



P.O. Box 1932
El Cerrito, CA
August 26, 2024

Clerks' Office, California Air Resources Board
1001 I Street, Sacramento, California 95814

Re: **Proposed Updates to the Low Carbon Fuel Standard**

Dear Members of the Board:

We at Sunflower Alliance appreciate the Board's acknowledgement that the LCFS is in need of significant revision. However, we are also disappointed that the proposed revisions continue many of the harmful measures of the current program.

The Low Carbon Fuel Standard Program has provided much-needed support for zero-emission transportation, especially the rapid conversion to electric transportation. We urge you to further revise

the LCFS program to focus on incentivizing these approaches, rather than continuing support for biomethane and combustion fuels.

Specifically:

- Removing credits for hydrogen produced from fossil fuel is a positive step forward. But delaying implementation of this measure until 2030 means another five-plus years of financial rewards for its production. This serves to further the harm we should be preventing. We would like to encourage far more immediate implementation to prevent any further reliance on dirty, greenhouse gas-intensive hydrogen.
- The proposed draft continues to provide credits for the production of industrial dairy “biogas” despite the many harmful effects of this financial support. It incentivizes the expansion of large-scale factory dairy farms¹, causing harmful effects on the health of surrounding communities, including increased release of ammonia, water pollution, and increased truck traffic²; encourages the inevitable leakage of methane during storage and transportation³; and generates greenhouse gas emissions created by combustion of the product. We urge you to phase out support for biomethane as rapidly as possible^{4,5}.

- Unlike previous versions of the LCFS, the new proposal does not require the aviation industry to take any responsibility for the combustion of fossil fuel–based jet fuel, even for intrastate travel. This is a step backward, excluding a major source of greenhouse gases and pollution from fossil fuel combustion.
- It can't be said enough that biorefining is still a species of refining, and, as such, releases dangerous emissions with dire impacts on frontline communities. The production of renewable diesel is *at best* an interim solution, whose necessity we hope will be short-lived.
- Biofuels manufactured from virgin soy or canola oil are particularly problematic, with major negative consequences that include increased food prices, global deforestation, and the incentivization of industrial agriculture, which generates high quantities of greenhouse gas and toxic pollution. We are truly appreciative that the proposed revision acknowledges the seriousness of these problems. But we are dismayed that the LCFS revision continues to provide credits for the production of biofuel that includes up to 20 percent of this destructive feedstock.
- We are entirely unclear about the basis for this 20 percent “cap.” What likely quantifiable impact will this have on the rapidly

increasing utilization of soy and canola oils as renewable diesel feedstock? (In the first quarter of this year, biofuel from soybean and canola oil accounted for about 30 percent of the renewable diesel qualifying for LCFS credits.⁶ By all accounts, that percentage is expected to rise even further.) And what impact will the proposed 20 percent standard likely have on GHG reduction? We would like to see a more rigorous and science-based approach employed here—one that more effectively discourages, and not just somewhat reduces, the use of virgin oils in renewable diesel production.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to comment.

Very sincerely yours,

Jean Tepperman
Co-Coordinator
Sunflower Alliance

1. Lee, Hyunok and Daniel A. Sumner. “Dependence on policy revenue poses risks for investments in dairy digesters.” *California Agriculture*. Vol. 72, No. 4. December 17, 2018.
2. Son, JY., Bell, M.L, “Concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) in relation to environmental justice related variables in Wisconsin, United States,” *Journal of Exposure Science and Environmental Epidemiology*, September 9, 2023.
3. Thomas K. Flesch, Raymond L. Desjardins, Devon Worth, “Fugitive methane emissions from an agricultural biodigester.” *Biomass and Bioenergy*, October 2011.
4. Waterman, C. & Armus, M. “*Biogas or Bull****? The Deceptive Promise of Manure Biogas as a Methane Solution*,” 2024.
https://foe.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Factory-Farm-Gas-Brief_final.pdf
5. Food & Water Watch, “*Big Oil and Big Ag Ponzi Scheme: Factory Farm Biogas*,” January 2024. https://foe.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Factory-Farm-Gas-Brief_final.pdf
6. Jesse Allen, “California Proposes Credit Cap on Renewable Diesel.” Ag News, August 18, 2024.

<https://americanagnetwork.com/2024/08/california-proposes-credit-cap-on-renewable-diesel/>