

## **Study: Valley would reap billions from high speed rail**

By Stacey Shepard, Californian staff writer  
Bakersfield Californian, Thursday, Oct. 2, 2008

The San Joaquin Valley could reap billions in economic benefits if voters approve the statewide high-speed rail system in November, according to a report released Wednesday.

"In my opinion, high-speed rail will materially and positively impact economic development in Central Valley," said Shawn Kantor, a University of California, Merced economics professor who presented the study to the California High-Speed Rail Authority at a meeting in Fresno. "This is one of those times when citizens can make wise decisions."

The report, commissioned by the rail authority, projected the long-term regional impacts of the \$40 billion rail project on the area from Bakersfield to Sacramento.

At full build-out, the high-speed rail would run from San Diego to the Bay Area, with about 40 percent of the track running through the Central Valley, including a stop in Bakersfield. From Bakersfield, it would take about 50 minutes to get to Los Angeles and just less than two hours to get to San Francisco.

Critics, such as the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, have been critical of the funding for high-speed rail. They say the \$10 billion proposed in Proposition 1A is only a "down payment."

According to Kantor's findings:

- Central Valley residents would save \$3 billion in direct costs by traveling on the high-speed train instead of by car or plane. The savings were based on decreased traffic congestion, [reduced air pollution](#) and lower risk of car accidents along with lower travel costs, time savings and higher productivity gained by shorter, cheaper commutes and the ability to do work on the train.
- Between \$6 billion and \$16 billion of the \$40 billion it would cost to build the train would be spent in the Central Valley.
- The high-speed train would help level the playing field for business growth in the Central Valley. Increased accessibility, lower transportation costs and the low cost of doing business in the valley would attract new types of companies that traditionally locate in major urban markets.

As new jobs are created — primarily in the service, transportation, communications, utilities, finance and insurance sectors — income in the Central Valley could catch up to other parts of the state, potentially increasing taxable earning by \$48 billion per year.

Overall, Kantor said, the Central Valley would be getting a good deal on the rail project because the bond to fund it would be paid back with state revenues, and the valley contributes less state revenue than other parts of the state.

"We're getting 40 percent of the track and we're not paying our proportionate share," he said.

"There will be no greater shot in the arm than the passage of Proposition 1A," said Rep. Jim Costa, D-Fresno, referring to the \$10 billion bond measure on the November ballot to fund the state's share of the project.

Costa, a longtime rail advocate, called the bullet train initiative "an economic stimulus package that will allow Californians to prosper."

## **Commission to weigh massive retail project**

By John Cox, Californian staff writer  
Bakersfield Californian, Thursday, Oct. 2, 2008

A proposed center that would add 1 million square feet of shopping space will be considered at Thursday night's Bakersfield Planning Commission meeting.

The Bakersfield Gateway project would be on Highway 99, between Hosking Avenue and Berkshire Road. It would feature a Bass Pro Shops, other stores, restaurants, a movie theater and maybe a hotel.

The commission will consider whether to recommend approval on several land-use requests and certify an environmental impact report. The City Council has final approval.

Project proponents say growth in south Bakersfield is driving the need for more shopping options. They said Gateway would add about 1,500 jobs when it's complete.

Presently, there's not access from the site to the freeway. An interchange at Highway 99 and Hosking is planned, and its construction may start in summer 2009, with completion projected for fall 2010, according to the city's report.

The first phase of the Gateway project may open in early 2011.

Project opponents include the Center for Race, Poverty and the Environment, which alleges the city's analysis does not comply with the California Environmental Quality Act. Negative impacts to noise, [air quality](#) and traffic are among the center's and others' concerns.

About five intersections in the project area will have traffic problems regardless of Gateway's presence, said Marc Gauthier, a principal planner with the city of Bakersfield.

Project opponents urged the city to adopt an alternative proposal which would instead feature 650,000 square feet of retail space. But the city's environmental impact report consultant deemed that option economically infeasible.

The commission will also consider:

- A tract map for 185 condominiums on the south side of Casa Club Drive, east of Miramonte Drive, within the Rio Bravo Country Club community.
- Applicant Andrew Fuller proposed 28-foot-wide streets within the gated property. But the city's fire and public works departments said internal streets must be 32 feet wide so emergency vehicles and garbage trucks can navigate them.
- A zone change from residential to commercial to facilitate development of a 14-screen movie theater, a restaurant and parking lots near East Hills Mall, north of Mall View Road and south of Highway 178.
- A request to change zoning that would permit low-density housing to multi-family units at the northeast corner of Monitor Street and Hosking Avenue.
- A zone change that would convert patches of land used for farming to accommodate future commercial and housing developments on the southwest corner of Taft Highway and Chevalier Road.

## **Gas company fined for violating inspection laws**

Lodi News Sentinel, Thursday, October 2, 2008

Airgas Inc., which has a fleet location in Lodi, must pay \$43,000 for violating diesel truck inspection laws, state officials said Wednesday.

The California Air Resources Board fined the gas distributor after auditing the company and finding that it had not conducted annual inspections at 22 locations in Northern California, including on in Lodi.

In addition to paying the fine, Pennsylvania-based Airgas must train its employees about diesel emissions inspections, provide proof that the inspections are being carried out for the next four years and make sure all trucks meet federal emissions standards.

Of the fine, \$32,250 will go to the California Air Pollution Control Fund and \$10,750 will go to Peralta Community College District to fund emission education classes, according to a news release from the state air board.

## **New law fights city sprawl**

**Local leaders don't think it'll have much impact on development.**

By Scott Jason

Merced Sun-Star, Thursday, October 2, 2008

Local leaders say an anti-sprawl bill to help fight global warming signed Tuesday by Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger may not change how and where Merced grows.

SB 375 offers incentives for developers to build more high-density housing complexes that would encourage people to bike, walk or use public transit to get to work.

The problem is that many people in Merced don't like the idea of big-city living in a rural county.

Local leaders say that it will take much more than a piece of legislation to end Californians' reliance on cars and encourage Mercedians to live the American Dream without a backyard.

"We're not a major metropolitan area," Merced County Association of Governments Executive Director Jesse Brown said. "We're not San Francisco. We're not Sacramento. We're not even Fresno."

The law, carried by Sen. Darrell Steinberg, connects how an area grows to global warming.

It requires the California Air Resources Board to set targets by September 2010 to cut greenhouse gas emissions across the state.

It also requires organizations, such as MCAG, to write sustainable community plans. It's not mandatory that counties and cities follow the plans.

Cars are still the biggest polluters in the state and could be one of the easier ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The law encourages cities to look at high-density building as a way to cut the number of cars on the road.

It allows those types of projects near mass-transit stations to be exempt from some environmental laws -- an incentive for developers to move away from sprawling subdivisions that encourage driving.

Brown said it's not enough of a carrot for much to change. "There has to be some meaningful financial incentive for the developer," he said.

Cutting out a few environmental reviews wouldn't affect a developer's bottom line enough to switch from subdivisions to condominiums.

"I don't think people move to Merced so they can live in that kind of housing development," Brown explained.

Melissa Kelly-Ortega, with the Merced-Mariposa County Asthma Coalition, urged local residents to pressure their City Council and Board of Supervisors to follow the sustainable living plans.

"We'll all have to realize that global climate change must be addressed," she said. "One way is how we grow."

Merced's Interim City Manager Jim Marshall said that, until recently, there were few empty lots within the city that needed to be developed.

The city has tried to encourage other forms of transportation since 1997 when it approved its general plan update.

New subdivisions with bike paths and nearby markets may reduce the need to drive, but it doesn't mean people change their habits. "Will they get out of their car and walk?" Marshall asked. "(Driving) is a mind-set that pervades California."

Besides that, he said, high-density projects typically meet with a not-in-my-backyard attitude from residents near the project.

In big cities, parking is hard and public transportation is easy, which creates a good reason not to drive, he noted. That's not the case in Merced, where many residents complain that there's not enough parking.

Another problem with creating Merced housing complexes to serve the city's major employers, such as the county government or school districts, is that their offices are spread throughout the area and not centrally located, he explained.

Still, Marshall said, there will come a time that land's cost and environmental restrictions will make builders look up and not out. The law's backers consider this to be the foundation of that development.

### **Governor vetoed port air cleanup bill**

By Josh Richman, Oakland Tribune

In the Contra Costa Times, Thursday, October 2, 2008

A bill that would've raised as much as \$300 million a year to fight air pollution around the ports of Oakland, Long Beach and Los Angeles was among Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger's last-minute vetoes Tuesday.

Republican vice-presidential nominee and Alaska Gov. Sarah Palin had asked Schwarzenegger last month to veto this bill, fearing it would increase the cost of goods shipped through California ports to Alaska. Now some critics see a political motive, a kowtow to big business or both behind Schwarzenegger's action.

"I have to conclude it had something to do with it," Assemblyman Sandre Swanson, D-Alameda, said Wednesday of Palin's request, calling the bill "good public policy" and calling the governor's veto "a clear contradiction of everything he has articulated about a green California."

State Senate President Pro Tem Don Perata, D-Oakland, said it's "such a shame the governor listened to business interests and vetoed this bill. ... His own administration has concluded that diesel pollution from ports kills hundreds of people each year, and gives thousands of kids asthma."

State Sen. Alan Lowenthal, D-Long Beach, the bill's author, said he'd "held off on this bill last year at the request of Governor Schwarzenegger, and spent the whole year working with his office. Unfortunately, the pressure from Governor Palin and multinational corporations was too much for him."

And Planning and Conservation League legislative director Tina Andolina said Schwarzenegger "went back on his word and vetoed the best solution we have to the devastating pollution plaguing communities near the ports and other goods movement corridors."

SB 974, by state Sen. Alan Lowenthal, D-Long Beach, would've imposed a fee of up to \$30 per shipping container processed in the Ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach and Oakland, with the revenue to be spent on relieving ground traffic and air pollution in communities around the ports.

It was supported by environmental and health organizations, and opposed generally by retailers and manufacturers moving cargo through the ports.

The Assembly passed it July 15 on a 46-24 vote, and the state Senate passed it Aug. 5 on a 22-10 vote.

Schwarzenegger's veto message Tuesday said the bill lacks "necessary assurances that projects will achieve the greatest cost-effectiveness, emission reductions, and public health protection.

Also, the bill does not adequately provide the San Joaquin Valley with access to funds to reduce pollution related to container cargo coming directly to and from the ports throughout the Valley."

The bill lacks a means of coordinating and integrating infrastructure projects and plans, providing no "long-term, strategic planning for the state's goods movement infrastructure," he wrote, adding the bill also "misses the opportunity to leverage billions of dollars in available funding through public-private partnerships, which could otherwise increase investments in infrastructure geometrically."

Schwarzenegger had cited the bill Friday in San Francisco, telling a Commonwealth Club of California audience that he'd be taking a close look at it.

The California Air Resources Board issued a report in March which found West Oakland residents are at significantly higher risk of developing cancer due to diesel particulate emissions from the Port of Oakland.

## **Governor nixes port bill that Palin opposed**

By Samantha Young, Associated Press Writer

In the Hanford Sentinel, Thursday, Oct. 2, 2008

SACRAMENTO -- Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger on Tuesday vetoed legislation that would have imposed a pollution fee on cargo ships at California's ports, siding with Alaska Gov. Sarah Palin. The fee would have paid for clean-air programs but was opposed by the Republican vice presidential nominee, who wrote to Schwarzenegger saying it would lead to higher costs on goods shipped to her state. She asked Schwarzenegger to reject the bill in a letter dated the day before she was named Sen. John McCain's running mate.

Schwarzenegger has endorsed McCain's presidential bid.

The bill by Democratic Sen. Alan Lowenthal would have imposed a fee of up to \$60 for each 40-foot cargo container moving through the ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach and Oakland. The Southern California port complex is the nation's largest and handles more than 40 percent of the nation's goods; Oakland is the fourth busiest.

In a veto message issued late Tuesday night, the governor said he rejected the bill in part because it lacked accountability. He also said it failed to direct money to the Central Valley, which has some of the nation's dirtiest air and gets much of the truck traffic going to and from the ports.

"Given the current economic downturn, it is vitally important that the state does not worsen the situation by mandating added costs on business that do not provide any public benefit," Schwarzenegger said.

Schwarzenegger vetoed similar legislation two years ago over concerns a port fee would drive cargo ships to other states.

Lowenthal, of Long Beach, had modified his bill in hopes of winning Schwarzenegger's signature. Environmentalists had urged the governor to make good on his campaign promise to clean up the state's air.

It was among the last set of bills the governor acted on before a midnight constitutional deadline.

"I'm shocked," Lowenthal said after being told of the veto. "The governor is just wrong. He doesn't mention the thousands and thousands of people who are dying prematurely in southern California."

Supporters of the bill estimated the fee would bring in at least \$300 million a year to fund programs that clean up the lingering smog at port communities. State air regulators say 3,700 premature deaths each year can be attributed to pollution at California's ports.

Alaska and Hawaii and a host of major retailers that import goods from Asia objected, arguing that the pollution charge would have raised consumer prices.

"Shipping costs have increased significantly with the rising price of fuel, and these higher costs are quickly passed onto Alaskans," Palin wrote in her Aug. 28 letter to Schwarzenegger. "This tax makes the situation worse."

Messages left during business hours with the governor's office in Alaska and the McCain campaign were not returned.

Hawaii Gov. Linda Lingle and the congressional delegations from Alaska and Hawaii also urged Schwarzenegger to oppose the fee because of the costs. Instead, they asked Schwarzenegger to modify the bill and exclude domestic commerce between U.S. ports.

Supporters say the fee could have been used to develop cleaner truck and train engines, build railroad overpasses to avoid traffic idling for long periods as trains pass and implement other programs that reduce diesel pollution.

"There's a lot of things that take money to be realized," said Martin Schlageter, campaign director at the Coalition for Clean Air. "The bottom line is you're turning your back on an opportunity to spend money to clean up the air."

Schwarzenegger said the legislation would have allowed ports to spend money with little state oversight.

"This bill does not provide necessary assurances that projects will achieve the greatest cost-effectiveness, emission reductions, and public health protection," Schwarzenegger said.

He also pointed to bonds approved by voters in 2006 that set aside \$1 billion to improve air quality, \$2.1 billion for infrastructure improvements to trade routes and \$100 million for port security.

In his veto message, Schwarzenegger did not address the objections from Alaska or Hawaii. His communications director, Matt David, did not immediately respond to an inquiry about whether Palin's letter played any role in Schwarzenegger's veto decision.

Lowenthal accused the governor of seeking last-minute amendments to a bill he had praised the year before. He said the governor was "not paying attention" if he thought \$1 billion would solve California's port pollution problems.

"The governor has really sold us out to the large business interests," Lowenthal said. "I will never work with the governor on this bill again. I will wait until there are people who honestly want to work with me on this bill."

## **Anti-pollution bill is vetoed by governor**

By Kristopher Hanson, Staff Writer  
L.A. Daily News, Thursday, October 02, 2008

Southern California health advocates reacted with anger Wednesday to Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger's veto of an anti-pollution bill aimed at cleaning up smog in and around the state's ports and trade corridors.

The bill, SB 974 by state Sen. Alan Lowenthal, would have raised \$300 million annually for congestion relief and clean-air technologies.

"This is a sad day for California," said Lowenthal, D-Long Beach. "There is a dark cloud over our heads and that dark cloud is cancer. The governor could have shrunken or eliminated that cloud, but chose to side with out-of-state executives instead."

SB 974 would have established a \$30 fee on the 18 million or so 20-foot-equivalent containers moved annually through the ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach and Oakland.

Its passage had been a top priority for many area conservationists, elected leaders and health advocates, who say pollution from trucks, trains and ships moving freight through California contributes to 3,700 premature deaths annually.

The claim is backed up by the California Air Resources Board, which cites health studies showing that diesel exhaust contributes to asthma, lung cancer and heart disease.

"It's disgusting that he has sided with polluters over the health and well-being of those here at home," said Martin Schlageter, campaign director at the Coalition for Clean Air in Los Angeles.

In a veto message, Schwarzenegger said the timing wasn't right, given the nation's economic turmoil.

"Given the current economic downturn, it is vitally important that the state does not worsen the situation by mandating added costs on businesses that do not provide any public benefit," Schwarzenegger wrote. "Careful consideration must be given to any proposed solution as to its potential impact to our state's economy."

Alaska Gov. Sarah Palin, the Republican vice presidential nominee, and the International Longshore and Warehouse Union both urged Schwarzenegger to veto the bill.

Palin argued that both consumers and the economy in California and Alaska would suffer as a result of the fee. The ILWU opposed the fee because it would have come on top of several other assessments on cargo containers moving through the ports.

Economists said the \$30 fee would have added a minimal cost to consumers - perhaps 5 cents on a pair of sneakers moved through a California port.

A 2007 economic study commissioned by the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach estimated the value of goods inside a 40-foot container averaged \$50,000.

The Natural Resources Defense Council said money spent cleaning up port pollution would have lessened health impacts and saved up to \$1.9 billion in hospital costs in the coming decade.

"Millions of people live within miles of the ports of Oakland, Los Angeles and Long Beach and today, they will continue to breathe the life-shortening fumes of diesel exhaust," said Victoria Rome of the NRDC.

Lowenthal accused Schwarzenegger of bowing to pressure from corporate interests and from Palin, whose candidacy he supports.

"Unfortunately, the pressure from Governor Palin and multinational corporations was too much for him and the governor chose those interests over the health and well-being of Californians," Lowenthal said.

Saying he was incensed at being misled by Schwarzenegger, who indicated earlier in the year he would sign the bill, Lowenthal vowed to wait until Schwarzenegger is out of office in 2010 before reintroducing the bill.

"We need to stand up and fight this ourselves and hopefully, some day, we'll have a governor that will fight for California as well," Lowenthal said in an e-mailed statement.

The veto comes as port authorities in Los Angeles and Long Beach prepare to collect a \$35 container fee on cargo moved off the docks by the oldest, most polluting diesel trucks.

The fee, set to begin Jan. 1, will be used to help replace an estimated 16,000 rigs now working in the harbor during the next five years.

Port authorities this week banned diesel trucks built before 1989 from entering waterfront terminals. The ban proceeds progressively through 2012, when only trucks meeting federal 2007 emission standards are allowed.

## **2,000 diesel trucks built before 1989 banned at L.A., Long Beach ports**

By Art Marroquin, Staff Writer

L.A. Daily News, Thursday, October 02, 2008

The ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach formally launched a \$1.6 billion initiative on Wednesday aimed at reducing diesel truck emissions by 80 percent within five years.

The first phase of the Clean Trucks Program immediately bans about 2,000 diesel trucks built before 1989 - an estimated 10 percent of the rigs that haul goods to and from the nation's busiest port complex.

The move is expected to remove 350 tons of harmful diesel emissions, which make up about 30 percent of the pollution generated by trucks each year.

"Today, the children of Los Angeles and the South Bay are breathing easier," said Los Angeles Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, who touted the program as his "most significant environmental achievement" since taking office in 2005.

Although an estimated 5 percent to 10 percent of the trucks trying to enter port terminals were turned away Wednesday because they violated the new standards, officials said operations ran smoothly.

So far, nearly 600 trucking companies with more than 20,000 trucks have applied for the so-called concession contracts needed to access terminals at the Los Angeles port. The Port of Long Beach has received applications from more than 750 carriers with about 15,000 trucks.

The American Trucking Association had opposed the program, saying that the concession contract was an effort to control the trucking industry, which was deregulated in 1980.

The truck program is part of the Clean Air Action Plan designed to cut harmful diesel emissions by 45 percent by 2012. That's when all trucks will have to meet 2007 vehicle emissions standards.

"We are a long way from finished," said Martin Schlageter, advocacy director for the Coalition for Clean Air. "There were many naysayers who said Oct. 1 is too soon, but community members said that Oct. 1 should have come quicker."

## **L.A., Long Beach ports inaugurate new anti-smog plan**

**Trucks moving goods in and out of the complex must meet tougher antipollution laws; 2,000 dirty diesel big rigs are banned. Despite compliance checks, cargo moves smoothly.**

By Louis Sahagun and Ronald D. White, staff writers

L.A. Times, Thursday, October 2, 2008

A landmark pollution-control program at the nation's busiest port complex was launched Wednesday with an immediate ban on 2,000 of the region's diesel-spewing big rigs and few reports of backups or unusual delays in the flow of cargo.

An estimated 95% of the trucks lining up for the starting 8 a.m. shift at the adjacent ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach had stickers on their windshields and doors indicating that they were in compliance with new rules restricting access to the gateway for 40% of the nation's imported goods. Trucks without stickers were turned away.

Against a backdrop of cargo ships docked beside massive cranes, Los Angeles Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa and Long Beach Mayor Bob Foster held a news conference to inaugurate the Clean Truck Program forged by environmentalists, drivers, shippers, community leaders and the ports during two years of contentious debates and legal challenges.

"Ports across the world have their eyes on us as a model for the future because today the cornerstone of the world's most comprehensive plan to clean up a major port hits the road," Villaraigosa said. "We will not disappoint them, nor will we disappoint all the Angelenos who suffer from emphysema, throat cancer and mouth cancer caused by this pollution."

Later, port authorities and reporters gathered at a nearby Port of Los Angeles recycling yard to witness the crushing and scrapping of two trucks barred by the program. Among the onlookers was Jorge Sibrian, 57, a port trucker since 1992 and former owner of one of the rigs that was ripped to pieces by a massive iron claw, then shredded into scrap metal.

Wearing a blue hard hat and safety goggles, Sibrian nodded toward the wreckage and said, "That's my baby. I had her 12 years. She's been everywhere."

"Everything comes to an end, and this is the end for her," added Sibrian, who sold the truck to the Los Angeles port for \$5,000. "Hopefully, it's for a good cause."

Under the program's first phase, trucks built before 1989 were banned as of Wednesday. When fully implemented in 2012, only trucks meeting 2007 emissions standards will be allowed to enter the ports.

Although the ports met their Oct. 1 deadline, two critical components of the program were missing. An electronic vehicle-monitoring system was not in place, and the ports had yet to start collecting the \$35 per-cargo-container fee that is supposed to fund the \$1.6-billion truck replacement program.

And a related effort to curb port pollution has been put on hold. On Tuesday, Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger vetoed the multibillion-dollar proposal, arguing that the related cargo fees would harm an already suffering economy.

The measure, SB 974 by Sen. Alan Lowenthal (D-Long Beach), would have allowed the collection of \$60 for each 40-foot container that moved through the ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach or Oakland. The \$400 million raised annually would have gone into reducing traffic congestion and putting cleaner-burning engines in trucks and trains.

On Wednesday, truck traffic was lower than normal because the economic slowdown has hit the ports in dramatic fashion. Through August, overall container traffic at the Port of Long Beach was down 9.9% compared with the same period last year. That included a 12.8% drop in imported goods. Overall traffic at the Port of Los Angeles was down 4.6%, including a 7.2% drop in imports.

Fearing a traffic jam of trucks and drivers being turned away in droves, trucker Eduardo Valladares arrived early enough to be second in line at a Long Beach terminal. He was pleasantly surprised.

"This is not so bad," said Valladares, 40, who drives a battered blue Freightliner. "At least I can work today."

The program's goal is to rid local skies of tons of carcinogenic pollution and particulates and to persuade environmentalists to stop raising legal objections to expansion projects designed to meet future growth at the ports.

The ports' fleet of about 16,800 trucks account for more smog and soot than all 6 million cars in the region, and their diesel emissions cause 1,200 premature deaths annually, according to the California Air Resources Board. Asthma rates among children living in neighborhoods near the ports are double the national average, and dock workers and drivers face significantly higher risks of lung and throat cancer, according to the U.S. Census Bureau and local studies.

"My hat is off to the mayors who transformed talk of cleaning the air into action," said Martin Schlageter, campaign director of the Coalition for Clean Air. "Powerful institutional forces representing billions of dollars had for years urged that the ports not do anything. But the mayors and the ports stood firm."

The program, which is a key component of the Clean Air Action Plan designed to slash overall emissions at the ports by 45% by 2012, was hotly contested by the nation's largest trucking association. Now, an ongoing Federal Maritime Commission investigation looms over the program.

The investigation, which commission officials warned could lead to a cease and desist order that would send the ports back to the drawing boards, would address whether the Port of Los Angeles violated federal maritime regulations and practices by insisting that trucking firms hire port drivers as employees. The Port of Long Beach adopted a plan that allows both independent operators and employee truckers to access its terminals.

Ports from San Diego to Seattle have expressed an interest in adopting similar programs to get cleaner-burning trucks on the road. However, some shipping interests believe the concept may be a hard sell elsewhere.

"You're seeing an aggressive approach at these ports because of the overall air quality concerns of that region, the magnitude of the cargo they have to move, and because of community concerns about health," said Meredith Martino, manager of government relations and environmental policy for the American Assn. of Port Authorities. "But those are not the top priorities of every port."

Los Angeles City Councilwoman Janice Hahn, whose district includes the Port of Los Angeles, would disagree.

"No longer do we have to decide whether we can have good jobs or good health," she said. "Today, we can have both."

### **Houston and L.A. only 2 cities with 'severe' smog**

The Associated Press

In the Contra Costa Times and other papers, Thursday, October 02, 2008

HOUSTON—The Environmental Protection Agency on Wednesday granted Gov. Rick Perry's request to classify the Houston area's smog problem as "severe," giving the region an extra nine years to meet federal health standards.

The eight-county Houston region, whose smog problem used to be classified as "moderate," now joins Los Angeles as the only two places in the nation with a severe smog problem, according to the EPA.

The Houston area now has until June 2019, instead of 2010, to meet federal air quality standards. The extension, however, is for Houston to meet the 1997 standard on ozone limits, which the EPA no longer considers safe for public health.

"What are we doing here?" said Matthew Tejada, executive director of the Galveston-Houston Association for Smog Prevention, in a story for Thursday editions of the Houston Chronicle. "We've just done a bureaucratic dance, and we're not any closer to clean air."

Perry requested the extension last year, surprising some local officials because he asked for a double bump in classification from moderate to severe, skipping over serious, which required compliance by 2013.

The move was praised by the Greater Houston Partnership, a business association that expressed confidence in the region's ability to meet the 2019 target for air quality.

"The partnership believes that improvement in air quality is important in order to maintain a robust, viable economic climate and to improve public health in the region," spokeswoman Christina Garza said.

### **Santa Clarita receives award for campaign to improve air quality**

By Jerry Berrios, Staff Writer

L.A. Daily News, Thursday, October 2, 2008

SANTA CLARITA - The city of Santa Clarita received the Model Community Achievement Award on Wednesday from the South Coast Air Quality Management District for its efforts to improve air quality.

Mayor Bob Kellar accepted the honor at the district's annual Clean Air Awards luncheon at the Millennium Biltmore Hotel in downtown Los Angeles. The award means the city and the community are working together to improve the environment, said Travis Lange, Santa Clarita's environmental services manager.

The city was lauded for its environmentally friendly efforts, including Bike to Work Day, transit-oriented development plans and urban forestry programs.

In May, about 270 people - including 34 city employees - participated in the fifth annual Bike to Work Day.

In the city's redevelopment plan for downtown Newhall, officials made sure to incorporate transit options - including commuter rail - for future residents in the hopes that they will use their cars less or possibly get rid of them.

Completed in 2006, the city's transit maintenance facility has several green features to keep the building cool and minimize water usage. Santa Clarita's urban forestry division organizes volunteer tree plantings throughout the city and arranges educational programs at local schools.

## **Yellowstone National Park speeds up action on snow machines**

**An environmental assessment allowing for the use of snowmobiles and snow coaches will be ready by next month, a spokesman says. The park's winter operations could be shut down if a plan is lacking.**

By Julie Cart, staff writer

L.A. Times, Thursday, October 2, 2008

In an about-face, officials at Yellowstone National Park said Wednesday that they would quickly craft a plan to allow snowmobiles and snow coaches into the park in time for the winter season.

After a federal judge ruled two weeks ago that Yellowstone's snowmobile-use proposal was unacceptable because it would put the health of visitors and animals at risk, park officials said they would not be able to hammer out a new plan before the season starts Dec. 15. The impasse had threatened to shut down much of Yellowstone's winter operations for the first time in decades.

On Monday, park Supt. Suzanne Lewis told a business group in Cody, Wyo., that it was possible that only snowshoers and cross-country skiers would be allowed into Yellowstone. But on Wednesday, park spokesman Al Nash said that an environmental assessment allowing for the use of snow machines would be ready by early next month, followed by a 15-day comment period.

Conservation groups -- which support making the park accessible through snow coaches and a limited number of snowmobiles -- cautiously applauded the announcement.

"It's good news," said Bill Wade, a former park service superintendent and leader of a group of agency retirees who oppose Yellowstone's snowmobile regulations. But the better option, Wade said, would have been allowing solely snow coaches, which are multi-passenger vans on tracks and skis, because they are less-polluting and not as noisy as snowmobiles. Their use has increased 89% since 2002 as visitors seek a more comfortable experience complete with educational guides.

The scramble began after federal Judge Emmett G. Sullivan ruled that the snowmobile regulations Yellowstone had in place violated the "fundamental purpose of the national system . . . to conserve park resources and values."

Sullivan threw out the rules and told the park to come up with something environmentally acceptable. That ruling meant there would be no regulations in place for motorized access to the park this winter.

Last year, as many as 720 snowmobiles a day were allowed in Yellowstone. That number would have been reduced to 540 per day under the plan Sullivan rejected. Conservation groups have argued that those numbers don't reflect actual visitor use.

Last year, the average daily number of snowmobiles in Yellowstone was 290, Nash said.

The switch to snow coaches has been gaining acceptance in the communities surrounding Yellowstone, where tourism has been disrupted in recent years because of lawsuits and judicial reversals regarding the park's winter-use plans.

Under President Clinton, snowmobiles were to be phased out after studies found their use negatively affected visitor and employee health as well as the welfare of wildlife. The Bush administration reversed that policy.

In the last eight years, the park has conducted scientific analyses on the effects of snowmobiles at Yellowstone. The reports all concluded that snowmobiles result in unhealthy air and unacceptable noise for humans and wildlife.

## **Report: Tougher European Climate Rules Would Save Money and Lengthen Lives**

By James Kanter, N.Y. Times  
Thursday, Oct. 2, 2008

The European Union has said it is prepared to raise its target for cutting greenhouse gases to 30 percent from 20 percent – but only if there are similar pledges to cut emissions from other countries in the industrialized world. In a report issued on Thursday, health and environment campaigners called on the E.U. to adopt the more ambitious target anyway, because it will lengthen European lives — and save money.

Representatives from the Health and the Environment Alliance, the Climate Action Network Europe and WWF, say the higher target could generate additional health savings of 25 million euros (about \$34 million) each year by 2020, bringing the total annual savings to 76 billion euros (\$105 billion).

The groups based the calculation on economic evaluations of how people will live longer and healthier lives by breathing cleaner air, how industry will make savings from reduced loss of working days, and how governments will benefit from reduced costs to health services.

They say the evidence comes from a large number of studies published over the last 20 years that show that sulphur dioxide, nitrogen oxide and particulate matter from fossil fuel emissions are linked to higher rates of death and respiratory illnesses, including bronchitis and the exacerbation of asthma symptoms, and cardiac problems.

“Particularly compelling,” the report stated, “are the results of ‘intervention’ studies in which population health is monitored following action to reduce air pollution concentrations, such as after the ban on coal burning in Dublin, Ireland.”

The report comes as E.U. legislators and governments prepare to decide whether to adopt ambitious climate change laws – and as lobbying in Brussels is reaching feverish levels. Major industries like electricity, steel and cement are battling against a wide range of measures, including some that would force them to purchase many more carbon allowances than before.

(Europe established the world’s largest greenhouse gas market three years ago.)

Industry representatives have warned that climate regulation comes with a huge price tag, saying that tougher rules would be too economically painful, and would lead them to freeze investment in Europe, or even drive their business abroad. Some of the direst warnings have come from the automotive and airline industries.

The health and environmental campaigners, however, say that three of the main air pollutants that operate at “continental scale” – fine particles, nitrogen oxides and sulfur dioxide – are released by some of the same major sources of CO<sub>2</sub>, and that they can be reduced by many measures taken to control CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, at no extra cost to industry.

The campaigners also say industry currently is paying 83 billion euros (about \$115 billion) each year to meet air pollution rules, and that this would fall by significantly more than 10 billion euros (\$14 billion) each year under a tough CO<sub>2</sub> target, because of increased use of renewable sources of energy and reduced demand for the most polluting fuels.

"The report clearly demonstrates what scientists, economists, academics and N.G.O.s have said before: action on climate change produces win-win-win scenarios," said Tomas Wyns, a policy officer at the Climate Action Network Europe.

## **China Keeps Car Rules Imposed for Olympics**

By Maureen Fan, Washington Post Foreign Service  
Washington Post Thursday, October 2, 2008

BEIJING, Oct. 1 -- The government began taking 30 percent of its cars in the capital off the roads Wednesday in an attempt to make permanent some of the traffic restrictions imposed during the Olympic Games, officials and media reports said.

Beginning Oct. 11, Chinese motorists will also stop driving one workday a week, based on the final number on their license plates. The new rules should take 800,000 vehicles off the roads each day, according to reports quoting Wang Zhaorong of Beijing's Municipal Traffic Committee. There are 3.5 million cars in Beijing, and more than 1,000 vehicles are added each day, according to government statistics.

The attempt to manage traffic is one of the first concrete signs of possible lasting change as a result of the Olympics. The new restrictions come as the capital's traffic has once again surged and as smoggy skies have returned following the lifting of rules imposed from July 20 to Sept. 20 for the Olympics and the Paralympic Games. In an all-out effort to try to clear the air for millions of athletes and visitors, Beijing ordered more than a million cars off the roads, shut down polluting factories and halted heavy truck traffic.

Many in China seemed to approve, taking to the Internet to mostly praise the measures, which in the end produced bluer skies and generally smoother traffic flows. A survey of 5,058 people by the New Beijing News last month showed 68.9 percent supported the traffic controls based on odd- and even-numbered license plates, 19 percent objected to them and 12.1 percent had no opinion. Asked what they would do if the restrictions were to continue, 18 percent of interviewees said they would buy another car.

"Recently, it takes me nearly twice as long to commute than it did during the Olympics," said Zhang Fengyan, 30, an appliance salesman. "The difference is too big. I'd love it if they can make this rule permanent."

There were some problems during the Olympics: A special Olympic lane meant that cars had to crowd into two remaining lanes, and the slower traffic produced greater emissions, experts and officials said. The city's air pollution index initially climbed despite the restrictions.

The Beijing Environmental Protection Bureau declined to release details about pollution components, which would have allowed outside experts to monitor progress.

The air pollution index, which is based on an average from 27 monitoring stations across the city, has increased recently, from 26 last Wednesday to 104 a week later. Anything above 100 is considered dangerous to the health of sensitive individuals.

It was unclear how the city would enforce the provision that 30 percent of government cars not take to the streets. Government spokesmen were unavailable because of a nationwide holiday, and the immediate impact was difficult to determine.

In addition to the traffic changes, businesses will begin staggering their hours, with large department stores opening at 10 a.m. and other offices beginning work between 8:30 and 9:30 a.m., state media reports said. Parking fees downtown will also be increased to encourage people to use public transportation. The rules will last until April, when officials will decide whether to continue the restrictions.

Car salesman Liu Ce, manager of Beijing Xinshan Trade Center, said the city should do more to improve public transportation "so that people will choose public transportation naturally instead of forcing people to do so or irritating people who want to buy new cars."

Others questioned whether government drivers would obey the new rule and said motorists feel overwhelmed.

"Drivers already feel numb," said telecommunications engineer Li Haibin, 29. "People got used to the faster driving times during the last few months. Now, wherever I go, there's a traffic jam."

[Daily Breeze Editorial in the L.A. Daily News, Thursday, October 2, 2008:](#)

### **Educating the governor**

The governor's last-minute vetoes Tuesday spared Californians a slew of burdensome legislation, which should be reason to celebrate. Instead, he's getting a slew of criticism.

But some of it is justified. Sen. Alan Lowenthal, D-Long Beach, for example, says he is going to give up trying to work with Schwarzenegger because the governor vetoed his bill putting a \$30 fee on shipping containers.

This was Lowenthal's third attempt at getting the governor to sign off on a fee to help pay for cleaning up pollution caused by transporting the containers. He was optimistic this time, and so were we.

What better way to pay for the cleanup, than to attach a fee to the cause of the problem? And it isn't as though it would be a hardship, at least not to consumers. On average, a container holds \$50,000 worth of merchandise, which means it would have added 6 cents to the price of a \$100 import.

Consumers aren't the issue, though. Shippers and retailers think bigger, in terms of thousands or millions of containers. They don't want the fees.

But we don't want the pollution. Tolerating it means we have to subsidize cheap imports with our health. Good health doesn't translate easily into dollars, but the cost of restoring it does, and even at that crass level the equation makes no sense at all.

The governor says that turbulent economic times are no time to raise taxes, which is generally true, and nobody denies that fees are a form of taxation. But a fee that pays directly for a benefit as fundamental as removing diesel poisons from the air is the best form of taxation. Consumers, we venture to say, would be glad to pay the extra 6 cents, and even if they weren't, they should have to pay it anyway.

But Lowenthal shouldn't give up. He should listen to the same wisdom he once imparted as a professor of psychology. Reframe the argument. Manage anger. Rather than demonize, share mutual concerns and objectives. Above all, concentrate on what you do want, not what you don't want.

That's not precisely Psych 101, but it's precisely what's called for now.

Lowenthal should start over again next session with a similar bill. Remember, we all share similar concerns when it comes to diesel pollution, and the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach are the region's biggest single source of it.

This is no time to let up. The governor just needs some educating.

[Merced Sun-Star Editorial, Thursday, October 2, 2008:](#)

### **Our View: Cities benefit as air board expands**

The Valley air district may soon have its full complement of board members, thanks to a bill signed by the governor Tuesday.

It's a welcome change in the makeup of the regional air board, which has been dominated by supervisors from the eight counties that make up the district.

Legislation last year increased the size of the governing board from 11 to 15, but there was no mechanism for appointing the five city council members from the region that bill authorized.

Under SB 1548, authored by state Sens. Dean Florez, D-Shafter, and Mike Machado, D-Linden, city councils throughout the district will appoint a member to a selection committee, which in turn will choose two council members from large cities -- those with a population greater than 100,000 -- and three council members from smaller cities in the district.

They will be joined by two new members appointed by the governor -- a doctor (already in place) and a scientist with expertise in air quality issues (still to be filled by Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, an action we urge the governor to take with some urgency, now that his signings and vetoes are drawing to a close).

The new lineup of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District should help redress an imbalance that has existed since the district's inception. With the board heavily weighted toward county supervisors, the cities -- large and small -- of the district have been underrepresented, despite the fact that they have the majority of the Valley's population.

Most egregiously, there have been stretches in which Fresno, Bakersfield and Stockton -- the major population centers of the Valley -- have not had their own voices on the board.

And the county supervisors, by the nature of their jobs, have often leaned toward serving the interests of business and agriculture, which aren't always in the forefront of aggressive efforts to clean the air.

The eight county supervisors on the air district board will still represent a majority, though one not quite so daunting as before. That should help make the board -- and its actions -- more representative in the future.

[Modesto Bee Editorial, Thursday, October 2, 2008:](#)

### **Stanislaus needs to take part in regional planning**

Did you know Stanislaus County is an island?

We didn't either, but some of our county supervisors seem to think so -- or at least that's the impression they give by their isolationist attitude toward regional planning.

The board has been, at best, lukewarm about the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint Planning Process, a two-year-old effort to identify a common vision for land use, transportation, housing and other issues in eight counties.

But Tuesday, lukewarm deteriorated to icy. Supervisor Jim DeMartini went on a rant, saying, "This is such nonsense. I can't believe we're talking about it." He dismissed the idea of greenhouse gases, saying he didn't know what they are. (The simple answer, Supervisor DeMartini: water vapor, methane, carbon dioxide, and ozone.) On a 4-0 vote, the supervisors agreed to continue participating in blueprint discussions, but only if they can draft their own alternative.

The blueprint process is far from over, but we're seriously concerned about the troubling attitude among many local officials. We know local leaders hate to be told what to do, and they're really unhappy about Senate Bill 375, signed by Gov. Schwarzenegger on Tuesday, that establishes new incentives to discourage sprawl.

But the fact is, sprawl has caused many of the valley's problems -- air pollution, traffic, insufficient water, etc. Until the sour economy shoved everything else aside, survey after survey showed that valley residents want better long-term planning. We hope residents will let their supervisors and city council members know that they want Stanislaus County participating in this regional planning strategy. We are not an island.

[Sacramento Bee Editorial, Thursday, October 2, 2008:](#)

### **Editorial: A big step to cut sprawl, clean air**

**GOVERNOR SIGNS STEINBERG'S BILL THAT REWARDS SMARTER GROWTH**

He's no longer in the movies, but Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger still likes to engage in some drama.

As of Friday, it appeared that Schwarzenegger was ready to veto Senate Bill 375, a bill that aims to align the state's land-use policies with its fight against global warming.

Had the governor vetoed it, his environmental legacy would have been scorched, and his relationship with the bill's author – incoming Senate leader Darrell Steinberg of Sacramento – would have gone up in smoke.

But sometime between Friday and Tuesday, Schwarzenegger came to his senses. Perhaps he stopped listening to aides who were making spurious claims about SB 375. Perhaps the bill's advocates did an effective job of countering those claims. Or perhaps, amid the frenzy of vetoing and signing hundreds of bills, the governor and his top lieutenants finally had a chance to read this legislation and understand its historic significance.

More than any previous law, Steinberg's seeks to address one of California's nagging flaws – its Wild West patterns of development. Housing separated from jobs has led to traffic jams, smog, long-distance commutes, loss of valuable farmland and transit systems that can't easily build ridership.

SB 375, by itself, won't stop this kind of "dumb growth." But it will discourage it – and help create more sustainable communities – with a mix of incentives and regulatory relief.

Under the bill, the California Air Resources Board will work with each of the state's 18 metro regions on land-use strategies – similar to Sacramento's "Blueprint" – to reduce future greenhouse gases from cars and trucks.

Each region will be assigned a target for emissions reductions. If those targets are tough – CARB will decide on them in September – they will constrain the march of sprawl and reward new communities that are walkable and designed for transit. Developers will get a long-desired break from the California Environmental Quality Act, but only if their projects are aligned with a regional strategy for reducing vehicle emissions.

In signing the bill Tuesday, Schwarzenegger praised Steinberg for bringing together disparate interests for a "historic state-local partnership." He noted how the bill will help California meet its greenhouse gas rules. "Spending less time on the road is the single-most powerful way for California to reduce its carbon footprint," he said in a press release.

Unfortunately, the governor continues to press for "cleanup" changes to the bill that are unneeded. In particular, the governor wants stand-alone commercial developments to get the same relief from CEQA that smart growth housing projects would enjoy. Local governments have already zoned too much land for such retail projects (because of the tax revenue they generate). No additional incentive is needed, and Steinberg should resist pressure to immediately create one.

On the other hand, Steinberg has agreed to work with the governor on other forms of cleanup legislation, including language that would put to rest claims that SB 375 could affect the rewarding of transportation bond funds.

Steinberg should keep that commitment. This bill has generated enough drama already.

[Letter to the Fresno Bee, Thursday, Oct. 2, 2008:](#)

### **Don't cut down trees**

I was appalled to learn of the scheduled removal of 20-plus mature Modesto ash trees that line two sides of the ponding basin at Thorne and Holland avenues. The tree roots are lifting some sections of the sidewalk and occasional falling branches are a nuisance. Six of the trees have already been removed. Apparently, according to the tree removal crew, it is cheaper to cut the trees down than to maintain them.

Dozens of people use this basin daily for recreation. The shade those trees provide is a welcome relief in the summer, not to mention a habitat to hundreds of birds. We rarely, if ever, see pedestrians on the sidewalks which border the basin.

In a city that has some of the most polluted air in the United States and so few parks or green spaces for its size, one would think Fresno would try its best to preserve these trees that are natural air purifiers.

Please, Fresno, let's do the right thing for a change and not succumb to cheap and easy.

*Nadia Arnold, Fresno*

[Note: The following clip in Spanish discusses clean trucks for ports. Over 2 thousand trucks will be removed from the Long Beach and San Pedro ports. For more information on this and other Spanish clips, contact Claudia Encinas at \(559\) 230-5851.](#)

### **Camiones limpios para los puertos**

#### **Sacan de circulación dos mil vehículos de carga de la zona portuaria**

Isaías Alvarado

La Opinión, Thursday, October 02, 2008

Pese al pleito legal con la asociación de empresas de transporte más grande del país, el Programa para Camiones Limpios entró en vigor ayer en los puertos de Long Beach y San Pedro con el retiro de dos mil unidades de modelos anteriores a 1989.

Sin embargo, el plan ecológico más ambicioso de las terminales marítimas de la nación no libró otro obstáculo: el veto del gobernador Arnold Schwarzenegger a una propuesta de ley que impondría una tasa de 30 dólares a los contenedores que arriban por este complejo portuario.

Esta iniciativa del senador demócrata Alan Lowenthal, representante de Long Beach, pretende recaudar 300 millones de dólares anuales para financiar proyectos para disminuir los niveles de contaminación en ambos puertos.

"Tenemos que actuar localmente, no podemos depender de Sacramento, de Washington, debemos resolver esto por nuestra propia cuenta", reclamó la concejala Janice Hahn, ante la decisión del mandatario estatal.

En tanto, la Asociación Americana de Empresas Camioneras (ATA) prepara otro dardo para el 8 de octubre próximo: más elementos en su litigio en contra de este programa que cataloga como una regulación de la industria.

"Esto no ha acabado, los puertos tendrán hasta noviembre para responder", mencionó Clayton Boyce, vocero de ATA.

En noviembre de 2006, el Plan de Acción para la Limpieza del Aire (CAAP) fue aceptado por autoridades portuarias, en el afán de reducir el número de enfermedades respiratorias.

Ayer, el proyecto se materializó desde las ocho de la mañana con la revisión de la calcomanía que acredita a cada unidad como parte del programa de aire limpio.

Una ordenanza de la ciudad firmada a principio de año provee a los dueños de camiones que datan de antes de 1989 con cinco mil dólares por cada uno que reemplacen por modelos más nuevos. Para 2012, los camiones que no reúnan los estándares de emisiones de 2007 tendrán prohibido entrar al complejo portuario.

Las compañías transportistas están ahora obligadas a contratar a choferes directamente, y no como contratistas independientes. Ese requisito fue establecido para que las compañías sean responsables del mantenimiento de los camiones "ecológicos".

"Los niños de Los Ángeles y Long Beach perdieron más de un millón de días de escuela porque el asma los mantuvo en sus casas, pero ahora podrán respirar más tranquilos", justificó el alcalde Antonio Villaraigosa sobre la implementación del programa.

"Nuestro plan de acción para el aire limpio reducirá las emisiones de diésel por 80%, una reducción total de 45% para 2012", subrayó.

Por su parte el alcalde de Long Beach, Bob Foster, dijo que si bien ambas terminales representan la puerta de más de 40% de todos los contenedores que entran a Estados Unidos, el precio de esta actividad comercial es la salud de los residentes de la región.

"El objetivo es asegurarnos de que se mejoren las condiciones del aire y de salud de todos en el Sur de California, y mantener el funcionamiento de este motor económico".

Según la alcaldía angelina, el retiro del primer grupo de camiones equivale a sacar de la carretera a 400 mil vehículos.

Empero, para grupos ambientalistas el enemigo sigue estando en casa, toda vez que —en algunas zonas— los barcos de carga llegan a ser la causa del 60% de la contaminación por las emisiones del combustible de su maquinaria, que no apagan incluso mientras son descargados.

En el puerto de Long Beach, por ejemplo, se han desembolsado 9,000 millones de dólares para apoyar a las empresas navieras en la compra de un combustible más amable con la ecología, pero hace falta la colaboración del gobierno federal y de otros países, expuso Mario Cordero, comisionado de esa terminal.

Para Martin Schlageter, director de campaña de la Coalición por el Aire Limpio, también se debe actuar lo más pronto posible ante esta problemática. "No tenemos tiempo para esperar, tenemos la crisis aquí".

#### MEJOR AIRE

De acuerdo a la Junta de Recursos del Aire de California (CARB), cada año 1,200 muertes prematuras son causadas por las emisiones contaminantes de los camiones que laboran en los puertos del estado.

De hecho, los niños que viven en comunidades aledañas a los puertos presentan el doble del promedio nacional en niveles de asma.

Violeta Unzueta, residente de Wilmington, conoce en carne propia los efectos de la contaminación: tres de sus cinco hijos padecen de asma y dependen de un inhalador.

Como trabajadora social, Unzueta capacita a otros 15 padres de familia que, como ella, tienen a un hijo con alguna enfermedad respiratoria. Todos viven cerca del puerto.

"Con esto la gente estará más saludable, pero debió haberse hecho antes".

[Note: The following clip in Spanish discusses truck program in Los Angeles ports goes into effect to help fight air pollution.](#)

### **Entra en efecto programa en puertos de Los Ángeles para combatir contaminación**

Noticiero Latino

Radio Bilingüe, Thursday, October 2, 2008

Con la presencia del alcalde de Los Ángeles, Antonio Villaraigosa, arrancó ayer en los puertos angelinos el Programa de Camiones Limpios, que busca reducir la contaminación. Según Villaraigosa, mediante el citado programa han quedado fuera de circulación en los puertos de Los Ángeles y Long Beach dos mil camiones de modelos anteriores a 1989. De acuerdo al alcalde, poco a poco irán dejando de circular las viejas unidades para dar paso a los nuevos modelos de camiones limpios. Organizaciones ambientalistas de Los Ángeles aplaudieron la puesta en marcha del programa, que busca combatir la contaminación.

[Note: The following clip in Spanish discusses the largest port in the US removes older air polluting trucks.](#)

## **Impide el mayor puerto en el país circular a camiones de carga contaminantes**

Noticiero Latino

Radio Bilingüe, Thursday, October 2, 2008

El puerto marítimo de Long Beach, el más grande en el país, implementó un nuevo reglamento con el que impedirá que los camiones de carga comercial que son viejos y contaminantes participen en transportar desembarcos en esa terminal.

De acuerdo con un reporte de esta mañana, durante el primer día de operaciones el miércoles, el puerto impidió entrada a unos dos mil camiones.

Por ahora el programa incluyó a las máquinas más obsoletas que consumen diesel, pero para el año 2012 todos los camiones tendrán como límite los niveles de contaminación que se habían aceptado para el año 2007.