

Davis to voice air bill support

Governor plans to sign legislation by Dean Florez.

The Fresno Bee

(Published Monday, September 22, 2003, 5:14 AM)

SACRAMENTO -- Gov. Davis intends to sign a package of clean-air bills including one that will end agriculture's historical exemption from air-pollution controls, an administration official said Sunday.

Winston H. Hickox, the state secretary of environmental protection, will be in Fresno today to formally announce the governor's support for the legislative package aimed at cleaning the Valley's dirty air, which ranks among the worst in the nation.

The bills were pushed through the Legislature by Sen. Dean Florez, D-Shafter, after a months-long battle that ended with their approval this month.

Speaking with The Bee by telephone Sunday, Hickox said some people questioned whether Davis would sign the bills because of the impact on the farming industry, "but in the end, the agricultural community realized it had to come to the party and be a part of the solution as well."

Hickox is scheduled to join Florez and Assembly Member Sarah Reyes, D-Fresno, at Viking Elementary School this afternoon to announce the governor's support. Reyes carried the bills in the Assembly. Florez and Reyes couldn't be reached to comment Sunday.

Debbie Jacobsen, president of the Fresno County Farm Bureau, said Sunday she hadn't heard that the governor would sign the measures, but that the announcement is not unexpected.

"It's our job now to work with the local air district and the farming community and get the air bills implemented," Jacobsen said.

The Sierra Club's Kevin Hall was excited by the governor's decision.

"Wow! This is great news for all Valley residents," he said. "This is a very big step in the right direction."

Hall described the package of bills as a "very important first step" to cleaning the Valley's air.

"We won this round, and it's a very big win," he said. "I am very impressed with the governor for stepping up to the plate. It takes a lot of political courage, and Senator Florez impressed me to no end. He was very determined to get this package through."

Florez's air bills had a long, unstable climb to Davis' desk.

Agriculture leaders opposed most of the bills, saying they put too many restrictions on farming and unfairly singled out the industry. Farmers argued too-tight regulation would be costly and, in some cases, jeopardize their businesses.

The most fought-over measure was Senate Bill 700 to repeal the agriculture industry's exemption from air operating permits. The bill brings agriculture under the same pollution-control requirements guiding other industries in California.

Farmers agreed to end the exemption, as ordered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in the wake of an environmental lawsuit settlement. But they argued that Florez's bill, which went beyond the minimum, was unfair.

The dissent hit Florez hard when the Assembly Appropriations Committee at first didn't pass the bill. Florez had expected SB 700 to sail through the financial committee.

He responded with a sharply worded attack on a band of urban Democrats, accusing them of holding up the bill to keep it from the Assembly Floor, where Assembly Member Nicole Parra would be asked for her vote.

Parra, a Democrat from Hanford, won her seat by a slim margin, and casting the controversial vote could have given her political enemies some ammunition. Parra called the accusation absurd but, at first, wouldn't pick a side. She later supported an amended version of SB 700.

Taking much of the heat was Assembly Member Leland Yee, a San Francisco Democrat. Yee said he sympathized with farmers who said they didn't get a fair shake from Florez.

In the ensuing weeks, Yee, Florez and several environmental and agriculture advocates argued over the language in the bill. In the end, Florez made a few changes, but none that he said compromised his goal of cleaning the air and helping asthmatic children.

The bill eventually passed out of Appropriations and the full Assembly by a slim margin. It was the only vehicle to end the exemption, which is necessary to salvage about \$2 billion in federal highway funds and avoid higher fees for some businesses.

Also hotly debated was SB 705 to phase out open-field agricultural burning. At first, the bill didn't get an Assembly majority, and Florez again pointed to the urban Democrats, this time for playing to the pockets of farm lobbyists.

But, after it was amended, SB 705 received the necessary votes along with its counterpart, SB 704 to create incentives for Valley biomass plants to take in more agriculture waste.

SB 705 phases out burning of field crops by June 1, 2005, and all other farm waste, such as orchard removals, by 2010. Florez added language to extend the dates for farms that meet certain criteria.

SB 708 targets gross-polluting vehicles. It raises the penalty for driving such vehicles and puts the increased revenue toward pollution-control efforts.

SB 709 expands the authority of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District to monitor and regulate mobile sources of emissions. It allows the district to assess emissions created by large developments, such as regional distribution centers, and create a fee schedule to ensure that such businesses help fund programs to mitigate their impact on air quality.

The fate of three remaining clean-air bills, which didn't make it to Davis, is unclear. Florez could bring them back when the Legislature reconvenes in January.

Bee reporter Marc Benjamin contributed to this report. The reporters can be reached at jfitzenberger@fresnobee.com, jbier@fresnobee.com or 441-6330.

Davis Poised to Sign Green Bills

The governor has embraced more environmentalist legislation than he did in his more cautious past.

By Miguel Bustillo, Los Angeles Times Staff Writer

Gray Davis is poised to sign a spate of environmental measures to curb air pollution, boost recycling and protect the state's coastline and forests in the coming days — part of a concerted effort to rally supporters whom the beleaguered governor cannot afford to lose.

One of the most far-reaching measures, a first-in-the-nation bill to slap a recycling fee on all new computers and televisions, is not much different from legislation Davis vetoed last year. But aides to the Democratic governor say he will probably sign it this time around, even though it is still opposed by Hewlett-Packard, the state's largest computer maker.

Before the recall campaign, Davis' cautionary approach to environmental policy often exasperated conservationists. But with the electronics recycling legislation and other measures, including a bill that would subject Central Valley farmers to tougher clean-air laws, the governor appears willing to take more political risks.

"The dynamics of the recall help us," said Mark Murray, head of the environmental group Californians Against Waste, the main sponsor of the electronic recycling bill. "Every signal we are

getting from the administration is that it is important for this governor to be perceived as a friend of the environment."

As he has campaigned against the recall, Davis repeatedly has made a point of reminding Californians of his environmental record.

The governor signed legislation last month making the state the first to ban toxic flame retardants commonly found in clothing and furniture. He has signaled support for numerous other environmental bills, including measures to help the state purchase the Ballona Wetlands in Los Angeles, prevent oil spills and fortify the state's strong clean-air laws amid efforts by the Bush administration to weaken the rules.

On Monday, Davis is set to take his environmental stagecraft to a new level. He is scheduled to unveil a new partnership with the governors of Washington and Oregon to combat global warming.

The three Pacific Coast Democrats have agreed to a number of joint measures in response to what they regard as irresponsible inaction on climate change from President Bush. Their ideas include pooling money to buy hybrid vehicles and compiling a tri-state inventory of greenhouse gas emissions.

Mindful of the political timing, liberal lawmakers stacked a sweeping array of environmental measures on the governor's desk before the close of this year's legislative session — bills that force Davis to choose between conservationists and some of the state's most powerful special interests.

One measure could halt logging on private land if it pollutes rivers and streams. A top priority of the Sierra Club, it is opposed by the timber industry, which has been a generous campaign donor to Davis.

Other measures would bar cruise ships from discharging sewage and trash in state waters; increase the money people can get back for recycling bottles; place a fee on a polluting chemical used by dry cleaners; make environmental education part of the public school curriculum; and require defense contractors to reveal whether they used the toxic rocket fuel component perchlorate in the last 50 years.

Many of the top candidates running to replace Davis have staked out aggressively pro-environment stands, putting pressure on Davis to clarify his conservationist credentials. In past elections, Davis faced conservative Republicans who did not make environmental protection a vital part of their platform.

Green Party candidate Peter Camejo and independent Arianna Huffington are appealing to environmentalists with their support of solar energy and opposition to gas-guzzling SUVs. Republican Arnold Schwarzenegger has tapped conservationist Robert F. Kennedy Jr., a cousin of his wife, Maria Shriver, to help forge an agenda attractive to environmentally conscious voters. It includes support for strict logging limits in the Sierra Nevada and controls on carbon dioxide emissions from cars and trucks — positions that pit Schwarzenegger against the Bush administration.

"From our perspective, Gray Davis has been a pretty green governor," said Dan Jacobson, director of Environment California. "But I certainly don't doubt that politics are playing a part. With those positions, if [Schwarzenegger] were running for governor of any other state, he would get endorsements from major environmental groups."

In the past, environmentalists have been tepid supporters of Davis, who has vetoed several measures they have championed — such as a bill last year to ban low-level radioactive waste from municipal landfills. The legislation was opposed by utilities and biotechnology companies that have been generous contributors to Davis.

But Davis' approach began to shift last year, some environmental leaders said, when the governor received international publicity for signing a trailblazing bill to curb tailpipe emissions of carbon dioxide, a contributor to global warming.

"I think that was a turning point," said Bill Magavern, a senior legislative advocate for the Sierra Club. "That's when I believe Gray Davis truly realized the power of environmental politics. There is a tendency to view everything in California through the lens of the recall. No doubt it plays a role, but he had already taken a turn in the green direction."

Winston Hickox, secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency, said Davis' more aggressive actions have been prompted by Bush administration efforts to weaken some of California's toughest regulations.

Under Bush, the Environmental Protection Agency has called for eliminating a key measurement used to determine whether smog has reached unacceptable levels, and the administration has consistently challenged California's right to have a role in regulating oil drilling three or more miles off the coast.

"California is having to stand up for its rightful place in the face of some outrageous policies coming out of Washington," Hickox said. "If he [Davis] didn't stand up for those things, he would not be fit to represent a state with such wondrous natural beauty."

Shortly after the recall against him made the ballot, Davis held a news conference to announce his support for SB 288, the "Protect California Air Act," a bill by state Sen. Byron Sher (D-Stanford) that would ensure that the state's older refineries, factories and power plants upgrade pollution control equipment when they upgrade their facilities. The measure, opposed by the Navy, California Farm Bureau and American Forest and Paper Assn., is a response to a Bush administration move to drop the requirement at the federal level.

Officials in Sacramento said Davis is also poised to sign another sweeping pollution bill, SB 700 by state Sen. Dean Florez (D-Shafter), which would lift an exemption from statewide air quality regulations that agriculture has enjoyed. Farmers object to the bill, but California's Central Valley now suffers from the second-worst air quality in the country.

Similarly, Hewlett-Packard objects to the electronic waste bill, which seeks to address the growing problem posed by junked computers monitors and televisions. There are already more than 6 million old monitors and television sets lying in homes around the state today, according to a report, and they have been barred from municipal landfills because they contain lead and other toxic materials.

Hewlett-Packard favors a program that requires each company to recycle its own products — an idea Davis said he supported last year when he vetoed similar legislation amid industry opposition.

"We are in favor of computer recycling in California, but we do not think the answer is another large government program funded by a fee on consumers," said David Isaacs, HP's director of global public policy.

Nonetheless, Davis should sign the bill this time around, said Hickox, the California EPA secretary. "We have to move forward," he said.

Air district rejects bid to carve up valley

By MATT WEISER, Californian staff writer
The Bakersfield Californian
Thursday September 18, 2003, 11:20:18 PM

Regional air quality officials on Thursday soundly rejected a plea from their northern members to split the valley into two planning areas, saying it is vital to "stay in this boat together" to fight smog.

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District was asked by the counties of Merced, San Joaquin and Stanislaus to study creating a separate "planning area" in the northern part of the district. The counties argued that they generally have better air quality and, therefore, shouldn't be forced to adhere to the same air-quality rules as the rest of the valley.

Others fear it will lead to looser pollution controls in the north, resulting in more smog blowing south into Bakersfield and Fresno, which already face enough hurdles to clean up their air.

"The more we run down any path that leads to parceling up the valley, the more we put in peril whatever area is the last one standing," said Mike Maggard, air district board member and Bakersfield city councilman. "We have to stand as one -- as difficult as that is for those who look up in the sky and see it blue every day."

Under the proposal endorsed by the boards of supervisors in all three counties -- each of which has one vote on the 11-member air district board -- they would remain within the air district and be governed by the same board.

But they would not follow along as the rest of the district moves into the federally designated "extreme nonattainment" pollution category later this year. This category gives the valley five more years to meet air quality goals, but also adds additional red tape and expense for many valley businesses.

Instead, the three counties would remain under the existing "severe" category, with lower pollution-related fees and paperwork as a result.

"I don't think that misery does love company. And I believe if you have lifeboats, you should use them," said Jack Sieglock, San Joaquin County supervisor and air district board member.

But Kevin Hall, an air pollution specialist with the Sierra Club, said this would harm the rest of the valley.

"Where are you going to locate in the valley (as a business) if you have a choice?" he said. "Where are your costs going to be lower? Where are you going to have a competitive advantage?"

To meet federal deadlines, air district staffers would have to study the matter while finishing complex studies on the extreme designation.

David Crow, the district's air pollution control officer, called this "impossible for us to undertake" given the staff's workload. The two would have to be submitted together to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency by January.

Kerry Drake, associate director of EPA's regional air division, told the board it could take at least a year to review the planning-area request alone, meaning the valley would miss its deadline to attain "extreme" status. The result could be steep sanctions against the whole valley, including a loss of billions of dollars in federal highway funding and steeper permit fees for polluting businesses.

Crow said pollution created in the three northern counties does get transported south by prevailing winds. But how much this occurs remains largely unknown.

"Until I have an answer to that question, I would not even consider creating a separate planning area or to break this valley up in any way," said Barbara Patrick, Kern County supervisor and air district board member.

"All of us are in this boat together, and we need to stay in this boat together."

In the end, the proposal got three votes -- from the three board members representing the northern counties.

Cultivating a payoff

By MATT WEISER, Californian staff writer
The Bakersfield Californian
Saturday September 20, 2003, 10:45:14 PM

Generations of teens have heard it over and over from their parents. The mantra pops up seemingly every time a trip to the mall is mentioned: "Money doesn't grow on trees, you know!"

But it turns out that money does grow on trees, in a manner of speaking.

Trees absorb air pollution during their normal respiratory process. As they absorb carbon dioxide for photosynthesis, trees also breathe in pollution caused by cars and factories, such as sulfur dioxide and ozone, and then they breathe out oxygen. In fact, trees are so good at this filtering that the benefits outweigh the costs of planting and pruning.

In other words, trees are a pollution-control device that makes money. That still won't fund a trip to the mall, but it's a pretty good deal in an air basin like ours that has become home to some of the worst pollution in the nation.

"If you breathe, you ought to plant a tree. It's pretty much that simple," said Paul Graham, Bakersfield's urban forester.

The role that trees can play in fighting air pollution has been overlooked, Graham said. In a valley with blistering summer heat and the nation's worst or second-worst air quality -- depending on how you measure it -- Bakersfield's urban trees have gone unappreciated for far too long, he believes.

Local problems include poor pruning practices, planting the wrong tree species, and simply not planting enough trees, especially when new housing and commercial projects are built. Planting more trees, and taking better care of those we have, could not only improve air quality but also make Bakersfield a more pleasant place to live.

"We really want to change the way people feel about trees in Bakersfield, the way it looks to outsiders and the way it looks to us," Graham said. "Hopefully we can help people to understand what the urban forest can do in conjunction with the environment, and make it a little more productive for Bakersfield."

A new school of thought is emphasizing the financial benefits of trees to get money-driven urbanites to appreciate them on a new level.

Striking back with trees

Studies have found that a single large tree, at maturity, can take as much as \$50 worth of pollution out of the San Joaquin Valley's air every year. That figure is based on the cost of mechanical pollution controls to remove the same amount of pollutants from a factory smokestack, for example.

The largest component of that number is an estimated \$15 a year saved on the energy bill of a home shaded by that tree. And a lower energy bill, of course, means fewer power plant emissions.

"They're a great offensive move against air pollution," said Ray Clanton, a volunteer with the Tree Foundation of Kern. He has planted numerous trees on the west side of his northwest Bakersfield home to create shade and on the north side to block winter winds.

That same hypothetical tree also lends that house an estimated \$20 a year in additional property value, and it provides the entire community with esthetic benefits.

The net benefits from that single, large tree are \$64 per year, after subtracting out a cost of just \$10 annually, primarily for watering and the occasional pruning.

All these estimates are the result of recent studies unique to the San Joaquin Valley by scientists at the U.S. Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station, based at UC Davis.

"I guess what we found is, generally, trees do appear to be cost-effective in the benefits that they provide," said Jim Simpson, a Forest Service meteorologist and co-author of many of the studies. He noted that these studies did not include some other benefits that are more difficult to measure.

"If the population lives in a nice, treed area as opposed to some area that's been clear-cut, it's a nicer environment. It's more calm. There's probably not as much crime," he said. "There's some pretty good evidence and studies that people who have a nice sylvan view out their hospital window get out of the hospital twice as fast as people who look at the proverbial brick wall."

Getting the word out

A comprehensive study in 1999 of Modesto's 91,000 street and park trees found that they provide public benefits worth nearly double their management costs. The study even factored in the salaries and benefits of city forestry staffers, street and sidewalk repairs attributed to trees, and claims of property damage and trip-and-fall injuries caused by city trees.

Modesto's public trees, it was found, annually absorb 170 tons of air pollution, valued at \$1.5 million if it had to be controlled mechanically. The same trees provide shade and cooling in summer worth \$870,000.

Overall, Modesto's trees provide a net benefit to the city of \$2.3 million, or more than \$12 per city resident, the study found. Air quality improvements represent 30 percent of this benefit.

It's probably not realistic to think Bakersfield can plant enough trees to fix its air pollution problem. It would take millions of additional trees to cancel out just the smog caused by Kern County's automobiles. But Simpson said trees can make a difference.

"The important thing to remember is that it's going to make a dent, but it's not going to be huge," he said.

Still, even a dent can matter in the battle against smog. If Kern County could plant just 91,000 trees to equal those in the Modesto study, their pollution-absorbing power would roughly cancel out the ozone-forming gases released by trains in the county, for example.

Bakersfield and the Tree Foundation are working toward a more productive urban forest in a number of ways. First, they're starting to educate residents and commercial landscapers about proper pruning practices.

Too often in Bakersfield, trees are pruned by "topping," or simply removing branches at mid-limb to give the tree a uniform shape. This drastically reduces the tree's shade canopy and its pollution-absorbing ability by taking out too much of the leaf area. It also weakens limbs, making them more vulnerable to damage and disease.

A proper pruning job should remove no more than 25 percent of the canopy -- focusing on removing weak or competing limbs -- and result in very little change to the tree's overall appearance.

Grass-roots vision

The city is also working to inventory its trees. Graham estimates Bakersfield has about 800,000. He and his crew are trying to find out how many are in the public right-of-way and determine their health.

"Is it enough? No, it's not enough trees," he said. "We've got areas of town that are virtually devoid of trees. There really needs to be kind of a grass-roots effort to get people to plant trees."

That was suggested three years ago as part of the Bakersfield Vision 2020 plan, a process that involved 13,000 residents in drafting a better future for the city. One recommendation was to launch a campaign to get every person in Bakersfield to plant five trees.

That proposal has gone nowhere. Dana Karcher, executive director of the Tree Foundation of Kern, said Bakersfield isn't ready for a tree-planting campaign, in part because many residents can't afford the typical \$65 cost to plant a single tree. Instead, she said, the city needs to focus on learning to care for the trees it has already.

The city also needs a bigger forestry staff, she said, not just to oversee a program like that, but to better maintain existing trees. Bakersfield has a tree crew of five full-time people, compared with 51 in Modesto, which has about 30 percent fewer residents than Bakersfield. Granted, those Modesto employees perform some other duties, but the city is also widely recognized for its large and healthy urban forest.

"Planting 1 million trees is a wonderful goal, but there are forest management issues. And with the size of the urban forestry division in this city right now, they couldn't keep up," said Karcher. "We want to encourage tree planting, but we need it to be done right."

With that in mind, Graham is developing a Web site to help people choose the right tree for the right location to reduce problems as the tree matures. For instance, a tree that's too tall will eventually cause problems if planted under power lines. Other species just don't do well in Bakersfield's climate.

Some trees also have a pollution downside. Certain species emit large amounts of natural volatile organic compounds as they grow. These natural compounds contribute to ozone formation in the atmosphere, which causes smog. Examples of high-emitters include oak and eucalyptus species. A tree's overall benefits still outweigh these emissions, but in a smoggy town like Bakersfield, it is better to plant a low-emitting tree.

"The ozone control trees provide is way more important than the small amount of ozone they emit," said Graham.

Shady neighborhoods

Trees provide other air quality benefits. Tree shade can reduce the "heat island" effect that contributes to smog formation.

Smog forms when vehicle and industrial exhaust cook together in the presence of sunlight and heat. Cities aggravate this problem with their broad plains of pavement, which absorb and reflect heat back into the atmosphere. Trees can reduce temperatures by shading some of this pavement.

"Granted, it's a small effect, but at least there's something that we can do to improve things," said Clanton.

Pavement also gives off polluting gases as it slowly decays. Ample shading from trees can reduce these emissions while prolonging the life of the pavement.

And studies have found that well-shaded parking lots reduce vehicle emissions. Cars give off pollution even when parked, because high temperatures can cause pollutants to evaporate from a vehicle's fuel system. Shaded cars were found to reduce these emissions by 2 percent.

Westchester, one of Bakersfield's oldest neighborhoods, provides a good example of these benefits. The area is blessed with a grand canopy of mature trees. In some places, these trees touch over the street centers, shading the entire street and creating a cool tunnel of leaves for people, pavement and cars.

The opposite example can be found in Kern City, an older subdivision located off New Stine Road in southwest Bakersfield. The neighborhood, home to many retirees today, has never had many sidewalk trees. Many of the trees that did get planted when the neighborhood was built were spindly, decorative palms.

"This was done in the '50s and the design is not scientifically amenable to where we live," said Karcher, noting the city recently removed a number of palms in the area. "Removing palm trees is good, because they don't provide shade and they don't clean the air. They don't really do much good at all."

Today, Kern City looks forbiddingly sun-baked compared to Westchester, but that will be changing.

The city and the Tree Foundation recently won a \$32,000 grant from the California Department of Forestry to plant 800 trees throughout the neighborhood. The planting will start in October and continue into 2005.

Faye Shearer, president of Kern City's Yorba Linda Homeowners Association, is looking forward to the planting project.

"Trees are calming. They're cooling, they're refreshing," she said. "Trees are beautiful, and there's no reason why we shouldn't have more around."

Neighborhoods sprout in northeast Fresno

Developers take cue from surveys that see huge demand around Copper River project.

By Sanford Nax
The Fresno Bee

(Published Sunday, September 21, 2003, 5:20 AM)

Copper River Ranch housing development is garnering most of the attention in north Fresno, but smaller projects are starting to take shape around it.

DeYoung Communities, Wilson Homes, Aluisi Development, The McCaffrey Group and Lawrence Partners are among the companies staking out claims in one of northeast Fresno's last frontiers.

Together, they could develop almost 700 production and custom lots, according to a report by California State University, Fresno.

Developers say early surveys show a huge demand for homes in that area, with an interest in Clovis Unified School District's plans to open three schools in the region and live in one of the last emerging regions of northeast Fresno.

The Clovis school district will open James S. Fugman Elementary School near Cedar and Olympic avenues next year. An intermediate and a high school are tentatively planned to open on the north side of International Avenue between Willow and Chestnut avenues in 2007, said Roger Oraze, the district's assistant superintendent for facilities services.

The 710-acre Copper River is one of the largest housing and commercial developments ever proposed in Fresno. A partnership of Lyles Diversified, Gary McDonald Homes and Granville Homes is behind the project north of Copper Avenue between Friant Road and Willow Avenue. Copper River could contain more than 2,800 homes.

Gary McDonald also is building a 62-lot gated community across from Fugman Elementary School.

"In the next 24 months, all of the available remaining land south of Copper will be consumed," he said. Interest in Copper River is "so substantial that we have a waiting list of several hundred."

However, health and community activists have filed a lawsuit, asking a judge to set aside approval of Copper River Ranch. The group contends city officials didn't properly analyze the air pollution hazards.

The developers say Copper River will feature clean-air measures, such as the subsidizing of electric carts that buyers can purchase, and no wood-burning fireplaces.

"We're hoping for an early resolution to the lawsuit," McDonald said.

Meanwhile, the other developments are progressing.

DeYoung Communities has more than 500 names on a waiting list for Brentwood on the Green, a 334-home neighborhood at Copper and Millbrook avenues. The neighborhood also will feature 24 custom lots that back up to the Fort Washington Golf Course.

"You can't get a better location," said Jerry DeYoung, a company principal.

To ease access to the area, Millbrook Avenue will be realigned to the east so it cuts into Copper Avenue at a T-intersection, DeYoung said. None of the lots is yet for sale.

"It has sewer and water halfway in; all the utilities are going in over the next few months," said DeYoung, who plans to sell the lots from models at another project he is building further south on Willow Avenue.

Not far away, Wilson Homes is getting ready to start grading on a 56-lot gated community near the southwest corner Maple and Copper avenues, near former San Francisco 49er Tim McDonald's estate.

In addition, The McCaffrey Group and Lawrence Partners are separately developing custom home lots near Copper and Maple and Copper and Chestnut avenues. McCaffrey is marketing 108 lots in a custom development called Bellamontagna, and Lawrence has the 27-lot Copperline project.

McCaffrey decided to develop the lots after enjoying success at Bellaviera, a luxury neighborhood, said Ron Pottoroff, a Guarantee Real Estate agent who is marketing Bellamontagna. The 74-lot Bellaviera is near Alluvial and Milburn avenues, on the bluffs of the San Joaquin River.

"Bellaviera was so successful that [McCaffrey] determined that the demand has pointed us to that other property," Pottoroff said.

He estimated that the homes eventually built in Bellamontagna will be worth \$500,000 to \$850,000, depending on which lot is purchased. The parcels are at least 10,000 square feet.

Next door, Case Lawrence is assembling a list of custom-home builders and others eager to buy half-acre lots at Copperline.

The builders are interested because they face a shortage of lots for custom homes, Lawrence said. Copperline will be adjacent to the back entrance of Copper River Ranch.

Schwarzenegger proposes 'hydrogen highway'

By ERICA WERNER, Associated Press Writer

In The Bakersfield Californian

Monday September 22, 2003, 04:35:09 AM

CARPINTERIA, Calif. (AP) - SUV enthusiast Arnold Schwarzenegger is having one of his Hummers overhauled to run on hydrogen, hoping that the move will inspire Detroit - just as his example did 11 years ago when he paid to have a military Humvee turned into the first civilian Hummer.

"There is no quick solution to this ... but what I want to do is I want to show them my car when it's done and inspire Detroit and let them know that this is what we can do, get going right now," he said Sunday.

His campaign said the upgrade will cost \$21,000 and take one to two months. The recall candidate made his remarks Sunday, as he unveiled an environmental plan aimed at cutting smog by up to 50 percent within five to eight years. The centerpiece of his proposal promotes hydrogen-powered cars.

Hydrogen technology is several years from being a practical reality for consumers, however. Even Schwarzenegger environmental advisers who briefed reporters said no hydro-vehicle is projected to hit the market before one BMW plans for 2006. Schwarzenegger arrived at the event in a GMC Yukon SUV.

Schwarzenegger said he would sign an executive order to create a network of hydrogen fueling stations by 2010. Running every 20 miles or so along a highway, they would number fewer than 200.

A hydrogen highway is "speculative, unfunded and far off in the future," said Pedro Nava, a member of the Coastal Commission. "We need solutions now," he said.

In an exchange with reporters, Schwarzenegger criticized Gov. Gray Davis, saying he "has just started talking about the environment the last few days" in the recall election campaign. But Schwarzenegger backtracked when asked about laws signed by Davis, who generally wins high marks from environmentalists.

"I'm not aware of all those bills that he has signed the last year," Schwarzenegger said.

Davis spokesman Peter Ragone responded: "In the past four years Gov. Davis has signed more than 200 measures protecting California's environment. These laws include the toughest air and water quality laws in America, most importantly, a landmark bill to limit greenhouse gases. We already know Arnold doesn't vote regularly in elections; now we know he doesn't read the papers either."

Schwarzenegger also said he would prevent coastal oil drilling, seek to reduce energy consumption by 20 percent within two years and protect parks and open spaces.

His speech was disturbed at times by protesters. One pulled out a megaphone and began shouting, "A Hummer isn't clean and Arnold isn't green."

At one point a Schwarzenegger supporter tried to snatch the megaphone away, resulting in a brief scuffle. The man, 28-year-old Michael Warnken of Santa Barbara, ran away and was later arrested for felony grand theft and resisting arrest, said Santa Barbara County sheriff's Sgt. Chris Pappas.

In the speech, Schwarzenegger said he would:

- Stop oil drilling off the coast and negotiate with the federal government to buy back existing oil leases.
- Work to reduce smog, in part by replacing the oldest and dirtiest vehicles with clean, alternative-fuel vehicles.
- Preserve forests and parks, and ensure that park fees are used to maintain parks.
- Protect ancient forests, especially redwoods.
- Clean up drinking water and oceans.

Tejon, critics seek judge's ear

By AMY HILVERS, Californian staff writer
The Bakersfield Californian
Friday September 19, 2003, 11:00:30 PM

A Kern County Superior Court judge heard arguments Friday in a suit filed by environmental groups trying to reverse Kern County's approval of a massive Tejon Ranch industrial development project.

Attorneys from a coalition of local and out-of-town environmental groups told Judge Kenneth Twisselman II the Tejon Industrial Complex expansion was approved before proper environmental impact reports are done.

But attorneys from Tejon Ranch argued that they followed all guidelines set forth by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District and provided the county with all the information needed to review the project.

Lawyers for both sides ended up tussling Friday over exactly which air quality guidelines were used and when -- both 1999 and 2002 guidelines were mentioned in Tejon's legal papers. The issue threatened to derail Tejon's defense for a time.

But Twisselman allowed the Tejon attorneys to rewrite their argument to use the 1999 air standard and return on Sept. 29 to argue those points.

In the main arguments Friday, Kassia Siegel, attorney the Center for Biological Diversity, argued that there was not enough information disclosed about the impact of the project on the environment.

"The true impacts of the projects ... were hidden from view," Siegel said.

Adverse impacts from pollution on air, water and health were not addressed properly in the environmental impact report before the decision was made, she said.

The effects on certain animals were also not included in the report, she said.

Robert McMurry, attorney for Tejon Industrial Corp. and Tejon Ranch Co., argued that the ranch did follow air district guidelines and there was adequate analysis on impacts.

"We followed the guidelines. The air district agrees that all of those were adequately done," McMurry said.

McMurry conceded that two animals were not included in the report, but said that the impact would not be substantial because the land is not useful for any type of creatures.

"We believe firmly that we did what we were supposed to do," McMurry said.

County supervisors approved an additional 15 million square feet of warehouses for the project along Interstate 5 in January.

A coalition of local and out-of-town environmental groups filed suit a month later claiming the impact on air quality and wildlife was not adequately reviewed and analyzed.

Tejon Ranch is the largest privately owned piece of land in the state, and spreads over Kern and Los Angeles counties.

The Tejon Industrial Complex is a development of warehouses, light industry and retail buildings on property at the base of the Grapevine.

The first phase, already partly built out, would consist of about 5 million square feet of buildings.

The suit targets only the second phase of the project, proposed to include an additional 15 million square feet of industrial space.

The Center for Biological Diversity, based in Southern California, the Center on Race, Poverty and the Environment, the Kern Audubon Society and the Sierra Club are parties in the suit.

Both sides will return to court later this month to finish the arguments, Twisselman will then weigh them and issue a ruling within 90 days.

Spare the air

News Brief in The Bakersfield Californian
Saturday September 20, 2003, 10:55:10 PM

Air quality officials urge valley residents to avoid outdoor exertion and unnecessary driving today and Monday due to expected high smog levels.

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District declared the "Spare the Air" notice in response to anticipated smog levels forecast to be unhealthy for everyone. The voluntary advisory applies to valley portions of Kern County.

Residents -- especially children, the elderly and people with breathing problems -- are urged to avoid exerting themselves outdoors. In addition, everyone is asked to avoid activities that cause air pollution, such as excessive vehicle idling and short driving trips, barbecuing, and the use of lawn mowers and off-road vehicles.

For more information and additional smog-fighting tips, call 1-800-SMOG-INFO or visit www.valleyair.org.

Community Voices / Kelley Hogan Malay: How air quality forecasts are made

The Bakersfield Californian
Friday September 19, 2003, 06:40:18 PM

A letter writer recently asked some good questions. The Valley Air District issues daily air quality forecasts based on meteorological and air quality conditions reported by more than 30 monitoring stations valley-wide.

The forecasts are issued to the news media and are available to the public at www.valleyair.org (<http://www.valleyair.org>) and 1-800-Smog-Info.

The letter writer asked why the forecast appears to differ from actual air quality levels reported later. In order to protect public health, air pollution control districts issue forecasts based on the worst air quality expected in given regions.

In the valley's southern region, the worst summertime air pollution usually is downwind of Bakersfield. Therefore, air quality levels expected in Arvin and Edison frequently drive the southern region's forecast. However, the actual air quality readings taken the following day are site-specific and can vary greatly from location to location.

For example, the south valley's air quality forecast for July 25 was 135 (unhealthy for sensitive groups.) The actual air pollution level in Arvin that day was 140. The actual reading in Bakersfield was 85 (moderate.) If a news outlet reported the regional forecast of 135, and then later report Bakersfield's actual reading of 85, it certainly would appear that the forecast was off-base. But Arvin was, in fact, experiencing poor air quality very close to the forecast level.

In an effort to make forecasts more helpful to residents, the air district is developing smaller forecast regions. We plan to implement 26 forecast regions valleywide starting early next year.

Kelley Hogan Malay is an air quality education representative II with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District.

[Los Angeles Times editorial, September 21, 2003:](#)

Pollution's Federal Friends

Californians care about clearing the still-smoggy skies and protecting the state's 1,100-mile oceanfront from oil spills and urban runoff. For that reason, and because the problem of pollution has been more acute in California than elsewhere, the Legislature and state and local agencies have led most other states in innovative, forceful efforts to improve air and water quality. The Bush administration's response? See you in court.

Never mind the administration's states' rights rhetoric; the Justice Department joined oil companies and engine makers last month in a federal lawsuit to block rules that push conversion of transit buses, trash trucks and other vehicles from soot-belching diesel to cleaner fuels in Southern California. The Environmental Protection Agency insists that the federal Clean Air Act trumps state plans to curb emissions linked to global warming.

Last year, the White House asked a federal court to revive oil drilling off the coast of Ventura and Santa Barbara counties. When that suit failed, the Commerce Department rewrote rules to give federal agencies more power over states when it came to drilling and other activities that could taint ocean water and poison fish and shorebirds.

California isn't the Bush administration's only target, nor is the big-footing confined to environmental policy.

Atty. Gen. John Ashcroft has sued to derail the assisted-suicide law approved by Oregon voters. He seeks to undermine California's 1996 voter-approved initiative allowing sick people to grow or smoke marijuana to help them ease the pain of cancer, AIDS and other diseases. And the Bush-backed credit reporting bill, now before the Senate, would block the far stronger identity theft protections in the privacy law that Gov. Gray Davis signed last month.

The administration's environmental push-back may stem from California's being a pacesetter, a role that grows out of its market size. The state's auto emissions standards, for example, drive pollution-control technology nationally just because so many cars and trucks are sold here. But

automakers, oil refiners and manufacturers don't want to march at California's fast beat anymore, and, as Bush backers, they've had the president's ear.

Bush often says states can craft better solutions to their problems than can the behemoth federal government. California has figured out environmental policies that work, and the markets are freely and properly responding to these.

So why can't the feds, especially if they're not going to make matters better, just leave California alone?

News in brief from the San Joaquin Valley

The Associated Press, published in the San Francisco Chronicle, September 19, 2003

FRESNO, Calif. (AP) -- Regional air quality regulators have denied a request by three northern San Joaquin Valley counties to create their own smog-reduction plan.

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District voted Thursday not to approve the request by officials in San Joaquin, Stanislaus and Merced counties who say there is less pollution in their counties than the rest of the valley.

Northern county officials argued that businesses in their areas shouldn't be unfairly punished by southern counties who have dirtier air. The northern counties seldom violate air standards but violations in Fresno or Bakersfield affect the whole air district, which runs from Stockton to Bakersfield.

"Why should we be held hostage to conditions in the south?" said Thomas Mayfield, air pollution board member and Stanislaus County supervisor.

Board members weren't convinced.

"We have to stand as one, as difficult as it is for those who look up at the sky and see it blue every day," said Mike Maggard, a Bakersfield City Council member who sits on the air pollution board.

[Editorial, Merced Sun-Star, Sept. 22, 2003:](#)

Will traffic signals get timed, or what?

Whatever happened to the move to time Merced's traffic lights? Unfortunately, it seems the mayor and City Council have forgotten about this important task. And we wonder how they could, assuming they drive themselves around our fair city just like the rest of us. The reminders occur every minute or so.

ANGER is a good word to describe the thoughts that cross our mind as we prematurely hit the brake pedal time and time again. Driving around shouldn't have to be so annoying.

So what's being done to remedy the problem? Not much, it seems, if we can judge by the collective silence coming from the Civic Center.

Enough is enough. It's time to get the lights timed once and for all. And we don't want to hear the normal "the budget is so bad" crybaby baloney. There's got to be some creative way to get this done in an efficient manner. All that stop-and-go traffic undoubtedly contributes more vehicle exhaust to the already polluted Central Valley air basin - perhaps a grant can be written to help alleviate our predicament?

We'd guess we're not the only ones annoyed by the traffic light mess. City Council candidates looking for a surefire winning campaign issue, here you go.

Air quality poor this weekend

Merced Sun-Star

Saturday, September 20, 2003

Merced County's air quality is expected to be unhealthy over the weekend.

A Spare the Air Day is forecast for both today and Sunday, according to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District.

To help reduce and control air pollution levels, the district suggests avoiding unnecessary vehicle use, including personal automobiles, watercraft and off-road vehicles.

The district also recommends: Accelerating gradually; using cruise control on the highway; obeying the speed limit; combining your errands into one trip; avoiding "topping off" at the gas pump; and taking the train for trips.

For more information about the Spare the Air program, call (559) 230-5800 or visit www.valleyair.org <<http://www.valleyair.org>>.

Unhealthy air is forecast

The Hanford Sentinel

Sept. 21, 2003

Air quality in Kings County is forecast to be unhealthy today and Monday, the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District has announced.

Residents can help reduce air pollution by avoiding unnecessary vehicle trips and, if a person must drive, then to drive "smarter" to avoid excess pollution by:

€ Accelerating gradually

€ Using cruise control on the highway

€ Obeying the speed limit

€ Combining errands into one trip

Motorists can also help reduce pollution by not topping off at the gas pump.

Cars (Not Cows) Bigger Problem For Our Air

Valley Voice Newspaper

Monday, Sept. 22, 2003

News Analysis by John Lindt

Tulare County - Our neighbors, the cows, may be a visible target when we glare into the morning sun looking at our stinky air. Usually we're looking at it wondering where all this stuff comes from as we peer through the front windshield driving to work. Out of sight is our own tailpipe. That's probably why they put in the back. As they say in the funny papers - we have met the enemy and it is us.

We live in a basin - on a smaller scale the Tulare Lake basin and from a larger perspective the 250 mile long San Joaquin Valley. Our airshed is all connected. So it shouldn't come as a surprise that looking at just one figure - the number of registered vehicles in Tulare County - we can sense why the air may be one-third grayer than it used to be.

From 1980 to this year Tulare County has gained 100,000 registered vehicles - a one-third jump in 23 years according to the Department of Transportation. By 2020 - when your little one is in high school - we will approach 400,000 vehicles in this county alone. Now multiply by 8 - our entire air basin - 8 counties strong - is 25,000 sq. miles.

While the good news is that more recent model cars pollute less than pre 1980 vehicles, the bad news is that we are traveling more - at a faster pace than the population is growing.

More Miles

According to the Air Resources Board the valley's population increased from 2.1 million to 3.2 million from 1981 to 2000. During this same period the number of daily vehicle miles traveled more than doubled from 35 million miles a day in 1981 to 136 million in 2000 - a 136% increase. This is the biggest reason our air doesn't get better despite the fact vehicles are cleaner than they used to be, says the ARB (see chart).

Population growth, new households who increasingly commute and make multiple trips to shopping centers and drive-thrus - are adding to the load.

According to the State Water Resource Board the population of the greater Tulare Lake Basin that includes both the Fresno and Bakersfield metro areas as well as Tulare and Kings - the population in 2000 was 1.88 million people. By 2030 that population is projected to be 3.4 million - almost double.

The huge increase in the volume of people here, the buildings, stores, cars and delivery trucks it takes to supply them - the sprawl of homes that depend on cars to get to work and the work environment itself - all are far bigger factors than farm based pollution.

In fact, argues farmer advocate Manuel Cunha, the issue is simply urbanization of the valley vs the continued survival of agriculture. "Look at the entire valley in 2020 and imagine 7 million people - cities spreading across the landscape and few farms left. America will get their food shipped from other countries in containers and farms won't be here to help scrub the air as they do today."

Truck Caravans

Cunha says just the endless volume of truck traffic that speeds through the valley - some 6 million miles a day of big rigs belching diesel smoke motoring through the valley is an example of pollution we have to live with but pollution we don't make.

Cunha says the new Port of San Diego expected to open soon - will mean a huge increase in truck traffic unloading containers in San Diego to ship product across the state. He says our truck caravans will increase by 3 times "because of the opening of the port."

Cunha fears the loss of profitability for valley farmers will mean it will be more likely farms will be replaced by housing subdivisions and other urban uses. "Look what replaces farms?" Asphalt and concrete take the place of topsoil and green plants.

Cunha has USDA figures that show that more farmers are part time holding down urban jobs to make ends meet. The number of farms in California in all sizes went down by 3500 from the census of 1992 to 1997. Fewer farms equal more sprawl, says Cunha. That's what is impacting our air.

160 Acre Lesson

Kings County farmer Tony Oliveira - who teaches an economics class at West Hills offers a dramatic example of the choice the valley has in the cows vs cars debate. He says they modeled the numbers gathered from a number of sources. "Consider 160 acres of alfalfa hay - grown to feed the cows. We figured that to grow, cut, rake, band and deliver that hay to the dairy it will require 4200 gallons of diesel fuel over one year's time. Now take that same 160 acres - now planted to single family homes. Not only will that acreage no longer absorb ozone - scrub the air - it means that the cars associated with that 160 acre subdivision will use 2.2 million gallons of gasoline in a year's time." It's not even close.

As this example proves out - land use matters. Cows may mean air pollution and manure on one hand, but they also mean thousands of acres of feed crop land needs to be planted - i.e. the cows sustain the field crop land surrounding them and that crop land helps clean the air. Conversely, the conversion to urban uses generates - by a factor of 50 - more bad air days.

Air Pollution and Gas Prices

Pissed over high gasoline prices? Simply put, California refineries - many here in the valley - can't keep up with demand even as we buy big, more fuel hungry vehicles. The California Energy

Commission says that the average fuel economy of cars and light trucks actually declined from 36 mpg in 1988 to 24 mpg in 2000.

California consumes 16.4 billion gallons of gas every year. But that could rise to 24.2 billion gallons by 2020 says the Energy Commission. The upshot will be the valley will have to increase petroleum refinery activity to meet the demand. The Energy Commission suggests that simply increasing the fuel mileage to 40 mpg would keep demand at current levels for the next 30 years. Substituting cleaner fuels and fuel cell vehicles could have a beneficial effect on our air - and our lungs.

What can you do? You can buy a hybrid Toyota Prius that gets 50 mpg in a full size vehicle coming out later this month.

Also, Congressman Dennis Cardoza has offered a bill to give to a buyer in a highly polluted region like ours a \$4,000 tax incentive to buy such a vehicle. The bill is pending in Congress.

How About Those Cows?

Just what part cows play in the gloomy picture is yet to be sorted out, but studies are underway to come up with a base line answer.

No doubt farming does play a part and likely a significant part. Estimates run to 25% of our problem. Farm advocate Cunha says that farmers are actively working on it however, and if farmers don't go out of business - there are major initiatives underway that will mean air improvements.

For now the state ARB says our air pollution problem is something like 60% mobile sources, cars, trucks and machinery and tractors. A 2000 ARB inventory of emissions by category for Tulare County for each pollution component like Nox-nitrous oxides - one of the main precursors to smog suggested the inventory of Nox emission was 54 tons per day. Of that mobile sources made up 46.65 tons per day. In the mobile category the emission inventory included about 11 - for cars and light duty trucks, 10.4 for heavy duty diesel trucks, trains at 2.5 - off road equipment at 4.15 and farm equipment at 11.5 tons per day. Dairies are not included in the emission inventory, even though the ARB thinks they should be.

That there are more cows than people in Tulare County is a factor both in the perception and reality of our air. Cows produce a lot of waste and pass a lot of gas. The massive volume has popularized estimates that cows would soon pass cars as the biggest source for one criteria pollutant, reactive organic gases. That has been an issue carried by environmental critics of the dairy industry and news media.

But as we noted in a recent Valley Voice article - current research being done by a Fresno State professor under contract with the state Air Resources Board suggests the current estimate - based on a 1938 research grossly overestimates the volume of reactive organic gases coming from methane. Dr. Charles Krauter is undertaking a two year research project to make new estimates of how much reactive organic gases come from methane and how much ammonia is given off by cows and if plants grown near dairy farms actually pull the ammonia from the air helping to mitigate the situation.

His initial study found that nearby plants, often corn or alfalfa feed, grown near the dairy cut the volume of ammonia emitted down by 80% - absorbing the emissions.

Ag supporters have argued for some time that their crops absorb many pollutants as well as giving off oxygen. Because the science is not clear, modification to legislation such as the new Dean Florez bills on dairies suggests that before there is some further regulation of dairy pollution, the scientific work has to be completed.

Two approaches appear to have promise however - methane digesters that also make electricity and scraping systems that separate manure before it gets a chance to cook in the sun in a dairy lagoon. That cuts the stink as well. The stink may be dairies biggest political problem.

Cut The Dust

PM 10 raises a huge problem in the valley, particularly in the winter months. Major culprits include vehicle travel on unpaved and paved roads, waste burning and residential fireplaces. Ag can kick up less dust in the air from ag land prep and harvesting using conservation techniques that the industry has agreed to implement with the local Air Board.

Increasingly Resource Conservation districts are working to adopt management plans that seek to both conserve water resources and cut emissions. The Pond - Shafter-Wasco Conservation District - is working with farmers to change their irrigation practices that would reduce water use by 15%, conserve wildlife habitat by 30% and cut PM 10 levels by 50% on their permanent crops - an example for others in the valley to follow.

Misting systems to keep the dust down on dairies can make a difference. In the orchards researchers are working on machinery that as it harvests makes far less dust. Some are going with a short cover crop in walnut fields that could absorb dust when harvest is underway. "We will be relying on better technology in the future," says Cunha. "But it takes time to develop those things."

Critics of Senator Florez's approach to getting the SB 700 Air Bill passed in the state recently, says that the bitter argument over its content could have been avoided by working with locals rather than jamming it down our throat. In the end it was a compromise anyway like most legislation. SB 700 removed agriculture's exemption from the Clean Air Act a tough argument for ag to fight. The cost for ag to get their permits will go up. But clean air is hard to campaign against. That portion of the problem that is ag's to clean will have to be cleaned up. This will take time, but ag and dairies have to get on board. Industry itself will have to lead the way. Incentives to help the transition will help. Biofuels like ethanol and biodiesel - grown from the farm - may help do it.

No Fireplaces

This winter the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Board will institute mandatory no-burn days. Also, as of January 1 of next year, new homes can't be built with wood burning fireplaces.

Whatever the case, we can largely blame ourselves for the dust cloud over our heads. The Valley Air Board estimates that about 11% of total emissions come into the Fresno area from the Bay Area while that percentage drops to just 7% of the problem in the south valley.

While most agree the problem is ours to solve many feel frustrated by the fact valley residents can have little impact on the constant stream of trucks and cars that travel through the valley each day dumping on our airshed without controls, monitoring or near term regulatory fixes on the horizon.

[Fresno Bee editorial, September 22, 2003:](#)

An attempt to create a separate plan for cleaning up the air in three North Valley counties went down to defeat last week, courtesy of the five southernmost counties in the Valley air district.

The idea might have stood on its own merits, but there was too much baggage attached to it for the southern counties to handle. The northern counties -- San Joaquin, Stanislaus and Merced -- had earlier made noises about seceding altogether from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, and suspicions ran deep in some quarters that the "study" suggestion was just a less direct avenue to that same end.

It's probably for the best that the effort was killed, though it may not seem so to north county officials and residents. They correctly point out that their counties and cities suffer far fewer violations of air standards than Fresno, Madera, Kings, Tulare and Kern counties, and shouldn't have to bear the same burdens in cleaning up.

But one of the reasons those three counties have cleaner air is that much of the pollution they create flows into the southern parts of the Valley, just as a portion of valleywide pollution is actually borne in by winds from the Bay Area. Bay Area residents have seen tighter restrictions

on their own behavior -- they are now subject to the more rigid Smog Check II testing of their vehicles -- and they have accepted that burden, though not without a good deal of grumbling.

Complicating the situation just now is the impending decision by the Valley air district on whether or not to ask for a voluntary designation of "extreme" nonattainment of federal air standards. The decision is expected in January, and may prove necessary to forestall severe federal sanctions on Valley businesses and communities next spring.

No one is anxious to make the sort of changes we must make to clean up our air. There is already a terribly strong tendency among us to blame everyone but ourselves. Agriculture feels put upon because of the success of recent legislation that will force many changes on their operations. All of us know that automobiles are the single biggest problem -- and everyone of us wants someone else to give up the car.

But the air is indivisible. We all breathe it, we are all responsible for its pollution. It's up to all of us to fix it.