

## Valley's smog timeline knocked

### Governor wants local air regulators to reconsider delay plans.

By E.J. Schultz / Bee Capitol Bureau  
Fresno Bee, Tuesday, June 26, 2007

SACRAMENTO -- Gov. Schwarzenegger is calling on state and local air regulators to reconsider a controversial decision to delay a Valley smog cleanup plan by 11 years.

Siding with environmentalists, the governor said he is "deeply disappointed" in the deadline extension and vowed to "push for more aggressive action on these fronts" -- including asking that regulators revisit the proposal within the next month, according to a recent statement.

Regulators, he said, "must keep California on the path of cleaner air, particularly in areas with significant air quality issues such as the San Joaquin Valley."

The reprimand was included in a statement released Friday in which the governor commented on a series of recent actions by the California Air Resources Board, an 11-member body that he appoints.

The board two weeks ago approved a 2024 completion target for smog cleanup in the San Joaquin Valley, one of the nation's worst air basins. The target date is more than a decade beyond the initial deadline set by the federal government.

The plan, also approved by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, now heads to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. EPA approval would remove the threat of federal sanctions for the Valley, such as the delay of \$2 billion in road-building funds.

Environmentalists want a quicker fix and say the governor's comments will put pressure on the Valley air board to change course.

"I think it's significant that the governor is paying attention," said attorney Paul Cort of Earthjustice, an Oakland watchdog group. "Maybe there is an opportunity to actually go back and fix this plan."

But Steve Worthley, a Valley air board member and a Tulare County supervisor, said it's not that simple.

"It's easy to take pot shots," he said when asked about the governor's statement. "But when you really get down and do your homework, it's going to take this period of time to get to the final outcome."

Air district officials say major progress will be made in coming years but that the technology does not exist to fully eliminate vehicle pollution, a major contributor to the Valley smog problem. Officials also routinely note that the district doesn't have the power to regulate trucks, cars and other mobile sources of pollution. Only state and federal regulators have that authority.

But Schwarzenegger said that by approving the delay, the state air board "let the federal government off the hook."

Aides said the governor believes that the federal government is more likely to adopt stricter emissions rules for trains and diesel trucks if regions like the Valley face tighter air cleanup deadlines.

But Worthley said "we have no power over" federal regulators.

The California Air Resources Board approved the Valley smog plan on a 7-1 vote. But members also called for more research into ways to speed up the cleanup, including possibly banning older vehicles during bad-air days.

A report detailing additional pollution-cutting ideas is expected within six months. Schwarzenegger wants action sooner. He called for the state air board to work something out with the Valley air district "within the next month."

Sen. Dean Florez, D-Shafter, a longtime critic of the Valley air board, seized on the governor's statement.

"We're happy to have his help," Florez said. "It's not often that a governor disagrees with one of his own boards."

Florez also called for the governor to reconsider his recent appointment of Fresno County Supervisor Judy Case to the state air board. Case voted for the deadline extension twice: once as a member of the state board and again as a member of the Valley board.

"I don't think voting twice against the governor speaks well for her," Florez said.

Case's appointment still must be confirmed by the state Senate.

Case, in an interview, said she voted for the plan in order to meet certain deadlines but hopes it will be "tightened" in coming weeks.

Case said she is open to additional rules, but "there's no easy guidebook out there that says you can do this, this and this and you will get clean air."

## **Air district adds teeth to state's lawsuit threat against feds**

Written by Gabriel Dillard

The Business Journal, Friday, June 22, 2007

The San Joaquin Air Pollution Control District has agreed to join Gov. Schwarzenegger in a lawsuit threat against the federal Environmental Protection Agency over the state's desire to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles.

The district's governing board decided to take part in a lawsuit against the EPA if the department fails to grant the state a waiver allowing the regulation of car and truck emissions.

Such regulation would include stricter vehicle mileage standards.

The EPA has indicated that it will wait until late next year to consider the waiver request. Schwarzenegger said that is not good enough, and the state will sue if the waiver isn't granted by Oct. 22.

If that happens, the district is on board with the effort to gain a new tool in their pollution control mission.

"We believe that the evidence and the rationale that climate change is occurring is compelling and convincing," said Seyed Sadredin, the district's executive director, in a written statement.

The district is the first in the state to announce intentions to join the lawsuit.

California would also be arguing on behalf of eleven other states that have adopted California's mobile emissions standards as their own. These states include Vermont, New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maine, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Washington and Oregon.

Six more states are currently in the process of adopting the standard. The group makes up about one-third of all U.S. auto sales.

## **EPA launches emissions study**

First-ever nationwide measure of livestock feeding operations

Dave Wilkins, Capital Press Staff Writer

Capital Press Weekly, Friday, June 22, 2007

The Environmental Protection Agency announced last week that it's beginning the first-ever nationwide study of air emissions from poultry, dairy and swine animal feeding operations.

The agency said it will work closely with farmers and university researchers to conduct the \$14.6 million study over the next 2 1/2 years.

"This is a new day for cooperation between agriculture and EPA," Administrator Stephen L. Johnson said in a news release. "Working together to expand our scientific understanding of air emissions from livestock operations, we can do what's good for agriculture, good for our environment, and good for the American people."

Researchers from eight universities will work with the EPA to measure levels of hydrogen sulfide, particulate matter, ammonia, nitrous oxide, volatile organic compounds and other gases from livestock facilities.

The research officially started June 14 at 24 sites in nine states.

Participating institutions are Purdue, UC-Davis, Cornell, Iowa State, University of Minnesota, North Carolina State, Texas A&M and Washington State University.

"There has never been an agricultural air emissions study this comprehensive or long term," said Al Heber of Purdue, the lead scientist for the study. "We don't know enough about what is being emitted into the atmosphere. This study will give the EPA the data it needs to make science-based decisions."

Air emissions from large livestock operations have come under much greater scrutiny in recent years, and it's been more than just hog farms in the Midwest that have attracted attention.

Environmental groups have threatened lawsuits against several Western dairies, alleging violations of the Clean Air Act.

On May 9, the Idaho Conservation League announced that it intended to sue the Funk Dairy in Cassia County over air emissions.

Similar notices have been sent by environmental groups to the DeRuyter Brothers Dairy of Outlook, Wash., the Schakel Dairy in California and the Rock View Farms/Ponderosa Dairy in Nevada, according to the Western Environmental Law Center in Eugene, Ore.

The EPA determined in the late 1990s that it didn't have sufficient air emissions data for animal feeding operations.

The agency began discussions with AFO owners in 2001, and ultimately developed voluntary consent agreements involving about 14,000 swine, dairy, egg-laying and broiler chicken farms.

The consent agreements allow the EPA to collect air-monitoring data and require AFOs to contribute to a fund to pay for the study.

The EPA intends to use data from the monitoring study to develop an improved method for estimating emissions from individual AFOs.

*Dave Wilkins is based in Twin Falls, Idaho. His e-mail address is [dwilkins@capitalpress.com](mailto:dwilkins@capitalpress.com).*

## **Ex-EPA chief defends accounts of 9/11 air quality**

**Christine Todd Whitman tells a House panel that her statements on ground zero safety were 'based on the judgment of experienced scientists.'**

By Claudia Lauer, Times Staff Writer  
L.A. Times, Tuesday, June 26, 2007

WASHINGTON - Former Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Christine Todd Whitman, appearing Monday before a House subcommittee, denounced as "downright falsehoods" criticism of her statements following the Sept. 11 attacks that the air quality in areas around the World Trade Center site was safe for workers and residents.

"I am disappointed in the misinformation, innuendo and downright falsehoods" from critics, she told members of the House Judiciary subcommittee on the Constitution, civil rights and civil liberties. Her statements about the air quality near ground zero, she said, were "based on the judgment of experienced scientists."

Rep. Jerrold Nadler (D-N.Y.), whose district included the World Trade Center, called the hearing to determine whether EPA and other federal officials had violated the rights of citizens by what he contended were false assurances of air quality.

In his opening remarks, Nadler said he thought that the Bush administration had "continued to make false, misleading and inaccurate statements" regarding the environmental contamination of the area.

Whitman defended her statements about the air quality by emphasizing the difference between piles of dust and debris containing asbestos and lead at ground zero and the air that workers and residents were breathing in nearby areas. She said the EPA repeatedly urged workers at ground zero to wear respirators and masks, but was told by New York City officials that they could not be required to do so.

Nadler cited studies of the long-term health effects of the air quality, saying nearly 20,000 people - including 70% of the first responders being monitored - had experienced respiratory and digestive problems since the attacks. However, Whitman said the long-term studies she had seen did not come to that conclusion.

She also said the Bush administration had not pressured her to present a more favorable view of the air quality than was actually the case, adding that the White House had reviewed her statements only to ensure that the information from more than a dozen different agencies monitoring the area was up to date.

"It was entirely appropriate for the White House to look at those statements before they went out," said Whitman, who resigned from the EPA post in 2003.

Her statements were based on "what I was hearing from professionals," she said. "These were not decisions made by politicians.

Whitman's testimony was interrupted by boos from activists representing the Beyond Ground Zero Coalition, a group of organizations seeking long-term healthcare benefits for affected individuals and demanding that Whitman apologize and go to jail.

Before the hearing, the group, whose members came by bus from Manhattan for the day, held signs in several languages as they chanted, "Whitman lies, people die" on the steps of the Rayburn House Office Building.

Some raised posters portraying Whitman as the Grim Reaper.

Michelle Giraldo, 14, and her mother, Vaycer Giraldo, 40, were among those demanding "healthcare, not toxic air."

"My mom had to go down there without a mask and she had to clean," Michelle said. "Now she has asthma and lung disease, scarring in her lungs, and she's in the beginning stages of having cancer."

Other protesters who had volunteered to help clean up ground zero talked about such ongoing health issues as lung disease, pneumonia, asthma and digestive problems.

"People are outraged that they are continuing to stick to their story and continuing to lie," said activist Kimberly Flynn. "These lies have hurt our lives and the lives of our families."

## **Neighborhoods win against housing plan in an appeals ruling**

Bob Egelko, Chronicle Staff Writer  
S.F. Chronicle, Tuesday, June 26, 2007

The housing blueprint that San Francisco adopted three years ago could lead to increased neighborhood density, more traffic and extra pollution, and is invalid because the city failed to study the environmental consequences, a state appeals court has ruled.

The decision Friday by the First District Court of Appeal in San Francisco was a victory for neighborhood organizations, mostly in the western part of the city, that formed San Franciscans for Livable Neighborhoods to challenge the housing element of the city's general plan. They argued that the proposal would concentrate development in their areas and cause overcrowding.

The city Planning Commission approved the document in May 2004, which was 14 years after it was previously updated. It outlines plans for accommodating growth projected by the Association of Bay Area Governments: a population increase in San Francisco of 32,500 by 2010, to 809,200, and a need for about 2,700 new housing units each year.

City officials said the plan contained only minor differences from the 1990 revision and did not require an environmental impact report, a conclusion that a Superior Court judge accepted in December 2005. The appeals court disagreed.

Some provisions of the 2004 document "reflect a shift away from preserving existing housing density and a movement toward allowing denser housing development and decreased off-street parking," the three-judge panel said.

That, in turn, could lead to increased traffic congestion, air pollution and noise and a change in the "aesthetic quality" of neighborhoods, the court said.

The judges ordered the city to prepare an environmental report that would analyze the changes, discuss alternatives and solicit public comment.

The city could go through that process for the 2004 plan or set that document aside and conduct an environmental report for an updated plan that is due in 2009, Deputy City Attorney Audrey Pearson said Monday. She said the city could also appeal the ruling to the state Supreme Court.

Kathy Devincenzi, the lawyer for the plaintiffs, said the process of pulling together an environmental impact report would bring "all the adverse consequences (of the housing plan) to light." Those consequences include denser neighborhoods, scarcer parking and a more difficult climate for local businesses, she said.

## **Schwarzenegger, French president discuss trade, global warming Governor says he is studying France's public-private partnerships for funding roads, schools.**

The Associated Press

In the O.C. Register and Bakersfield Californian, Tuesday, June 26, 2007

Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger's European mini-tour stopped Monday in France, where he discussed trade, global warming and politics with French President Nicolas Sarkozy.

After the leaders' 30-minute talk, Schwarzenegger said he admired Sarkozy "tremendously" and believed the president would "put a new energy in the relationship between France and other countries, and our state."

Both pledged to work together on ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Sarkozy, elected last month, said in his election night victory speech that global warming would be a top priority and chided the U.S. for not fighting it more aggressively.

Last year, Schwarzenegger signed legislation that imposed the first statewide cap on greenhouse gases, garnering worldwide attention for a move that put California at odds with the Bush administration. The state is still trying to find the best ways to implement the law and meet its goals.

Schwarzenegger called Sarkozy "fresh new blood for politics in the world, because he is a politician that believes in inclusion and not in making everyone the enemy, which we have seen so many times in politics."

Sarkozy has reached beyond his conservative party to form his Cabinet, naming high-profile figures from the left, including Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner, who co-founded the aid group Doctors Without Borders.

Schwarzenegger said he also was studying France's method of using public-private partnerships to build schools, highways, rail lines, energy plants and other projects.

California voters passed \$42.7 billion in public works bonds during the November 2006 election. Schwarzenegger has said he wants to ask voters next year to approve another \$43.3 billion in bonds to pay for schools, prisons, dams and other projects.

The governor and Sarkozy also discussed the possibility of twin trade missions next year, with French officials promoting their country's products in California and Schwarzenegger returning to France.

California accounted for about 10 percent of the \$24 billion in total U.S. exports to France in 2006, according to the governor's office.

Trade missions abroad have been a regular feature of the Schwarzenegger administration. China, Japan, Mexico and Canada are among the countries he has visited, and India is on the agenda for the fall.

The stop in France came after Schwarzenegger visited his native Austria on Sunday. Today, he is expected to meet with outgoing British Prime Minister Tony Blair and business leaders to discuss ways to address global warming without hurting the economy. It will be Blair's final meeting with a foreign official before he steps down Wednesday.

Schwarzenegger's European visit began as a quick trip to Britain to reciprocate Blair's visit to California last summer, when the leaders announced a scientific alliance to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It later expanded into a three-nation tour.

The trip is being funded by the California State Protocol Foundation, a nonprofit composed primarily of business leaders that is headed by the California Chamber of Commerce and the Business Roundtable.

It coincides with California's latest natural disaster - a wildfire near Lake Tahoe that has burned more than 4 square miles and destroyed nearly 200 homes. Schwarzenegger's aides said he is being briefed regularly on the fire's status.

He plans to stick to his agenda and return to California Tuesday afternoon.

## **What's New**

Valley Voice Newspaper, Tuesday, June 26, 2007

Coming to a new car and EIR near you-Global Warming. California Attorney General Jerry Brown is pressuring all jurisdictions in the state to start including the issue of global warming in their impact reports and folded into their general plans. The new EIR for the Tulare meat packing plant will now include a new section on global warming and how the projects will mitigate any effects it might have. Likewise at the new car dealership in the near future where you are likely to see a new global warming sticker ranking the car like EPA does for gas mileage from one to ten on the car's global warming impact.

[Visalia Times-Delta, Editorial, Tuesday, June 26, 2007:](#)

### **Take light rail to the speed rail**

It's beginning to become clearer what California's high-speed rail project is all about, and it's not about the Central Valley.

Just as air travelers fly over the Valley on their way between Los Angeles and the Bay Area, it appears that high-speed rail travelers will watch the Valley speed past their train windows at 220 mph, without stopping.

That's all right. Whether the bullet train stops here or not, we ought to be planning our own train.

After years of talk and the cajoling of local officials, it is becoming evident that high-speed rail honchos want the train to carve a simple, straight and fast line through the Valley, without stopping in Visalia or nearby.

State officials last week admitted that their idea of the best route for the high-speed rail would not stop in Visalia. The track would run east of Hanford and stop at Fresno.

They had more discouraging news: The High-Speed Rail Authority isn't being funded fully enough to move the project forward.

Considering those two developments, the safe prediction is that if the bullet train does get built in California, it will follow the path of least resistance: The line will be placed in a way that avoids populated areas and stops. It will be great for traveling from L.A. to San Francisco, with a travel time of about 140 minutes, or about the time it takes to watch a movie. But it won't help much for traveling anywhere else in California.

Consider: Every stop that is designed with the high-speed rail costs more money and slows the train down, not to mention the development of the train. It appears to be the state's strategy to choke this project down so lean that it will be done on the tightest scale possible.

That might not be such a bad thing for Tulare County. We have long had our misgivings about whether the high-speed rail would benefit the Valley or accelerate its congestion. Probably some combination of the two trends would take place: There would be more people and more cars, but fewer long car trips.

City of Visalia officials have long lobbied for a stop in Visalia. They would like the high-speed rail line to make this county a regional hub with a maintenance station, bringing jobs, technology and growth potential. Those are grand goals, but the latest information has put a damper on them.

The current status of the high-speed rail might offer local officials a realistic compromise for them to pursue: Connections with high-speed rail by light rail.

Presuming that the train will have to stop at least once somewhere in the Central Valley, that stop could become the focus for light-rail to connect Valley cities and towns.

A regional light-rail system for the San Joaquin Valley ought to be one of the area's transportation goals regardless of the bullet train's progress. Provisions of Tulare County's Measure R, its special

transportation tax, include some light-rail planning among its list of possible projects. If the high-speed rail line were never built, it would still benefit the county.

If a high-speed rail is built, we have to presume it will not stop in Visalia, and probably not in Tulare. Valley travelers will have to connect with it to use it, and at this point that would mean driving in cars, or traveling in buses, to make that connection.

That defeats the purpose for one of the benefits of high-speed rail: [fewer car-trips and less air pollution](#).

We don't blame Visalia officials for pursuing a high-speed rail station for our community, but at this point it ought to become their secondary goal. Their primary objective ought to be establishing other forms of public rail transportation.

Then if the bullet train should ever stop here, we'll be ready to climb aboard.

[Opinion in the O.C. Register, Tuesday, June 26, 2007:](#)

### **Boosting forests' role in cleaning the air**

By JOHN A. HELMS

When considering ways to address the rise in atmospheric carbon-dioxide levels and potential climate change, we must look toward the important role the world's forests can play.

Forests are better at storing carbon than any other land cover. Forests in the U.S. sequester about 200 million to 280 million tons of carbon per year, offsetting as much as 20 percent of our greenhouse gas emissions - equivalent to the annual output of about 235 million automobiles.

It is, therefore, critically important to stabilize, or even increase, the world's forestland base. Unfortunately, the world is facing a net loss of about 45 million acres of forest per year. Even in the United States, we lose about 1 million acres per year to development, although some of this loss is offset by reforestation.

Another major problem is wildfire. In 2006, wildfires in the U.S. burned nearly 10 million acres, cost \$1.9 billion to suppress, and were 166 percent greater in magnitude than the previous 10-year average. Depending on forest type and intensity, on a per-acre basis a wildfire emits up to an estimated 100 tons of greenhouse gases, aerosols and particulates (soot).

Current estimates show that 180 million acres of federal land are at an unnaturally high risk of catastrophic wildfire. Yet harvest levels on national forests are about one-eighth of annual growth, resulting in overly dense, fire-prone forests.

To stimulate the sequestering of carbon in forest management, we need stable, market-based mechanisms and incentives. On national forest lands there is an urgent need to overcome the so-called federal "analysis paralysis," where land management decisions are made by litigation and layers of regulation, rather than through decisions by resource professionals in a timely manner with public input.

However, if we focus on forests only in their role of storing carbon, we overlook an even bigger benefit of our forests.

Forests have added value because they provide a renewable source of wood products. Use of wood should be enhanced because assessments show that using wood for construction and housing uses far less energy and has a much lower "carbon footprint" than structures built with steel, plastic, or aluminum.

It seems clear from modeling studies that, in the long run, managed forests that incorporate a sequence of harvests result in more carbon sequestered than an unmanaged forest. This is because young forests are more efficient in carbon sequestration. Old forests store more carbon, but as they age the net uptake of carbon dioxide can diminish to zero as more carbon is lost from the trees due to respiration and decomposition.

Forests are unique in that no other means of storing or offsetting carbon has the added benefits of providing clean water, biodiversity, clean air, wildlife habitat, aesthetics, and needed products.

Policymakers should put aside past assumptions and take necessary steps to sustain healthy forests. Rather than being controversial, this should be common cause of society, the forest industry and conservation groups.

[Opinion in the O.C. Register, Tuesday, June 26, 2007:](#)

## **We're breathing some of China's pollution**

By PETER BROOKES

China last week became the world's biggest air polluter, according to a Dutch government-funded environmental watchdog. The People's Republic now out-belches the United States as the world's largest producer of greenhouse gases - two years ahead of predictions.

Worse yet, thanks to prevailing wind patterns, a lot of China's pollution ends up here: As much as 40 percent of the air pollution that residents of West Coast states breathe originates in China.

The air's so bad in Beijing, it's rumored that some teams are making plans to do last-minute training tune-ups for the 2008 Olympics within Asia, but outside China, so they can acclimate to Beijing's time zone while avoiding the smog as long as possible.

Overall, China has 16 of the world's 20 most air-polluted cities. In some, the air carries twice the pollutants considered safe by the World Health Organization, causing as many as 400,000 premature deaths a year due to respiratory disease.

In Beijing, the unofficial air-quality index is known as the "building index." That is, how many buildings you can see down the street.

Coal is the main source of those pollution "exports"; China is the world's largest producer and consumer, relying on the fuel for 70 percent of its energy/industrial needs. And coal-fired plants emit carbon dioxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrous oxide, mercury and dust. China produces 25 percent of world mercury emissions and 12 percent of CO<sub>2</sub>.

And the pollution problem is on track to get worse.

Beijing plans to build 50 to 100 new coal-burning power plants a year - that's one a week - until 2012. That expansion will outstrip all the possible gains envisioned under the Kyoto environmental treaty.

There's also vehicular pollution. China has only 20 million vehicles on the road today, but expects that to skyrocket to 150 million to 300 million by 2020.

China's airborne pollution not only plagues its crops, waters and forests, it pelts neighboring Japan and the Korean peninsula, too. Meanwhile, the winds bring considerable carbon dioxide, sulfur dioxide and mercury to America.

While the East Coast isn't immune, the West Coast is particularly hard hit. Sensors in the Sierra Nevada Mountains have identified huge Chinese pollution clouds that cross the Pacific Ocean to the United States.

In California, Oregon and Washington, sulfur from China alone reaches 10 percent to 15 percent of the EPA's allowable levels. Overall, researchers believe a third of California's air pollution (and a fifth of Oregon's) originates in China.

Chinese pollution is basically nullifying the Western states' environmental progress - and their ability to meet federally mandated Clean Air Act requirements.

Unfortunately, Beijing's unswerving focus on economic development has made China unwilling to commit to curbing emissions. Premier Wen Jiabao has made informal pledges of cuts - but in the end delivered only increased pollution levels.

One thing the United States can and should do is offer help:

- Over the next 20 years, half the world's new buildings will be built in China. We should share expertise so that those buildings will be energy-efficient - that's a productive way to reduce energy consumption and pollution.
- We should work to open the Chinese market to energy-efficient American industrial and consumer goods. It will help reduce emissions - and maybe put a small dent in our \$200 billion annual trade deficit with China.

- The United States should also push to export smokestack-scrubber technology and clean-coal technology. We can't stop China from erecting new coal-fired power and industrial plants; we can help reduce the resulting dirty emissions.

In the end, a growing Chinese middle class will be the most potent force for clean air and water. But that stratum of society now is 80 million out of 1.3 billion people. We can't wait for China to "grow out" of its polluting ways -- we need to encourage progress now.

[Opinion in O.C. Register, Tuesday, June 26, 2007:](#)

## **Greenhouse-gas law**

### **Reader rebuttal**

By Edmund G. Brown Jr.

It's a sad day when a senior senator attacks California's governor as mendacious, intellectually dishonest and a fraud. But that is exactly what Sen. Tom McClintock did in his June 1 diatribe ["Arnold's contradictory promises," California Focus].

According to McClintock, Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger's vision that we can both build roads, public transit and dams and at the same time reduce greenhouse gas emissions is "a picture of breathtaking mendacity," in other words, a big lie. McClintock apparently is a faithful acolyte of the Bush/Cheney approach to the environment: Deny global warming, ignore our dangerous and growing dependence on foreign oil, and let the oil companies and developers have at it.

McClintock's Faustian choice between the environment and growth is not necessary.

Unchecked development and urban sprawl are not the only ways to grow.

There's a modern way to think about development. It's Assembly Bill 32, the measure McClintock voted against last year.

This landmark legislation envisions curbs on greenhouse gas emissions while supporting inevitable growth. Gov. Schwarzenegger signed the 2006 bill amid broad and bipartisan support, and as California's attorney general, I will proudly enforce it.

This legislation is not "the single greatest impediment," as McClintock asserts, to constructing new highways, dams, levees, aqueducts and other infrastructure projects. Yes, construction and concrete generate substantial greenhouse gas emissions, but it is also possible - not to mention desirable - to use better technology and wise planning to significantly reduce pollution and greenhouse gases.

Already, the construction industry is responding to the need to reduce emissions from the production of asphalt and concrete.

And while Sen. McClintock appears to have a command of the chemistry of cement production, he is ignorant on the science of climate change. Virtually every credible scientist in the world is warning about the growing dangers of global warming.

McClintock criticizes my proposal that counties consider mass transit, bus, bicycle and pedestrian projects as part of their 30-year transportation plans. For Tom, anything that might actually reduce - rather than encourage - car usage, must be ridiculed as a "new-age boondoggle."

Any responsible plan for California must consider and include the renewal of urban areas, smart growth, public transportation and livable cities. It turns out that those concepts not only bring families and vibrancy back to the heart of our cities, but they help fight global warming as well.

That's the point. The state and all our local governments have a choice, but not McClintock's Faustian choice between growth and environment. The real choice is how to grow our state in an intelligent way, through technology, good planning and common sense.