

Comments ARB 2030 Climate Change Commitments-Petroleum Use due 8.8.2015

The release **Cutting Petroleum Use in Half by 2030** stated:

Build on California's Climate Change and Air Quality Framework

Building on existing efforts, California can cut petroleum use from cars and trucks in half by 2030:

- *Build high-speed rail and continue supporting community planning to reduce vehicle mile travelled*
- *Continue current levels of light-duty and heavy-duty vehicle efficiency improvements*
- *Strengthen the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to continue reducing fuel carbon intensity*
- *Continue providing strong market support for zero emission vehicles and renewable fuel production through carbon pricing and other incentives*

Sample path to 50% petroleum reduction in 2030

An approach to 50 percent petroleum reduction could include:

- *Reducing growth in vehicle-miles travelled to 4%;*
- *increasing on-road fuel efficiency of cars to 35 mpg and heavy-duty trucks to about 7 mpg; and*
- *at least doubling use of alternative fuels like biofuels, electricity, hydrogen, and renewable natural gas. (ARB analysis) See graph at right.*

Rethinking Transportation in California Symposium Objective stated:

Provide a forum for State policy makers to hear from experts and stakeholders on ways to transform California's transportation system over the next few decades. Specifically, the forum will help identify the challenges and opportunities available to influence these changes in a way that:

- *efficiently moves people and freight,*
- *meets California's public health, land use, economic and environmental objectives, and*
- *puts us on a 2030 pathway to achieve petroleum use reductions, climate goals, and health-based air quality standards.*

Fragmented approaches do not seem to be successful, whether economic or practical. Political influence, whether in the form of formal lobbying or in a general outreach through public relations has never been addressed. The relationship of investments in carbon producing markets may sustain pension funds, yet that aspect of investment is never addressed.

Investment aspect, addressed in the air quality field, is the Cap and Trade Market. With that financial market, the relationship to reduction techniques is blurred.

Smart Growth and Transportation Choice issues ignore the other aspects of the purpose of General Plans and any CEQA documentation to mitigate and monitor those plans. If density increases to be near transportation, the infrastructure needs such as water, electricity, sewer, storm drains, sidewalks and streets and highways should be addressed to substantiate the policy.

If patterns of transportation where identifiable, then maybe that would be a baseline point to address reductions issues. We see no studies on time studies on travel, instead we see an approach of reduction of VMT vehicle miles traveled. If less time is involved in transportation by a car, where is the benefit of using public transportation? Time is money.

We do not see a baseline point addressed, other than a point in time, with no aspects of population increase/decrease, technology improvements, state of the infrastructure and public services budgeting.

In reality, we find most approaches based on a wish list with no substantial data but plenty of modeling and no method of proving that modeling.

Commercial end of freight-air, port and truck have never been incorporated into any meeting we have attended. This is an area of economic development, especially the world market in port freight.

Just how much petroleum is used every day? How much petroleum has been used over a period of time overlaid by economic increase/decrease? In other words, if the economic increases occurred at a 3% or 4% increase annually, did the petroleum increase relatively?

Where are the projections of petroleum decrease and the economic growth?

Will tax revenue decline? Tax revenue includes property taxes, income taxes, gas taxes etc.

Can the infrastructure, now deteriorated, sustain on reduced revenue sources.

Disposable income of the residents of California should be a concern. Can the taxpayer afford reductions without economic benefit realized somewhere in the mix?

Capital investments generate revenue to companies and jobs to individuals, but the long-term operations and maintenance funding needs to be an aspect of any policy.

Joyce Dillard
P.O. Box 31377
Los Angeles, CA 90031