

## **Wood burning ban sets county record**

By The Record

Stockton Record Wednesday, March 4, 2009

FRESNO - Wood burning was banned a record 24 days in San Joaquin County this winter, and 24 violations were issued to those who broke the rules, officials said Tuesday.

The Check Before You Burn program, which ended Saturday, saw higher numbers this year, because officials lowered the standard at which wood burning is outlawed. Under the old standard, San Joaquin County saw wood burning banned just two days over a span of five years.

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, which administers the program, said the stricter limits improved air quality this winter. Wood burning emits tiny particles that are linked to lung disease, respiratory illness, heart attacks and premature deaths.

As is normal, the number of days on which burning was prohibited increased toward the central and southern San Joaquin Valley. In Fresno County, burning was prohibited on 46 days, and 113 citations were issued.

Violations were driven chiefly by neighbors' complaints, a district official said. Offenders paid \$50 or were given the option of attending a smoke education class, similar to traffic school.

## **Video contest**

Tracy Press Tuesday, March 3, 2009

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District is looking for students to enter its annual For Reel video contest by filming a 30-second video promoting clean air. The district will award the first-place videographer a free iPod and give \$250 to the winner's teacher.

The deadline to submit an entry is May 15. Applications are available online at [www.healthyliving.com](http://www.healthyliving.com), along with the contest rules. For information: 557-6400.

## **Smog: Valley clean for PM-10, but fight goes on**

By Mark Grossi, FresnoBee.com, Tuesday, March 3, 2009

A federal appeals court this week rejected an environmental challenge to the Valley's clean-air status for dust and other particles of PM-10.

This legal stuff won't end here, of course. The legal watchdog Earthjustice filed a new lawsuit on another aspect of this same subject last month.

Intense legal fights are a hallmark of air cleanups. The Valley's fight is reminiscent of the South Coast Air Basin in the 1980s and early 1990s. So are the reactions to the court decision.

Local District executive director Seyed Sadredin: "Because of concerted, long-term policies and regulations aimed squarely at reducing the harmful health effects of particulate pollution, and staunch support by the Valley's residents and industries - notably agriculture -- the entire air basin now breathes cleaner with respect to particulate pollution."

Sarah Jackson with Earthjustice: "This decision is a victory for polluters and a sad day for the Valley's breathing public who still see the skies grow dark every fall and winter during particulate season. Without lawsuits from concerned citizens to push regulators to do their jobs, the air would never get any cleaner in the Valley."

## **Station running toward empty**

## **Town's only source for gasoline might close**

By J Harry Jones, Staff Writer

San Diego Union-Tribune, Tuesday, March 4, 2009

JULIAN — The only gas station in Julian may close March 31, forcing the mountain residents to drive miles for a fill-up and making evacuations in the fire-prone area more dangerous.

Norm's Service on Main Street is a victim of the bad economy as well as government regulations that dictate fueling-system upgrades the owners say they can't afford.

Just as the pharmacy closing in town a few years back forced people to drive 20 miles to Ramona to fill a prescription, residents will have to head down the mountain for gas.

Tourists coming for the annual apple festival or to stroll Main Street's curio shops better make sure their tank isn't near empty. The nearest gas station will be six miles west, in Santa Ysabel.

"I'm very disappointed," said Alice Froyck, office manager at The Julian News. "I've been going there for 20 years.

"I've talked to a lot of people who say, 'Oh no! we're not going to have a gas station?'"

But there's a slim chance Norm's won't close.

County Supervisor Dianne Jacob contacted station owners Cheryl and Jennifer DeWitt yesterday to say she will see if something can be done.

"I'm extremely concerned," Jacob said. "This is the only gas station in the area and for emergency purposes – fire and evacuation – it is needed.

"I don't want to raise expectations too high, but if there is a way to save it I want to find it."

During the Cedar and Witch Creek fires, the DeWitt sisters used the small gas station's generator so residents could have fuel to evacuate.

Now, Jennifer DeWitt said, "people are going to have to learn to live off the top half of their tanks."

Cheryl DeWitt said she will listen to what Jacob has to say, but expects to shutter the station at the end of the month.

Norm's has been a family operation since Milene and Norman Cozens built it in the late 1940s. The sisters – who married brothers named DeWitt – bought the station from their parents 17 years ago.

"It's the end of an era," said Danny Baker, 67, who has worked for the DeWitts for 25 years. "It's the last family-owned business in town that hasn't gone into tourism."

Norm's has been the only station in Julian since the early 1980s. For the past 11 years the DeWitts have struggled to make a go of the business, which includes a garage and small store.

The high price of gas last year hurt the town's tourism industry and the station. But the DeWitts say the final straw is a mandatory upgrade issued by the [county's Air Pollution Control District](#) regarding the vapor system that keeps fumes from being released into the air while gas is pumped.

The upgrades would cost Norm's \$60,000 to \$100,000 this year and at least \$30,000 in 2010, the DeWitts said.

"We just can't afford the upgrades," Cheryl DeWitt said. "We've known for a year or more that this was coming and we've struggled with what to do. We just basically can't do it anymore."

The county Board of Supervisors serves as the directors of the pollution control district. Most regulations regarding upgrades to gas station systems are mandated by state law, however.

The possibility that another wildfire someday will threaten Julian is almost a given. The entire town was evacuated in 2003 and 2007, and both times long lines formed at Norm's. During the

Cedar fire of 2003, most evacuated to Borrego Springs because the road west to Santa Ysabel was blocked by flames.

"We stayed open when we should have been home packing up," Jennifer DeWitt said. "We wanted everybody to have the chance to get out of town."

Many Julian residents routinely go down the hill to work or to shop at grocery stores in Ramona or bulk stores like Wal-Mart and Costco in Poway.

But others prefer to stay in Julian and the thought driving miles just to get gas makes them uncomfortable.

"It's going to be a big time inconvenience," said Leah Elmlad, manager of the Julian Market. "I always wait until the needle is on E."

## **A light touch**

### **The city earns a utility company rebate for saving thousands in energy costs by simply switching its lightbulbs.**

Written by Press staff

Tracy Press Tuesday, March 3, 2009

Installing longer-lasting light bulbs and motion sensors in several city buildings earned Tracy a \$22,000 rebate this week from Pacific Gas and Electric Co.

The switch from the incandescent bulbs of yesteryear to the mercury-filled fluorescent bulbs will save the city \$32,000 annually by reducing energy use in several public buildings, cutting 192,000 kilowatt-hours, PG&E estimates. That's about equal to cutting a year's worth of greenhouse gas emissions from 27 cars.

The 925 new light bulbs combined with the 229 motion sensors — which turn off lights when no one's around — mark the first steps toward building a more sustainable city, said Tracy spokesman Matt Robinson.

The new lights and motion sensors were recently installed in City Hall, the Tracy Branch Library, the Tracy Community Center, the Tracy Police Department and the Lolly Hansen Senior Center.

"This is just the beginning," Robinson said. "We have a lot more planned."

A few of those plans include getting boilers at the Tracy Water Treatment Plant to run on methane gas and replacing exterior lights with the more energy-efficient bulbs as well, said PG&E spokeswoman Nicole Liebelt. Other changes could include getting more energy-efficient computer servers, she added.

Liebelt said the utility company awards rebates to city, county and school governments that find ways to lessen energy use. The size of the rebate depends on how much energy could potentially be saved by the retrofits, Liebelt said.

The city spent \$3,373,010.85 last year on all its energy bills, according to the city finance department.

It's unclear how much of that money was paid to light city buildings — much of it went to power streetlights and water treatment plants, said Finance Director Zane Johnston, who could not provide an exact spending breakdown by press time.

## **Tough Test Emerges as Administration Aims to Bolster Automakers, Cut Pollution**

By Peter Whoriskey and Kendra Marr, Washington Post Staff Writers

Washington Post Wednesday, March 4, 2009

In the viability plans General Motors and Chrysler submitted to support their federal aid requests, the companies pledged to try to meet new fuel economy standards.

GM said that within six years its cars would average 38.6 miles per gallon. Chrysler proposed 35.4 mpg.

Yet whether those levels will be enough to meet new federal fuel efficiency standards is unknown because even as the Obama administration is trying to revive the American car industry, it is simultaneously drafting tougher fuel economy standards of the kind that many in the industry had said were bad for business.

If the administration opts for tougher rules, it could make its own auto rescue efforts more expensive and more complex.

Balancing the two goals -- saving the industry and the environment -- has emerged as a test of the administration's aims. And the decisions the president's auto task force must make in the coming weeks give it broad leverage to shape not only the industry's finances but its product lines.

By the end of this month, the Obama administration hopes to finalize its plans for the automakers, which have requested as much as \$21.6 billion more in federal aid to stave off bankruptcy.

Separately, the administration has requested new fuel-economy guidelines to go into effect in 2011, the first step in an effort to toughen and streamline federal regulations for fuel efficiency and tailpipe emissions.

Exactly how the administration should handle the automakers' difficulties is up to the president's Task Force on the Auto Industry. That group's designees include financial experts from the Treasury Department. It also includes designees whose focus is largely energy or the environment: Lisa Heinzerling, senior climate policy counsel for the Environmental Protection Agency administrator; Dan Utech, a senior adviser from the Department of Energy; and Heather Zichal, deputy director of the White House Office of Energy and Climate Change.

In a Sunday appearance on CBS talk show "Face the Nation," Obama chief of staff Rahm Emanuel suggested that dealing with the automakers' financial plight was only part of the task force's mandate.

"Here's the other thing, I think, that people should see in both GM as well as the others," Emanuel said. "They never invested in . . . alternative-energy cars, they got dependent on big gas guzzlers. . . . We have a day of reckoning of making sure that we have a policy on energy independence."

At a minimum, the Obama administration is preparing to set yearly fuel-economy standards that will lead to compliance with the Energy Act of 2007, which sets a fuel-economy goal for 2020.

If the Bush administration's approach to complying with that law is followed, it appears that GM's and Chrysler's plans would meet future fuel-economy standards.

But on Jan. 26, just days after the presidential inauguration, Obama signaled that he may be willing to entertain even stricter standards. He ordered federal regulators to consider giving California and 13 other states the ability to regulate tailpipe emissions. The California regulations in essence could allow the states to regulate fuel economy, and environmentalists are pushing to make the tighter California proposal the law nationwide.

Tomorrow, the EPA is scheduled to hold a public hearing on the California rules.

GM and Chrysler officials have said they will meet any new fuel-economy standards. But if California's rules are adopted, it is likely that the companies would fail the environmental tests, narrowly in some cases, based on their current product plans.

"Our analysis suggests that allowing California and other states to regulate CO2 emissions, and thus fuel economy, will further damage companies that are struggling, like GM, Ford and Chrysler and much of their supply base, and potentially destabilize relatively healthy companies like Toyota and Nissan," according to testimony being prepared by Eric Fedewa, vice president at CSM Worldwide, which provides forecasting services to automakers and suppliers.

Allowing the California waiver "imposes massive additional costs on an industry that's exceedingly weak," said Andrew Koblenz, vice president of legal regulatory affairs for the National Automobile Dealers Association.

Others think the requirements would not be as onerous as some have suggested.

"Our analysis shows, when the car and light-truck fleets are considered together, that a national greenhouse gas standard equivalent to California stringency is doable for GM and indeed consistent with their own business plans," said Roland Hwang, vehicles policy director at the Natural Resources Defense Council.

The differing opinions are largely the result of what assumptions people make about an automaker's future lineup and other factors.

Among other things, exactly what kind of cars the companies will sell in the future -- big or small -- is a matter of speculation that depends on the general economy as well as fuel prices. Moreover, the key California rules are set out in terms of emissions levels, not miles per gallon, and some reductions in emissions can be achieved without increasing fuel economy.

Whatever the effects of the California regulations might be, environmentalists and some in Congress have argued that forcing the companies to build more fuel-efficient cars will ultimately help the industry by preparing it for when oil prices rise once again.

"The worst thing you can do to an industry struggling right now is to let them lapse back into making gas-guzzlers," said Ann Mesnikoff, director of the Sierra Club's green transportation campaign. "Oil prices are down now, but in three to five years, they'll be up, and the automakers will be making vehicles the public won't buy."

## **US urged to lead in cutting greenhouse emissions**

By DINA CAPPIELLO, Associated Press Writer  
Modesto Bee, Wednesday, March 4, 2009

WASHINGTON — For the United States to play a leadership role crafting a global warming treaty, negotiators say Congress and the Obama administration must enact limits this year to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases.

Among those pressing for a new U.S. law is Todd Stern, the Obama administration's envoy for climate talks that begin in December in Copenhagen, Denmark.

"The optimum would be legislation that is signed, sealed and delivered," Stern said Tuesday.

"It's been a long time now that countries have been looking for the United States to lead and take action," he said. "I think nothing would give a more powerful signal to other countries in the world than to see a significant, major, mandatory American plan."

International leaders attending a symposium in Washington on climate policy echoed Stern's comments. They urged the U.S. to act despite a faltering economy.

"We are also being provided with an opportunity now to rethink business as usual," said Connie Hedegaard, the Danish minister for climate and energy. "Tackling global challenges, like that of the economy, we cannot do that without the United States. So we need the U.S. to engage."

Ed Miliband, British secretary of state for energy and climate change, said what Congress does to control domestic emissions will send a clear signal for the Copenhagen talks.

"The level of U.S. ambition that we see on this issue is very important because it will define and have an impact on the response that we see from other countries," Miliband said.

The Bush administration pulled out of the last global climate change treaty, the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, citing a lack of participation by developing countries and potential harm to the U.S. economy. In the 1990s, during the Clinton administration, the Senate balked at ratifying the agreement.

Stern acknowledged that a climate bill by year's end was a tall order.

House Democratic leaders are planning to take up legislation setting up a mandatory cap and trade system for greenhouse emissions sometime this summer. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid has said he would like the Senate to vote on a bill after the August recess.

Under cap-and-trade, the government would establish a market for carbon dioxide by selling credits to companies that emit greenhouse gases. The companies can then invest in technologies to reduce emissions to reach a certain target or buy credits from other companies that already have met their emission reduction goals.

President Barack Obama has called for an 83 percent reduction in greenhouse gases from 2005 levels by the year 2050 using cap-and-trade. His recently released budget banks on raising \$646 billion in revenues from 2012 to 2019 from auctioning emission credits to companies. The money would fund renewable energy projects and provide a tax credit to help families cope with higher energy prices.

But there is widespread dispute over the details of how cap and trade would work, with critics saying it would lead to higher costs for American consumers and could hurt an already bruised economy.

Duke Energy Corp. CEO Jim Rogers, a supporter of cap and trade legislation, previewed the debate to come. He said the Obama administration should redirect all money from the sale of credits to solving the "ecological crisis of our time."

Rogers said that as written now, Obama's budget would transfer wealth from the Southeastern and Midwestern states that depend more on coal for energy to coastal states where other fuels are used to produce electricity.

[L.A. Daily News Commentary, Tuesday, March 4, 2009:](#)

## **Examine better alternatives before funding bigger 405**

By Gerald A. Silver

The federal stimulus package recently approved by Congress could provide millions of extra dollars to help expand the 405 Freeway by adding a northbound car-pool lane.

But is this the best use of the stimulus funds? Are there better "shovel ready" projects that could bring more relief to motorists, faster?

Many residents living near the 405 Freeway think so. They have expressed criticism of the freeway expansion because of the disruptions that it would bring to their neighborhoods. Frustrated motorists are quick to call those who oppose freeway expansion NIMBYs (as in "Not In My Back Yard") or obstructionists.

For some people, freeway expansion must be done at any price, regardless of who is impacted. They want faster commutes, regardless of the consequences to others. Drivers with long commutes made a choice to live a great distance from their work. When they purchased their homes and took jobs in downtown Los Angeles or Century City they must have been aware of the long commute they faced.

It is not reasonable to expect that residents living near the freeways should now be subjected to freeway expansion causing more noise, congestion, glare and [air pollution](#) for the convenience of commuters. At what point is enough is enough? After the 405 Freeway is widened, and later winds up with the same congested lanes, will people still say want to keep expanding and add even more car-pool lanes?

People who live near the 405 Freeway are affected by increased lung cancer rates due to automobile exhaust. Do drivers think it is OK to subject people to increased cancer rates for their commuting convenience?

The issue of how stimulus money will be spent is extremely important. Should we let the bureaucrats at Southern California Association of Governments and Caltrans decide how to use the stimulus funds? It might be better to give the new funds to the Los Angeles Department of Transportation with a directive to improve city streets, align curbs, make double left turns or change traffic signalization and timing.

There are thousands of miles of roadways within the city that need repair, repaving, or minor right-of-way changes. Great improvements in the flow of traffic can be made by simply aligning curbs so that traffic does not have to cut in and out.

Many L.A. streets are not continuous. Funding from the stimulus package could cut streets through, reducing gridlock on our major thoroughfares.

Then there is a question that we must ask ourselves: is it possible that there are no solutions to L.A.'s traffic problems? Is it possible that gridlock is here to stay and that adding more car-pools lanes or widening the 405 Freeway are only a temporary fixes?

The city invites more traffic when it approves excessive new developments or fails to do integrated transportation planning. Infrastructure must be in place before projects are approved. Sound planning requires an assessment of the carrying capacity of the region.

Is there no end to how many freeways, schools, jobs, houses, apartments or automobiles that can be jammed into the region, and still maintain a decent quality of life?

Los Angeles officials must develop set of traffic priorities and form a sound basis for spending any stimulus funds that are allocated to L.A. for transportation improvements. There are many "shovel ready" projects that can be built without burying us deeper in traffic gridlock.

*Gerald A. Silver is the president of Homeowners of Encino.*

[LA Times Commentary Wed., March 4, 2009](#)

### **California's green meanies**

**By putting up barriers to new development in the state, environmentalists push homes to areas that are far less environmentally friendly.**

By Edward L. Glaeser

California environmentalists are tireless in their efforts to stop new development. But for the good of the planet, maybe they should lighten up. Indeed, the best thing that environmentalists can do to fight global warming is to encourage new construction in the state, especially in the areas with the most temperate climates.

California's metropolitan areas are, by far, the greenest in the country. Matthew Kahn, an environmental economist at UCLA, and I have estimated the carbon emissions associated with a new household in different parts of the country. Our estimates hold constant family size and income, and include driving emissions, public transport, home heating and electricity. We've found that the four greenest metropolitan areas in the

United States are San Francisco, San Jose, San Diego and Los Angeles.

Why is California so green? The use of clean energy and efficient appliances deserves some credit, but the biggest factor is climate.

The state's weather is just better than that of the rest of the United States. As I write these words, my New England home is emitting an awful lot of carbon just to get itself to 60 degrees. An average Boston home emits more than twice as much carbon, because of home heating, as a home in San Jose.

Humid Houston leads the country in days when the temperature rises above 90 degrees, but since the last census, that area's population has increased by more than 900,000, which is greater than the growth of Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco and San Jose put together. Our estimate is that a typical Houston household uses almost four times more electricity than a comparable household in San Francisco.

Much of America struggles with cold winters and hot summers. Making such difficult climates comfortable for humans requires a lot of energy. By contrast, much of coastal California is pretty pleasant year-round, requiring far less energy. The natural implication is that to reduce carbon emissions, more Americans should live in temperate California.

But just as global warming has strengthened the case for California's expansion, the state's rate of growth is faltering. After sustaining a double-digit growth rate for much of the mid-20th century, California's population grew just 7.9% from 2000 through 2007, only slightly more than the growth rate of the country as a whole.

The reduction in California's growth rate does not reflect economic decline -- the state still has enormous wealth. It does not reflect a lack of demand for California's amenities. Even after the housing bust, the state's home prices remain among the highest in the world. And although California is a populous state, it still has plenty of land. Santa Clara County, the home of Silicon Valley, only has about 2.2 people per acre. Even in denser places, such as Los Angeles, there is plenty of room to build.

California's growth has slowed because the state has made it increasingly difficult to build new homes. There is an almost perfect correlation between the growth of an area and the amount of housing that is permitted in that area. California has some of the toughest land-use regulations in the country, which are often justified as environmental measures. When high housing demand is met with restrictions -- not construction -- California homes become unaffordable and new construction goes somewhere else.

Local anti-growth activists don't have the ability to stop new construction in the U.S. as a whole. After all, households continue to form, and they need to go somewhere. When California won't build, people go to less-restrictive places, such as Atlanta, Houston or Phoenix, which happily erect new housing. The pro-development policies in these places promote affordability, but they do so at an environmental cost. Carbon emissions are much higher in these growing areas than they are in California.

The environmental opponents of California growth may sometimes accept that by pushing development from Los Angeles to Texas, their anti-growth policies increase carbon emissions. They then emphasize that California's water crisis makes further expansion impossible. But

today, the overwhelming majority of water in California is directed to farms, not people. Using 10% of the state's agricultural water for new households could address the water needs of a massive increase in state population. California's water shortage is real, but it calls for more efficiency, conservation and new technologies, not wholesale growth restrictions that increase carbon emissions.

The state took an important step by instituting environmental impact reviews for new development 35 years ago. But such reviews only make sense if they are complete. A full review also would ask about the effects on the environment if a development is pushed somewhere else, like the desert outside Las Vegas. More complete environmental reviews, showing the costs of both building and not building, would reveal the full environmental benefits of building in L.A.

Stopping new development may seem green, but it isn't. When new homes aren't built in California, they are built in other places that are far less environmentally friendly. The best way for Californians to save the planet is to tear down the barriers that stop new development and encourage more people to live in a state where nature, not artificial energy, makes living pleasant year-round.

*Edward L. Glaeser is the Glimp professor of economics and director of the Taubman Center for State and Local Government at Harvard University.*

[Bakersfield Californian Letter to the Editor Wednesday, March 4, 2009:](#)

### **Clean air improves life**

It is with disappointment that I read Lois Henry's Jan. 18 column, "Hype clouds picture of pollution." Henry cites two studies and several interviews to conclude that claims of a connection between air pollution and public health care are, in her words, "hooey."

A new federally funded study, just released by researchers from Brigham Young University and Harvard School of Public Health, in the *New England Journal of Medicine*, shows that, in fact, reducing air pollution translates into longer lives. This study, conducted between 1978-2001, shows that cleaner air over the past two decades had added nearly five months to the average life expectancy in the U.S.

Scientists used government data to track particulate pollution levels in 51 American cities. While particulate matter levels were falling, Americans were enjoying longer life expectancies. It must be noted that thanks to the regulatory standards of the Clean Air Act, our lives have improved.

Surely, improving the quality of our air, both locally and around the world, is directly related to the quality of life for all living beings. In conclusion, cleaner air equals longer life.

*Georgette Theotig, Tehachapi*

[Letter to the Contra Costa Times and Tri-Valley Herald, Tuesday, March 4, 2009:](#)

### **Crossings makes sense**

The San Leandro Crossings project proposed around our BART station is well-designed and in a location that makes sense. I take BART to work, and it would be nice to have homes and more people in the area. The development will mean more "eyes on the street," improving public safety. And, like me, these new residents will not have to jump in the car for every errand, and will have the convenience and cost-savings of taking transit to work.

The Bay Area is growing. One million new residents will move to our region by 2020. Where these people will live and how they will get around should concern all of us. Will they live in sprawling developments that push further east along 580, creating longer commutes, more traffic, worsening [air quality](#)? Or will they live in vibrant neighborhoods like San Leandro Crossings, and walk, bike or take transit?

Climate change is a very real and serious problem, and every community needs to do its part. By approving the Crossings project, the City Council will help to reduce carbon emissions and create a more livable San Leandro and Bay Area.

Last year, my husband and I bought our first home. We chose San Leandro because it's a family-oriented community. This project will not only create a vibrant and walkable downtown, it is a step toward a greener and safer San Leandro for all of our children. I strongly encourage the City Council to approve the Crossings project.

*Brianna Swartz, Greenbelt Alliance volunteer  
San Leandro*

Note: The following clip in Spanish discusses President Obama proposes that he will take into account the opinions and will respect the decisions of scientists. In California, the decision will limit the exploration of petroleum maritime drilling, and especially air pollution, caused by CO2 emissions. For more information on this Spanish clip, contact Claudia Encinas at (559) 230-5851.

### **Propone el presidente tomar en cuenta opinión de los científicos**

Manuel Ocaño

Noticiero Latino

Radio Bilingüe, Wednesday, March 04, 2009

El presidente, Barack Obama determinó ayer que la Agencia de Protección Ambiental (EPA) y otras instituciones federales que protegen a especies en riesgo de extinción consulten con asesores independientes sus políticas para evitar medidas contraproducentes.

"El trabajo de los científicos y los expertos en mi administración será respetado", dijo el mandatario.

Una portavoz de la Unión de Científicos Preocupados (por el medio ambiente) que aglutina a unos diez mil profesionales, Francesca Grifo dijo que esa decisión del mandatario eliminará conflictos de intereses.

En California la decisión limitaría la exploración y perforación de pozos petroleros marítimos, el potencial daño de proyectos como la barda fronteriza y especialmente la contaminación del aire por emisiones de dióxido de carbono.