



Our mission

Deliver rapid greenhouse gas reductions at scale, starting in California.

Board of Directors

Susan Thomas, Chair
Efred Carrillo, Immediate Past Chair
Venise Curry, MD, Vice Chair
Elliot Hinds, Treasurer
Larry Robinson, Secretary
Lokelani Devone
Jean S. Fraser
Susan Longville
Mary Luévano
Terea Macomber
Jim McGreen
Carl Mears
Aaron Schreiber-Stainthorp

Executive Staff

Ellie Cohen, Chief Executive Officer
Lois Downy, Chief Financial Officer
Jeri Howland, Director of Philanthropy
Barry Vesser, Chief Operations Officer

Strategic Advisors

Peter Barnes, Co-founder, Working Assets
Rick Brown, TerraVerde Renewable Partners
Jeff Byron, Former CA Energy Commissioner
Joe Como, Former Director, CA Office of Ratepayer Advocates
Ann Hancock, Chief Strategist & Co-Founder, The Climate Center
Hunter Lovins, President, Natural Capitalism Solutions

Science & Technical Advisors

Fred Euphrat, PhD
Daniel M. Kammen, PhD
Lorenzo Kristov, PhD
Alexandra von Meier, PhD
Edward C. Myers, M.S.Ch.E.
Greg Thomson, Green Solutions & Technologies
Mathis Wackernagel, PhD
Ken Wells, E.I.T.
Ai-Chu Wu, PhD

Contact

www.theclimatecenter.org
1275 4th Street #191
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
707-525-1665

May 3, 2022

Liane M. Randolph, Chair
California Air Resources Board
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Comments on Proposed Scoping Plan Pathways

Dear Members of the California Air Resources Board:

During its April 20 workshop, California Air Resources Board (CARB) staff expressed their intent to recommend to the Board that it adopt the Alternative 3 Scenario for the Draft Scoping Plan, which will set the state on a path to achieve carbon neutrality by 2045. **Alternative 3 is simply too late, as is Alternative 4. As goes California, so goes the world. We can and must achieve carbon neutrality followed by net-negative emissions by at least 2035 to have a chance at securing a stable climate.**¹

Additionally, Alternatives 1 and 2 rely on flawed technologies and do not properly take into account major opportunities in the natural and working lands and clean energy sectors. **Given these analytical weaknesses, the Board should adopt a policy proposal that achieves carbon neutrality by 2035 that better leverages these opportunities and removes, or at least reduces, reliance on engineered carbon removal.**

1. The Science Calls for Immediate and Rapid Emissions Reductions

The existential threat posed by climate change is well-known and is rapidly accelerating its pace. It's **"nothing less than a code red for humanity"** said the UN Secretary General, referencing the recent Sixth Assessment Report from the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).² Extreme events witnessed over the past several months are literally off the charts and some are not included in climate models that guide government decision making.³ Over 220 medical journals from across the globe declared in September that **"no temperature rise is safe" and our rapidly warming climate poses the greatest single threat to**

¹ <https://www.sfchronicle.com/opinion/openforum/article/Carbon-neutral-isn-t-good-enough-California-16351149.php>

² <https://news.un.org/en/story/2021/08/1097362>

³ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/jul/02/canadian-inferno-northern-heat-exceeds-worst-case-climate-models>

public health.⁴ The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration officially declared that July 2021 was the hottest month on record globally.⁵ After experiencing the hottest March on record, over 1 billion people have been subjected over the past week to an off-the-charts record breaking heat dome in India and Pakistan, that has decimated food crops and ignited over 8,000 fires, producing toxic air pollution.⁶ And new research shows that global warming has already destabilized the Arctic and Antarctic which will drive even more devastating global impacts.⁷ In short, as noted by the IPCC's 6th Assessment Report, we have "a brief and rapidly closing window of opportunity to secure a livable and sustainable future for all."⁸

Nowhere is the climate crisis more evident than in California, where we have been subjected to record-breaking wildfires, heat waves, floods, and repeated electricity outages. With the state in the early stages of a multi-decadal drought made severe by climate change, it has never been clearer that the time for accelerated climate action is now. CARB must act with speed and adopt a proposal that will achieve carbon neutrality by at least 2035 without relying on technologies that will perpetuate environmental injustices on vulnerable communities.

2. The Economic and Social Costs of Doing More Now are Far Less than the Cost of Future Damages

Immediate and aggressive actions and investments will cost much less than the costs that will be incurred through the adoption of a slower timeline.⁹ Indeed, as noted by the modeling itself, the social costs associated with avoided damages are expected to be higher than the numbers currently cited in the analysis. Given that the damages associated with the 2018 wildfires alone totaled \$150 billion¹⁰, and the 2019 wildfires cost \$80 billion¹¹, the expected social costs estimated in all of the scenarios—which range from \$2.2 billion to \$16.3 billion—appear to be vast underestimations.¹²

Beyond the analysis of simple dollars and cents, it is important to remember that people are dying every day because of our reliance on fossil fuels. The toxic criteria air pollutants emitted near major transportation corridors, power plants, and fossil fuel operations sites inflict the

⁴ <https://www.npr.org/2021/09/07/1034670549/climate-change-is-the-greatest-threat-to-public-health-top-medical-journals-warn>

⁵ <https://www.noaa.gov/news/its-official-july-2021-was-earths-hottest-month-on-record>

⁶ <https://www.arover.net/2022/05/03/india-and-pakistan-suffocate-under-record-heat-dome/>

⁷ <https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/2021/12/14/climate-change-arctic-antarctic-poles/>

⁸ *IPCC 6th Assessment, WGII, Feb. 28, 2022*

⁹ https://energyinnovation.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Cost_of_Delay.pdf

¹⁰ Wang, D., Guan, D., Zhu, S. et al. **Economic footprint of California wildfires in 2018.** *Nature Sustainability*, 2020 DOI: 10.1038/s41893-020-00646-7

<https://www.accuweather.com/en/weather-news/california-wildfires-will-cost-tens-of-billions-accuweather-estimates/612548>

¹¹ <https://www.accuweather.com/en/weather-news/california-wildfires-will-cost-tens-of-billions-accuweather-estimates/612548>

¹² Wang, D., Guan, D., Zhu, S. et al. **Economic footprint of California wildfires in 2018.** *Nature Sustainability*, 2020 DOI: 10.1038/s41893-020-00646-7

brunt of their poisonous potential upon the communities around them and then spread to inflict harms at the regional level. Addressing these health impacts can reap massive benefits, while also helping fight the climate crisis. One report found that “eliminating fossil fuel emissions from buildings and transportation, for example through electrification, would yield monetized health benefits of \$44 billion per year, based on detailed air quality modeling by UC Irvine, and that eliminating emissions from natural gas generators would yield benefits of \$1 billion per year.”¹³ That same report determined eliminating these emissions would also result in the avoidance of 4,950 premature deaths per year. The widespread availability and affordability of zero-emission technologies means that now is the time for the Board to move to decarbonize vast swaths of California’s economy and prevent future harms to the health of the state’s communities and to the climate.

3. CARB Must Avoid Relying on Failed Carbon Removal Technologies

In order to achieve carbon neutrality by 2035, both Alternatives 1 and 2 look to engineered carbon removal to make the target date work. As a baseline, CARB must ensure that the Scoping Plan does not rely on carbon capture and sequestration (CCS)-which operate at the smokestack and do not remove past emissions from the atmosphere- to achieve its goals. First, none of the existing carbon capture and sequestration projects attached to fossil fuel extraction operations have captured the amount of carbon they claimed they would, despite the fact that the technology has existed for decades and should therefore be much more mature.¹⁴ Indeed, the most widely cited “successful” project in Saskatchewan only captures 44% of its carbon dioxide emissions, not the promised 90%. Given this reality, CARB should not count on this unreliable technology to propel the state to carbon neutrality. To add to this, CCS is expensive, with captured carbon costing as much as \$140/ton for power generation.¹⁵ As there are cheaper, proven and natural ways to capture carbon over long periods of time that also provide significant co-benefits for water, biodiversity and the health of our communities, CARB should include these approaches rather than relying on CCS which has been shown to fail 80% of the time in the US.¹⁶

Perhaps most importantly, the use of CCS perpetuates the use of fossil fuels and all but ensures that the extracted carbon will be emitted into the atmosphere, even if some of the emissions associated with the extraction process are prevented. To make matters worse, a recent analysis found that 81% of the carbon captured by the fossil fuel industry has been used for enhanced oil recovery (EOR), thereby extracting even more carbon that is currently underground to be

¹³ <https://www.ethree.com/new-e3-reports-quantify-the-health-benefits-of-reducing-fossil-fuel-use-in-california/>

¹⁴ https://theclimatecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/position-paper_carbon-capture-and-storage_The-Climate-Center.pdf, page 5

¹⁵ <https://www.worldoil.com/news/2021/8/13/carbon-capture-tech-becoming-cost-effective-as-emissions-price-soars> and <https://www.iea.org/commentaries/is-carbon-capture-too-expensive>

¹⁶ Ahmed Abdulla, Ryan Hanna, Kristen R Schell, Oytun Babacan, David G Victor. Explaining successful and failed investments in U.S. carbon capture and storage using empirical and expert assessments. Environmental Research Letters, 2020; 16 (1): 014036 DOI: 10.1088/1748-9326/abd19e

emitted into the air.¹⁷ The continued operation of these oil and gas facilities unduly burdens the communities that surround them, driving ongoing environmental injustice in the form of detrimental health and social impacts. This outcome is unacceptable, and CARB must reject the use of CCS for fossil fuel applications and EOR as part of the Scoping Plan.

Direct Air Capture (DAC) technology, which removes CO₂ directly from the atmosphere, is in its infancy, expensive, and untested at scale, currently removing only a tiny fraction of the up to one trillion tons of carbon dioxide that must be sequestered to achieve carbon neutrality globally.¹⁸ The cost of DAC currently ranges from \$500- \$1,000/ton in the world's largest commercial facility.¹⁹ That said, we may reach a point where the technology is needed to supplement natural sequestration efforts, so the cautious exploration of DAC may be warranted, so long as the appropriate guardrails are put into place to protect the well-being of local communities.

4. Alternatives 1 and 2 Do Not Properly Account for Opportunities in California's Natural and Working Lands

Rather than relying on failed or currently unscalable and expensive technology, CARB should turn to the use of proven natural and working lands management approaches to achieve the carbon removal it needs to reach carbon neutrality by 2035 or sooner. CARB's analyses vastly underestimate the sequestration potential found in this sector. A recent report found that the biophysical potential of just the state's working lands is approximately 103 MMT.²⁰ And more gains can be made if the models properly incorporate other factors, like soil depth.²¹ When combined with the sequestration that can be achieved through the proper preservation and management of the state's natural lands, the carbon dioxide removal needs called for by the models can largely be met. These natural solutions are not at the demonstration stage of technology development. The techniques and strategies are known and immediately deployable, with only political will needed to make them a reality. Importantly, these solutions are also significantly cheaper than the technological solutions touted by the analyses. Given these factors, CARB must adopt a policy that leverages the state's natural and working lands to their fullest carbon removing potential.

In addition, per the California Climate and Agriculture Network, a "significant limitation of the croplands scenario modeling is that CARB did not include the benefits of reducing or eliminating nitrous oxide emissions from synthetic fertilizers when farmers and ranchers use healthy soils practices or transition to organic agriculture. This omission undercounts the role of healthy soils

¹⁷ Samira Garcia Freites, Christopher Jones. A Review of the Role of Fossil Fuel Based Carbon Capture and Storage in the Energy System. December 2020. https://foe.scot/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/CCS_REPORT_FINAL.pdf

¹⁸ <https://www.iea.org/reports/direct-air-capture-2022>

¹⁹ <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2021-09-08/inside-the-world-s-largest-direct-carbon-capture-plant>

²⁰ <https://theclimatecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/The-Climate-Center-Setting-an-Ambitious-Sequestration-Goal-for-CA-WL-Jan-22.pdf>

²¹ <https://calclimateag.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/4.4.2022-Public-Comments-on-CARBs-NWL-Modeling-Results-Update-to-2022-Scoping-Plan.pdf>

practices and organic agriculture, which does not allow use of synthetic fertilizer, in decreasing nitrous oxide emissions.”²² Several of our partner organizations recently submitted comments with proposed solutions to CARB.^{23, 24}

5. Economic Opportunities in the Clean Energy Sector

The clean energy sector represents another major opportunity that is underutilized in Alternatives 1 and 2. The cost of clean energy infrastructure has dropped precipitously in recent years. In fact, it is now cheaper to build large-scale renewable energy projects than it is to operate existing fossil fuel plants.²⁵ This shift in relative economics means that the state should be investing in renewables at an accelerated pace. This will not only drive down the emissions associated with the energy sector, but it will also mean an increase in the number of available jobs related to the projects themselves, as well as the related infrastructure.

Another undervalued strategy in the energy sector is the widespread deployment of distributed energy resources at the local level. Technology exists now to install much more of our clean power sources close to, and in many cases right on top of, the load. There is significant potential for local government to use its land use and permitting authority to play a unique role, with help from the state, in facilitating deployment of small-scale solar and storage to meet California’s energy needs with very low carbon resources. A 2016 National Renewable Energy Lab paper²⁶ found that nearly three quarters of the state’s electricity needs can technically be met with rooftop solar. Pursuing this approach can build community economic strength and resilience, and can help reduce the need for the vulnerable and expensive long distance transmission lines that have sparked many of the wildfires over the past few years.

United Nations Secretary General Antonio Guterres summed up the situation clearly in response to the latest UN climate science reports: “The science is clear. To keep the 1.5-degree limit within reach, we need to cut global emissions by 45 percent this decade. But current climate pledges would mean a 14 percent increase in emissions. And most major emitters are not taking the steps needed to fulfill even these inadequate promises. That is why this latest IPCC report is focused on mitigation — cutting emissions. It sets out viable, financially sound options in every sector. First and foremost, we must triple the speed of the shift to renewable energy. That means moving investments and subsidies from fossil fuels to renewables, now.”²⁷

²² <https://calclimateag.org/cdfas-science-panel-discusses-agricultures-role-in-meeting-state-carbon-neutrality-goal-climate-smart-ag-programs/>

²³ <https://calclimateag.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/4.4.2022-Public-Comments-on-CARBs-NWL-Modeling-Results-Update-to-2022-Scoping-Plan.pdf>

²⁴ <https://theclimatecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/CCI-Comment-on-CARB-NWL-Modeling-Scenarios-SPU-March-2022.pdf>

²⁵ <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-06-23/building-new-renewables-cheaper-than-running-fossil-fuel-plants>

²⁶ <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy16osti/65298.pdf>

²⁷ <https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/sg/articles/2022-04-04/amid-backsliding-climate-the-renewables-effort-now-must-be-tripled>

As the climate crisis continues to escalate, it is critical that California—and by extension CARB—reassert itself as the global leader in developing and implementing equitable strategies to cut carbon emissions and draw down existing carbon pollution while benefiting our communities. California can and must retake its climate leadership to achieve carbon negative and equity positive because as goes California, so goes the world and there is no time to lose. This Scoping Plan cycle is a key opportunity to demonstrate this leadership. We urge the Board to reject the recommendation to adopt Alternative 3 and to instead adopt a goal of carbon neutrality by at least 2035 through ambitious emissions reductions, accelerated deployment of renewables and scaled up natural carbon removal.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'ECohen', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ellie Cohen
CEO
The Climate Center