

Jeffrey Kilbreth

I live in Richmond, one of the first ten AB 617 communities. I live half a mile from the Chevron Richmond refinery and have served on our AB 617 Community Steering Committee for over 5 years. I care about reducing GHGs steadily in order to save the planet and improving public health in industrial communities like my home town. I assume CARB cares about both of these things as well. My summary reactions to the proposed changes to CAP & Trade/Invest are as follows

1) I'm disappointed by the emissions reduction trajectory you propose, especially from 2031-2045. Getting back to where we were in 1990 by 2045 is simply not stepping up to the challenge. Why don't we shoot for something significantly lower than 1990 by 2045? I haven't seen anything that convinced me we couldn't achieve this. It certainly looks like China and Europe are going to achieve greater reductions than what you are proposing. Think bigger about massive increases in renewable electricity generation and all of the ways we can replace fossil fuels with clean electricity.

2) Household Energy Relief. The average household PG&E bill is probably now well over \$3K per year and we all know that gasoline is up \$1.50 per gallon with many households spending over \$5K per year at current prices. The average household income in Richmond is around \$60K, roughly 50% of the Contra Costa County average. Many households make \$30-40K. What are you doing about this approaching crisis and the inequality of these impacts? I think an aggressive program to get money to the lower half of the income distribution is called for. Certainly CARB should champion using this fund for this purpose and if necessary take money out of "Invest" and put it into "Relief."

3) Climate Investment Fund. Many of the ideas here are good and are broadly part of an effective CAP & Trade/Invest program. In the big picture, we should provide incentives to electrify everything we reasonably can and speed up the percentage of renewable generation we have to work with. What we should be very wary of is industry ideas like "carbon sequestration & storage." Projects like the Montezuma Carbon Hub proposal are very risky in terms of cost overruns and poor ROI, unlikely to make that much of a difference in meeting our 2045 goals, and very likely to cause a lot of emissions and public health problems in the very industrial AB 617 communities we are supposed to be improving. This is simply not a place where we should be subsidizing industry. Put the money into getting to 90% renewable electricity by 2045 and ask the public and industry to "Go Electric wherever possible" Don't subsidize carbon sequestration & storage unless you can prove it makes economic sense and doesn't cause public health problems greater than the the tiny amount of GHGs that will be removed from the atmosphere.

4) Pay attention to what Chevron and the other refineries are saying about California being an energy island, market leakage, relative costs and necessary planning horizons for capital programs. I want Chevron to reduce GHG emissions wherever they can. And even more, I want them to reduce the 15-20 Toxic Air Contaminants that drive our health problems. But I don't want them to have unreasonable regulatory burdens and we can't forget that our economy still runs on gasoline, jet fuel and lubricants. We can hope we get to 90% renewable electricity and 80% electric cars, stoves, HVAC, and hot water heaters by 2045, but we'll still need some refineries. And we want them to be as well maintained as possible and to have the least possible impact on public health. We don't want to have to get our gas or jet fuel from China!