Comment 1 for New Passenger Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards (ghgpv10) - 45 Day.

First Name: Tom
Last Name: Magdaleno
Email Address: tom_mag2001@yahoo.com
Affiliation:

Subject: Greenhouse gas emissions
Comment:

To the Clerk of the Air Resources Board,
I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed new rules regulating emissions in California. Although I believe the science of global warming is sound, I think the direction the board is taking is draconian and will do nothing to solve the problem worldwide. In my travels outside the US I am always amazed they lack the basic environmental controls we had 40 years ago. Money spent there would go a lot further and it would actually improve the quality of life. Instead, we get regulations that send jobs to places where they can pollute more and nobody wins.
As a classic car hobbyist I was dismayed at the amount of difficulty I had this last year in painting one of my classics. It is already difficult to find the chemicals needed to practice my hobby. I am afraid I will not be able to practice my hobby at all if these new rules come into play.
I urge you to suspend this legislation and focus on educating people on proper tire inflation and on proper AC use. Many people I know use their air conditioning all the time and only adjust the temperature control. They do not realize they are wasting gas when ever the AC is on and when ever the defroster is on. Other people won't use the vent because of the smell from the ducts when the AC is turned off. These people need to be educated in the way to prevent the smell. Turning off the AC two blocks before you park your car will blow the moisture out of the ducts and prevent the smell. Disseminating this simple fact will save a lot of fuel.

Sincerely,

Tom Magdaleno

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-01-13 20:43:41

No Duplicates.

Comment 2 for New Passenger Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards (ghgpv10) - 45 Day.

First Name: Aynov
Last Name: Tanaka
Email Address: aynov@hotmail.com
Affiliation:

Subject: ghgpv10
Comment:

I find this regulation a massive intrusion into the lives of citizens and an unreasonable requirement. I do not see how California taking this action can have any impact on man caused Global Warming (assuming such a phenomenon even exists). All I see is an attempt by the State to collect fines.

I also do not see how enforcement will work. This is a meaningless action which will only drive away people and businesses from a State which already has too many regulations and laws.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-01-13 21:25:07

No Duplicates.

Comment 3 for New Passenger Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards (ghgpv10) - 45 Day.

First Name: Charlene
Last Name: Saunders
Email Address: Toytac@hotmail.com
Affiliation:

Subject: ghgpv10.
Comment:

I oppose this proposal. This gives one more opportunity for the ASP to charge for something. I always inflate my tires to the maximum recommended pressure.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-01-14 09:00:26

No Duplicates.

Comment 4 for New Passenger Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards (ghgpv10) - 45 Day.

First Name: Preston
Last Name: Riseling
Email Address: scottriseling@yahoo.com
Affiliation:

Subject: ghgpv10
Comment:

```
Lets stop this job killing prposal now! California contributes less
than 1% of all global green house gases worldwide. these mandates
will have zero impact on the any climate change. All this does is
drive tax paying business to leave our state and is a job Killer!
```

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-01-19 20:12:29

No Duplicates.

Comment 5 for New Passenger Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards (ghgpv10) - 45 Day.

First Name: Patrick
Last Name: Patton
Email Address: insomnifrk2111@yahoo.com
Affiliation:

Subject: Reduction of Carbon Emmissions from Motor Vehicles
Comment:

In reviewing your research, I have come to the realization that Government Employees and entities make up a majority of our collective carbon emmitters and so, in California, create the "overwhelmingly evident climate change we all fear". As such I propose that, before we further tax the populace who is already overburden with financial hardship, we perform two actions:
1) Mandate a part-time legislative body; this would reduce the significant carbon emmissions generated by travel by "representatives" by air and car to Sacramento.
2) Reduce the amount of Government employees, this will accomplish two basic principals, reducing pollution generated by their vehicles, and reduce the tax burden on the tax payers allowing them to invest in green technology.

In short, our government body should set an example and not be hypocritical; for instance it should fly all over the world in private jets and then force untenable regulations on its citizens, nor should they own shares of gas companies while proposing that we, the citizens, pay for their ill-conceived, immoral, and unethical policies on us.

In short, since I know will not consider my suggestions, reach down with both hands and pull your heads out of your butts and put them on sticks.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-02-01 14:39:06

No Duplicates.

Comment 6 for New Passenger Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards (ghgpv10) - 45 Day.

First Name: Robert E.
Last Name: Fisher, MSW
Email Address: rbrtfis@aol.com
Affiliation: Self

Subject: Passenger Vehicles ghgpv 10
Comment:

I SUPPORT, in particular, the LCFS passenger vehicle regulation. Should climate change and global warming be mitigated, the passenger vehicle, which contributes to approximately 40% of greenhose gas emissions, SHALL have to be significantly reduced, along with power plant greenhouse gas emissions, to mitigate climate change, global warming, glacial melting and extreme weather conditions in the world today, among other things.

I SUPPORT the CARB onthis issue 500%.

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-02-02 08:03:48

No Duplicates.

Comment 7 for New Passenger Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards (ghgpv10) - 45 Day.

First Name: John
Last Name: Cabaniss
Email Address: jcabaniss@aiam.org
Affiliation: Assoc of International Automobile Mfrs.

Subject: AIAM Comments on MV GHG Amendments 2012-2016 MYs
Comment:

```
AIAM comments on motor vehicle greenhouse gas amendments, 2012-2016
model years.
```

Attachment: 'https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach-old/ghgpv10/8-carb_phase_2_amendments_comments-_2.17.10_final.pdf'

Original File Name: CARB Phase 2 Amendments Comments- 2.17.10 final.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-02-18 12:42:01

No Duplicates.

Comment 8 for New Passenger Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards (ghgpv10) - 45 Day.

First Name: Joyce E.
Last Name: Epps
Email Address: jeepps@state.pa.us
Affiliation: PA Dept of Environmental Protection

Subject: PA DEP comments on CARB GHG MY2012-2016 Amendments
Comment:

```
Attached please find the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental
Protection's comments on CARB's proposed amendments to its GHG
regulations to allow compliance with the proposed National Program
to count as compliance with CARB standards for MYs 2012-2016.
```

Attachment: 'https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach-old/ghgpv10/10-pa_dep_comments_carb_ghg_my2012-2014.pdf'

Original File Name: PA DEP Comments CARB GHG MY2012-2014.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-02-23 12:22:29

No Duplicates.

Comment 9 for New Passenger Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards (ghgpv10) - 45 Day.

First Name: Don
Last Name: Heichel
Email Address: kiheidon@aim.com
Affiliation:

Subject: Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW)
Comment:

Your text:

"Citing compelling and extraordinary air quality and other impacts California faces from global warming, in 2002 the Legislature passed and the Governor signed Assembly Bill (AB) 1493. This bill required ARB to develop and adopt regulations to achieve the maximum feasible and cost-effective reduction of heat-trapping greenhouse gas emissions from passenger motor vehicles, beginning with the 2009 model year."

is WILDLY out of date and contrary to the Best Interests of the citizens of California. The Hockey Stick temp chart is totally discredited & the Mideveal Warming now discredits AGW alamrists such as you Bureaucrats!!

China is now #1 in manufacturing Solar PV Panels & Wind Turbines; they do not require an Air Resources Board or AB 32 to acheive this.

You CARB Bureaucrats are driving employers from this State & creating economic havoc in our communities: i.e., Toyota is moving production from Fremont, California to Texas which will kill 5,000 +- manufacturing jobs here.

Each manufacturing job supports 7 to 10 other jobs: do the math, get on your knees and beg employers to tell you what's needed to bring them back!

Answer this: what good does it do to import the steel for re-building the Bay Bridge with Chinese steel?

China's fuel is coal, creating just as much (or more) emissions than if it was produced here + fuel must be used to ship it 6,000 miles across the Pacific Ocean. You have NO answer to this question because your myopic vision is focused on some tailpipe or smokestack.

My advice to ARB Bureaucrats (YOU!) is to REDUCE emissions by have manufacturing done in California.

Reduce costs to employers drastically!

Create employment, here!

Reduce your impact on California taxpayers starting with these

emissions standards.

China is the competition: do not make doing business more expensive here than they do...our unemployment demands it.

Or we will elect new leaders that will give you a new focus.

Also fire Hien T. Tran!!

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-02-24 07:01:14

No Duplicates.

Comment 10 for New Passenger Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards (ghgpv10) - 45 Day.

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Lord
Email Address: michael.lord@tema.toyota.com
Affiliation: Toyota Motor Eng & Manufacturing NA

Subject: Toyota Comments on Proposed Amendments to New Passenger Vehicle GHG Emission Standards
Comment:

Please see attached.

Attachment: 'https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach-old/ghgpv10/12-toyota_comment_ghg_board_item_2-25-10.pdf'

Original File Name: Toyota Comment GHG Board Item 2-25-10.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-02-24 08:17:16

No Duplicates.

Comment 11 for New Passenger Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards (ghgpv10) - 45 Day.

First Name: Megan
Last Name: Norris
Email Address: megan.norris@sierraclub.org
Affiliation: Sierra Club California

Subject: California Must Lead the Nation in Adopting Strong Federal Standards for Greenhouse Gas Em
Comment:

Dear California Air Resources Board Member,

I applaud the California Air Resources Board (CARB) for setting a high national bar for greener vehicles. As CARB acts to accept compliance with new national standards for a clean cars program, CARB should ensure that we get what we have been promised -- national standards that deliver the equivalent reductions to California's strong standards.

State leadership has lead to strong national standards that will result in large scale greenhouse gas reductions and guarantee that all Americans benefit from cleaning up our air for our kids, save money at the gas pump, reduce our dependence on oil, create new jobs and ensure global leadership in advancing technology for greener vehicles.

I encourage CARB to keep up the hard work and urge the Board to make sure that national standards are as stringent as California's for new vehicle models from 2012 to 2016. I also support CARB's setting new standards for model years 2017-2025. California must continue being a leader when it comes to greener vehicles.

Sincerely,

Sierra Club California members

Attachment: 'https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach-old/ghgpv10/13-sierraclubmemberspubliccomment.xls.zip'

Original File Name: SierraClubmemberspubliccomment.xls.zip

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-02-24 11:07:51

No Duplicates.

Comment 12 for New Passenger Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards (ghgpv10) - 45 Day.

First Name: Cynthia
Last Name: Williams
Email Address: cwilli96@ford.com
Affiliation: Ford Motor Company

Subject: Ford Motor Company Response to CARB 15-Day Notice to Amend GHG Standards
Comment:

Ford Motor Company (Ford) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the California Air Resources Board's (CARB's) proposed modifications to section 1961.1 "Greenhouse Gas Exhaust Emission Standards and Test Procedures – 2009 and Subsequent Model Passenger Cars, Light-Duty Trucks, and Medium-Duty Vehicles", dated January 7, 2010. Ford supports CARB's intent to permit compliance with California Greenhouse Gas (GHG) standards based on a manufacturer's ability to comply the Federal GHG Emissions Standards.

As previously recommended in the Ford September 15, 2009 and December 9, 2009 comments on the CARB proposed amendments, Ford offers the attached comments in support of the use of Federal CAFE data to demonstrate compliance with the California GHG standards, with suggested regulatory language changes that would implement our comments. We also offer comments on some areas where the proposed regulations present some timing concerns. Ford welcomes the opportunity to discuss this information in detail with CARB staff.

Attachment: 'https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach-old/ghgpv10/14-ford_motor_company_15-day_notice_comments.pdf'

Original File Name: Ford Motor Company 15-day Notice Comments.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-02-24 11:25:17

No Duplicates.

Comment 13 for New Passenger Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards (ghgpv10) - 45 Day.

First Name: Jamie
Last Name: Knapp
Email Address: jamie@jknappcommunications.com
Affiliation: Clean Cars Coalition

Subject: Clean Cars Coalition Support Letter
Comment:

```
Comments attached.
```

Attachment: 'https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach-old/ghgpv10/15-2-25-10env-comments-on-acp.pdf'

Original File Name: 2-25-10Env-comments-on-ACP.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-02-24 12:00:39

No Duplicates.

Comment 1 for New Passenger Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards (ghgpv10). (At Hearing)

First Name: Julie
Last Name: Becker
Email Address: Non-web submitted comment
Affiliation:

Subject: Alliance
Comment:

please see attached

Attachment: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach-old/ghgpv10/16-julie.pdf

Original File Name: Julie.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-02-26 15:23:16

No Duplicates.

Comment 1 for New Passenger Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards (ghgpv10) - 15-1.

First Name: Kelvin
Last Name: Johnson
Email Address: kelvin.johnson4720@yahoo.com
Affiliation:

Subject: no greenhouse gas emission
Comment:

No on this bill. We already have one in place it been working just fine you are just tring to find more ways to take our money and jobs from us. The more you fine our business in California, the more they are just going to leave. Now I don't know where you are from, I know you are not even thinking about how to make more money in California or even thinking how our kids going to make money in this state, they can't make money if there's no jobs or if they want to start a business they got to deal with all the fine you are posing. Think about it if no one is working you can't get PAY.....

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-03-16 18:23:28

No Duplicates.

Comment 2 for New Passenger Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards (ghgpv10) - 15-1.

First Name: John
Last Name: Dodds
Email Address: jdoddsGW@sbcglobal.net
Affiliation:

Subject: Greenhouse Emissions
Comment:

A paper is available at www.scribd.com called Gravity causes Climate Changes.
http://www.scribd.com/doc/27343303/Gravity-Causes-Climate-Change

It claims that the IPCC and GCMs FAIL to properly implement the Greenhouse Effect, by

1. ignoring that the amount of energy photons coming into the Earth limits the GHE, and

2. instead claiming that the simple addition of CO2 without added energy, causes warming in violation of the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics and

3. An additional source of incoming energy in the force of gravity and gravitational potential ennegy has been totally ignored in the IPCC analysis.

In simple terms, Svante Arrhenius in 1896 said that in order to get the GreenHouse warming Effect (GHE), you must add an energy photon to a greenhouse gas (GHG) which delays the photon's transport to space by a few nanosonds thus causing more warming. The GHE results in about 11% (32/287) of the Earths temperature due to the fraction of the spectrum of energy photons that can be absorbed and released a few nanseconds later. The IPCC however claims that you just need to add a GHG to the air to get the GHE.(AR4, WG1, Ch1, p116). Clearly the latter is impossible since you can not increase the temperature witout adding an energy photon without violating the Law of Conservation of Energy.

It is claimed that the IPCC mechanism is only valid as the Earth's atmosphere is coming up to energy equilibrium, when there would exist sufficient excess energy to provide the GHGs with the required absorbable photon of energy. Once the Earth reaches equilibrium when all the energy coming in is equal to the energy going out, and with both the Water Vapor and CO2 absorbtion spectra saturated or absorbing 100% of the absorbable photons, then the addition of any more GHGs will not result in any more GHE warming because there are no longer any absorbable photons available. This then results in an EXCESS of the GHGs in the air. The proof is simple- When you add more WV to the air, as when the humidity goes from a "normal" 33% to 100% when it rains, there is no increase in

the GHE warming of the air. By the IPCC logic you would expect the WV GHE to triple from 32C to 96C. This does not happen because all of the absorbable photons are already in use. ie the absorbtion spectra for WV (& CO2) are saturated. This is why all of the Water in the oceans has not become water vapor in use by the GHE. The addition of more GHGs just results in more excess GHGs in the air, not more warming.

The idea of excess GHGs is also supported by the fact that whenever the temperature decreases, every night, every winter etc, then the amount of GHGs in use causing the GHE also decreases. This results in more GHGs becoming excess. Since the temperature is below the record highs and since man has added more CO2, then under normal average conditions today on Earth there is excess GHGs. If there is excess then then any increase is dictated by the energy coming in and out, and it would use the excess first (as it does every morning) rather than waiting until man adds more excess.

Now if there is excess GHGs and no available energy, then the IPCC/Models contention that more CO2 results in more feedback warming by WV, also is impossible. due to the lack of energy photons. Similarly the contention that more clouds will result in more positive feedbacks is also impossible if there are no available energy photons, even while in the lab more WV/clouds should result in more warming or posotive feedback IF THE PHOTONS WERE AVAILABLE. With the invalidation of the feedback models, then all derivations of forcing functions which depend on the models are also invalid.

The terminology that a Greenhouse Gas "traps" an energy photon to cause the Greenhouse Effect is incorrect and misleading.

The photon is absorbed and released within nanoseconds as the energized GHG molecule collides with other air molecules and returns the energy to the air. The concept that the energy is trapped is absurd. Since the GHE actually causes about an 11% temperature increase or (32C/287C on average), then if the energy photons were trapped for a significant period of time, say 10 days, let alone the 50+ years of disequilibrium claimed by Hansen, the air would have absorbed all of the energy that would have come in in a single day (ie 11% times 10 days=110%) yet the dailytemp increase is on the order of 10 to 15 degrees C, but the increase in the GHE only claims 0.8 degrees per century. Clearly trapping does not happen. You do not see individual GHG molecules at 900C. They are all at air temperature.

In summary, the GISS/HADCRU/IPCC models are so flawed as to be totally worthless. They fail to model the reality of conditions on Earth. They mis-apply the GHE. If more CO2 does NOT cause more warming, then there is no reason to Cap or reduce emissions. However as Hansen points out, the increasing temperature data is complete enough to document that warming exists, the data on incoming energy , the sole source used in the models, has essentially not increased since the 1960s, so there MUST be some other source of energy, eg gravity, that is causing the very real

warming. see the paper referenced above for further explanation.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-03-24 20:06:10

No Duplicates.

Comment 3 for New Passenger Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards (ghgpv10) - 15-1.

First Name: John
Last Name: Cabaniss
Email Address: jcabaniss@aiam.org
Affiliation: AIAM

Subject: AIAM Comments on 15-Day Notice for 2012-2016 MY GHG Standards
Comment:

```
Please see attached comments from the Association of International
Automobile Manufacturers.
```

Attachment: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach-old/ghgpv10/20-aiam_ghg_letter_to_carb_15-day_notice.pdf

Original File Name: AIAM GHG letter to CARB 15-day notice.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2010-03-26 10:47:01

No Duplicates.