reduction Strategy. CCEEB is a non-profit, non-partisan association of business, labor, and public leaders, which advances balanced policies for a strong economy and a healthy environment.

CCEEB believes the best path to achieving the state's long-range environmental goals—including SLCP-focused reductions—is through an integrated and flexible policy framework that optimizes sustainable and cost-effective GHG reductions across all programs and sectors. By addressing SLCP goals in a way that manages costs and spurs innovation, the state can ensure that California's economic recovery continues. CCEEB recognizes that the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has been directed by the Legislature to develop this strategy document, but it is important to recognize that some of the strategies in this document establish new, additional complementary measures that can potentially undermine the flexibility envisioned by the Cap-and-Trade program. CARB needs to guard against layered regulatory programs that add cost without benefit. CARB should rely on its many existing programs to the greatest extent possible as the starting point for strategies for addressing SLCPs (additional discussion below).

Accounting For Decades of Action

ARB's pollutant specific targets use a different starting year and baseline (e.g., the targets for black carbon are based on 2012 levels and the targets for fluorinated gases are based on forecasted emissions). This is confusing, makes comparison

difficult, and does not align with the state's broader GHG goals that use 1990 levels as the baseline.

ARB should show emissions trends and forecasts from current regulations and programs that already control emissions of each of the gases – this data can then be used to compare reductions with the state's climate goals and indicate what percentage of total emissions have already been or are expected to be reduced from 1990 levels as well as gaps between forecasts and targets.

CCEEB recommends that CARB make its targets California specific and consistent with existing programs. National and global targets lack the context of California's extensive GHG and criteria pollutant emissions mitigation and reduction programs. California's historical and persistent action should be fully accounted for in the context of national and global target setting. ARB should also develop a consistent inventory process that allows for direct comparison to other emissions in California's climate and air quality programs. From this apples-to-apples inventory, technical evaluations of potential measures will provide the transparent information necessary for sound science-based policy development.

Cost Analysis and Cost Effectiveness

CARB acknowledges the need for economic analysis but seems to have already concluded that many measures will have low or negative costs (see page 72). Many measures are proposed with a promise to look at the costs and benefits in the future. However, CCEEB requests that CARB provide a robust and transparent economic analysis for each concept prior to advancing draft strategies and developing this document further. All analyses should be available for public and legislative scrutiny, with adequate time provided for stakeholder review prior to furtherance of the strategy document.

As the SLCP strategy progresses, individual pollutant targets should be based on the potential for technically feasible and cost-effective reductions. Given the labor intensive regulatory process, ARB must focus on the largest sources first, rather than overlap or regulate the same sources in different rules. Overall, ARB should prioritize lower cost actions and ensure that reductions are equitably spread across the economy. CCEEB recommends that the SLCP strategy include information about how targets were set and indicate the cost-effectiveness of different control strategies.

Leverage Existing Regulations

CCEEB appreciates CARB's inclusion of existing regulations and believes that a comprehensive review of federal and State control measures will provide a vast majority of the reductions needed to achieve the State's goal and demonstrate that SLCP emissions will be significantly reduced directly or indirectly in the future. For example, according to CARB's own data, most black carbon in California comes from wood burning and forest fires. Wood burning is increasingly regulated by regional air districts. Moreover, regulation of particulate matter (PM) under both federal

and State laws has already reduced black carbon by 85 percent from 1990 levels.¹ CCEEB believes that inclusion of forestry management practices is vital and will have substantial benefits across multiple pollutant categories including the reduction of black carbon from forest fires.

Additional duplication could occur between the SLCP strategy and broader climate policies that regulate the same sources, such as the Cap-and-Trade program. While the Cap-and-Trade program places a clear price on GHG, with allowance prices hovering in the \$12 range, other “complementary policies” are not driven by a specific GHG reduction goal, nor do they produce a transparent GHG cost. Moving forward, we would like to see California adopt a GHG policy that prioritizes cost-effectiveness through promoting transparency around the costs and benefits of all reduction strategies and allows technologies to compete against one another on a level playing field. This approach will provide a clear market signal to developers of low and zero-carbon solutions and encourage innovation. Furthermore, direct emission-abatement measures within a system that has an upper limit (cap) on emissions will not change the total amount of emissions from within that system. Within a capped system, direct measures change only how the emission reductions are achieved, who pays for those reductions, and at what cost. Through the SLCP, CARB should be transparent about the purpose and impact of each direct measure as well as the target that, when achieved, will indicate that the measure is no longer warranted because the market signal provided by Cap-and-Trade will achieve further needed reductions. CCEEB believes that use of the Cap-and-Trade program could serve to achieve many of the reductions proposed within the SLCP strategy.

It has also been suggested that a Phase II of the CARB Landfill Methane Control Measure be explored. CCEEB recommends that if CARB proceeds with a Phase II that a thorough evaluation be performed to determine the effectiveness of Phase I, and that cost-effectiveness be determined for any additional methane reductions from potential Phase II measures.

Organic Waste

CCEEB supports the concept that wherever possible, organic waste should be utilized in ways that reduce SLCP emissions while reclaiming maximum value from energy and nutrients that remain in these sources. CARB estimates that building needed infrastructure to achieve a 90% diversion rate by 2025 would cost the state \$100 million per year for five years, with an additional \$100 million needed for management of organics from dairies. We believe these projections are underestimated. More importantly, we are concerned about CARB's ability to identify a funding mechanism, or mechanisms, for these efforts. Given the aggressive path laid out to recycle organic waste, CARB needs to re-prioritize its funding efforts to allow the necessary infrastructure to be built.

¹ ARB lecture shows that large decadal trends in black carbon concentrations are largely in response to policies enacted to decrease PM emissions from diesel combustion: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/lectures/speakers/ramanathan/ramanathan.pdf>

Additionally, CCEEB believes CARB should fully implement current mandates and targets before superseding them with new and additional organic waste regulatory mandates (e.g., 90% diversion of organics from landfills by 2025). As discussed in the SLCP, AB 1826 (Chesbro) – Chapter 727, Statutes of 2014, was passed and signed into law last year. CCEEB recommends that the SLCP focus on strategies to achieve a difficult AB 1826 commercial organic reduction mandates. The framework and success of AB 1826 implementation will pave the way for more consistent and effective future actions; it is premature to move beyond the AB 1826-goal in the SLCP strategy. Financial incentives and reduction in regulatory barriers for new infrastructure needs to be established prior to development of new goals outside of statutory authority.

The draft report correctly identifies municipal wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) as a means of managing organic waste in the short-term while infrastructure for new management strategies is being developed. CCEEB believes that CARB and CalRecycle should strengthen partnerships with industry to collaborate on much needed development of projects and funding opportunities. The California Association of Sanitation Agencies reports that existing WWTPs in the state have enough excess capacity at their existing digesters to handle up to 70% of the organics that could be diverted from landfills. With the proper funding and regulatory support, additional digester capacity could be added to these facilities. Given the enormous potential of WWTPs to handle organic waste, CCEEB believes this should be a priority for CARB and CalRecycle moving forward.

Voluntary Actions

CARB should include and assess the potential of voluntary measures in its SLCP Reduction Strategy. For example, CARB could examine the GHG reduction potential of offset projects (e.g., biochar). Offsets are a cost-effective mechanism to achieve GHG reductions, but much more support is needed to accelerate the development of offset protocols and the generation of offset supply.

Conclusion

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to comment. Please contact me or Jackson R. Gualco, Kendra Daijogo or Mikhael Skvarla, CCEEB's governmental relations representatives at The Gualco Group, Inc. at (916) 441-1392, if you have any questions regarding our comments. We welcome the opportunity to discuss any climate change-related matter of significance to the CCEEB membership.

Sincerely,

GERALD D. SECUNDY
President

cc: Honorable Chair & Members of the Air Resources Board
Mr. Richard Corey
Mr. Ryan McCarthy
Mr. David Mehl
Ms. Sarah Pittiglio
Ms. Marcelle Surovik
Mr. William J. Quinn
Ms. Janet Whittick
The Gualco Group, Inc.