

## **California regulators eye major anti-pollution measures at ports**

By Alex Veiga, AP Business Writer

In the S.F. Chronicle and other papers, Wednesday, Dec. 5, 2007

Los Angeles (AP) -- California regulators are taking aim at major shipping companies and thousands of individual truckers with two landmark measures intended to cut air pollution at large state ports and rail yards.

The proposed regulations would force operators of cargo ships and other large vessels to use land-based electric power while docked, and require trucks operating at major ports and rail yards to reduce emissions.

If approved, California would be the first state to impose such requirements on the shipping and transportation industries.

California ports account for more than 40 percent of all cargo container traffic into the U.S.

The California Air Resources Board has scheduled two days of public hearings in El Monte beginning Thursday. Votes on the two measures are expected to take place by Friday.

The board will also vote on whether to mandate the state's largest oil refineries, electricity plants and other facilities to report their greenhouse gas emissions beginning in 2009.

Currently, businesses can voluntarily track their emissions and report them to the nonprofit California Climate Action Registry.

The state's initiatives come amid growing concern among residents living near major cargo ports about health risks due to air pollution.

The communities, particularly cities near the neighboring ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, have benefited economically from a boom in cargo imports from the Far East.

In recent years, however, many residents have begun pressing for industry and the state to do more to curtail the emissions generated by ships and trucks servicing the ports.

Mary Nichols, who chairs the air resources board, said the proposed rules will do just that.

"Residents from San Pedro to Oakland will breathe easier as a result of our aggressive actions to clean up diesel emissions from ports throughout the state," Nichols said in a statement issued Wednesday.

"We owe it to the long-suffering ports communities to continue our quest of reducing all the emissions we can from ships, trucks and trains."

The regulation aimed at cutting pollution from docked ships requires cargo container, passenger and refrigerated cargo ships to shut off their auxiliary diesel engines while berthed and to tap electric power from a land-based source.

The rule would apply to ships visiting California's busiest ports, including the Los Angeles, Long Beach, Port Hueneme in Ventura County, San Diego, Oakland and San Francisco.

A study by the board found that emissions from docked ships elevated the risk of cancer to greater than 10 in a million for the more than two million people living near the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

The shore-power measure would reduce diesel and smog-forming emissions from docked vessels by nearly 50 percent by 2014 and by 80 percent by 2020, the state said.

The Pacific Merchant Shipping Association, which represents marine terminal operators and ocean carriers responsible for handling 90 percent of the containerized cargo moving through the West Coast, isn't objecting to the overall goal of relying more on shore power to cut back ship emissions.

The organization, however, plans to raise objections to facets of the language in the proposed rule, which it says would place the responsibility of implementing the initiative solely on terminal operators, said T.L. Garrett, an association spokesman.

The industry also faces major compliance costs that would ultimately be passed on to shippers.

While many ocean carriers have voluntarily begun equipping ships to receive onshore power, the regulation would require the industry to pay to refit other ships, a cost that ranges between \$300,000 to \$2 million per vessel, Garrett said.

The industry has recommended to the board that the program be voluntary.

"From our perspective, it makes more sense to have a carrot approach than a stick approach," Garrett said.

The industry also regards the proposed regulations as mere backstops to a clean air plan in the works by the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. That plan also seeks to address pollution from trucks and berthed ships but has more aggressive deadlines.

The added costs on shippers and concerns about whether the rules on trucks will lead to a shortage of port drivers, potentially causing a cargo slowdown, could lead some shippers to divert cargo away from California to ports to the north and in the Gulf of Mexico, said Paul Bingham, an economist with Global Insight.

Still, it's likely that if the board approves the proposals, other ports in the U.S. will follow, he said.

The regulation aimed at cleaning up truck emissions would apply only to trucks that haul goods from the major ports and rail yards, so-called drayage trucks.

The measure calls for pre-1994 trucks to be fitted with newer engines by the end of 2009. Newer trucks would be required to reduce emissions of diesel particulate matter by 95 percent by the same deadline.

By 2013, however, all drayage trucks would be required to meet 2007 emission standards.

"These rules, collectively ... are going to reduce diesel particulate matter in the neighborhood ports by about 75 percent by 2010, said Michael Scheible, deputy executive officer for the Air Resources Board.

## **State wants cleaner air at ports**

By Kristopher Hanson, Staff Writer  
Contra Costa Times, Thursday, Dec. 6, 2007

LONG BEACH - Diesel pollution emitted by big-rig trucks and ships at California's busiest ports would be cut 75 percent by 2014 under new regulations announced Wednesday by state air-quality officials.

The regulations, expected to be approved Friday by the California Air Resources Board, would phase out thousands of older, smog-producing trucks that serve the state's 14 busiest seaports, as well as 11 rail yards.

Cargo and cruise ships calling at ports from Long Beach to Oakland would have to reduce smog-forming emissions and diesel particulate matter 50 percent by 2014, and 80 percent by 2020.

"Residents from San Pedro to Oakland will breathe easier as a result of our aggressive actions to clean up diesel emissions from ports throughout the state," Mary Nichols, who chairs the board, said at a news conference in Long Beach.

If approved, the rules would not supersede the tougher truck-emissions regulations adopted last month for the ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles.

"We set the minimums, and local communities can go further, faster," Nichols said. "There's (legal) provisions that allow local communities to go faster."

The commissions governing the Long Beach and Los Angeles harbors have approved a plan that requires all trucks to meet 2007 emission standards by 2012.

The state's proposed rules give haulers until 2014 to meet emissions standards. But they also apply the regulation to California's largest rail yards, which are magnets for diesel trucks serving port marine terminals.

Health studies show that communities near busy ports and rail yards suffer from disproportionately high asthma and heart-disease rates.

Diesel soot has also been linked to increased risk for lung and throat cancer.

"This is the No. 1 one health challenge that Southern California faces," said Long Beach Mayor Bob Foster.

Officials estimate that it will cost the trucking industry \$3billion to replace or retrofit aging tractor-trailers, and they plan to offer several hundred million dollars in bonds and grants to ease the transition.

On ship emissions, the new rules require container ships, cruise ships and refrigerated cargo ships, while docked in port, to turn off their diesel-burning auxiliary engines and use cleaner alternative power sources such as electricity.

## **Emissions bill heads to fight on Senate floor**

Zachary Coile, Chronicle Washington Bureau  
S.F. Chronicle, Thursday, Dec. 6, 2007

Washington -- Congress took its first significant step in the fight against global warming Wednesday as a Senate committee voted to send a bill to cut greenhouse gases to the Senate floor next year.

The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee's 11-8 vote sets up a contentious debate in Congress over climate change that could have an impact on the presidential and congressional elections.

"This is a historic moment," California Democratic Sen. Barbara Boxer, who chairs the committee, said teary-eyed at the end of the nine-hour hearing. "What happened here today will not go unnoticed. The whole world is watching."

Boxer was under intense pressure to finish the bill this week while world leaders are gathered at a climate change summit at Bali, Indonesia, to show the world that Congress is moving closer to acting on climate change even though the Bush administration still opposes mandatory cuts in emissions.

"The United States simply has to take a leadership role," said Sen. John Warner, R-Va., one of the chief sponsors of the bill. "We are the superpower in the world, and we've got to utilize our status to try to correct a situation all of us acknowledge is causing hardship through fluctuations in temperature throughout the world."

The bill is modeled on California's market-based climate program. It would set a mandatory cap on emissions and would create a national trading system in which polluters could buy or sell credits to emit greenhouse gases.

The measure would cap greenhouse gas emissions starting in 2012 and require power plants, large manufacturers and the transportation sector to gradually reduce their emissions by 62 percent from 1990 levels by 2050.

But the heated debate at Wednesday's hearing showed there is still no clear consensus in Congress on solutions to the climate crisis. Warner was the lone Republican to join Democrats and two independent senators on the committee to support the bill.

Most Republicans on the panel warned that the bill could raise energy costs for American businesses and consumers and might not slow rapid temperature increases if emissions in China and India continue to grow.

"This bill is all pain and no gain," said Sen. James Inhofe of Oklahoma, the committee's ranking Republican.

The sharpest debate came over the issue of rising emissions from China and India. The United States historically has been the world's largest emitter - and it continues to be the world's largest per-capita emitter. But China, with a booming economy fueled by coal-fired power plants, is overtaking the United States in total emissions.

"We can do what we want, and Europe can do whatever it wants, but if China and India continue to do what they want, we will have zero impact on world carbon dioxide levels," said Sen. David Vitter, R-La.

But Warner, who warned of the national security implications if rising sea levels lead to mass population displacements, said the United States must stop using China and India as an excuse not to limit emissions.

"If we don't act, China and India will simply hide behind America's skirts of inaction and take no steps of their own," he said.

Republicans offered several amendments to boost nuclear energy, which some tout as a possibility for solving global warming because nuclear plants produce electricity without emitting greenhouse gases. But the measures were defeated after Boxer warned they would kill the bill.

Many of the GOP amendments were symbolic: One would have opened waters off the shore of several Southern states to drilling if natural gas prices increased because of the bill. Another would have pulled the plug on the bill if China and India didn't pass similar measures within 10 years. Still another measure would have required businesses to tell the Securities and Exchange Commission about how much it would cost them to comply with the bill. The committee rejected them.

A measure to prevent states like California or municipalities from enacting their own climate rules also was defeated.

The bill "continues to let the states do their trailblazing work," Boxer said.

The panel also added a low-carbon fuel standard - modeled on a California rule - that would require a 5 percent cut in the carbon content of transportation fuels by 2015 and a 10 percent cut by 2020. Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, who approved a similar standard in January, made calls to lawmakers in recent weeks lobbying for the measure.

But other efforts to toughen the bill failed. Sen. Bernie Sanders, I-Vt., offered an amendment to require an 80 percent reduction from 1990 levels by 2050, in line with what some scientists say is needed to limit the worst potential effects of global warming.

But Sen. Joe Lieberman, I-Conn., a chief sponsor of the bill, said the deeper cuts would not pass. "The most important thing is to get something passed, to get something started," Lieberman said.

Sanders also lost on a measure, backed by Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton, D-N.Y., that would have required the permits to emit greenhouse gases to be auctioned to companies rather than given away. The bill gives away most permits at first and gradually moves to auction them over time. But Sanders warned it could lead to windfall profits for some electric utilities and manufacturers.

Supporters hailed the panel's voting out of the bill as a major step, but insiders say it faces long odds in the Senate, where 60 votes are needed to pass any major bill.

The measure has three Republican co-sponsors - Sens. Norm Coleman of Minnesota, Elizabeth Dole of North Carolina and Susan Collins of Maine. Sen. Olympia Snowe, R-Maine, has sponsored a separate climate bill. But supporters of climate legislation might have lost another key Republican vote: Arizona Sen. John McCain, who recently said he'll support a bill only if it boosts nuclear power.

The House has been waiting for Senate action, but House Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman John Dingell, D-Mich., has pledged to push forward on a climate change measure next year. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, D-San Francisco, has said it will be one of the House's top priorities in this session.

The battle lines for the debate are already being drawn. Schwarzenegger and groups of environmentalists, scientists and evangelical leaders released letters this week supporting the bill. The U.S Chamber of Commerce and the National Mining Association released their own letters, warning of the bill's costs.

Inhofe promised "an enormous floor fight" next year to defeat the bill. But Sen. Max Baucus, D-Mont., who played a key role in brokering a deal over the climate bill, predicted: "The votes are going to be there.

They're going to be there because it's the right thing to do."

Key provisions of climate bill

The bill passed Wednesday by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, among other things, would:

-- Cap emissions of greenhouse gases starting in 2012, and gradually reduce emissions by 62 percent from 1990 levels by 2050.

- Cover about 80 percent of U.S. emissions, mostly from electric utilities, major manufacturers and fuel refiners.
- Allow polluters to buy, sell and trade credits to emit greenhouse gases.
- Create a Federal Reserve-type board to monitor the trading system, and make adjustments if the costs of the program rose too quickly.
- Use the proceeds from auctions of the credits to develop new energy technologies and help low-income consumers pay their energy bills.
- Create a low-carbon fuel standard, modeled on California's rules, cutting the carbon content of transportation fuels by 10 percent in 2020.

To read the complete text of the global warming bill go to  
[thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d110:s2191](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d110:s2191):

*Source: Chronicle staff report.*

## **Bill to impose mandatory emission cuts advances**

By Renee Schoof

Sacramento Bee, Thursday, December 6, 2007

WASHINGTON – A bill to reduce U.S. greenhouse gas emissions dramatically cleared the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee on Wednesday and is headed for a vote early next year in the full Senate.

If it becomes law, the United States would move from being the only industrialized country that opposes mandatory limits on greenhouse emissions to a leader in reducing them and developing new clean-energy technologies.

The Climate Security Act, sponsored by Sens. Joe Lieberman, I-Conn., and John Warner, R-Va., would impose a mandatory cap-and-trade program covering coal-burning plants and other facilities that account for 80 percent of U.S. greenhouse gases. It would cut emissions to 70 percent of 2005 levels by 2050.

The committee voted 11-8 in favor of the bill.

Under the cap-and-trade system, companies would get a limited number of emission allowances each year that they could sell or trade. In the early years, the government would give away most allowances. Over time, more would be sold in auctions. The overall number would decline each year, forcing the industries to find ways to decrease their emissions of carbon dioxide and other gases that cause Earth's climate to warm up.

The bill will face a tough fight in the closely divided 100-member Senate, where Democrats will need more Republican support to clear a 60-vote requirement. Three other Republicans have announced support: Sens. Elizabeth Dole of North Carolina, Norm Coleman of Minnesota and Susan Collins of Maine.

President Bush opposes mandatory emissions cuts.

Supporters are moving ahead, however, in the hope that whoever is elected president in 2008 will support the plan and move quickly to put it into effect.

Sen. Barbara Boxer, D-Calif., chairwoman of the committee, said the bill wasn't perfect, but that a stronger measure would have less chance of passing.

She'll lead a Senate delegation soon to Bali, Indonesia, where officials from more than 180 countries are starting to work on a replacement for the Kyoto Protocol, which calls for industrial nations to cut greenhouse gas emissions and expires in 2012.

"We are facing a crisis that will hit our children and our grandchildren the hardest if we don't act aggressively," Boxer said.

She and other supporters said the news on global warming isn't all bad.

"If we can overcome politics as usual, if we utilize the knowledge and technology that is available today, not only can we reverse global warming, but we can create millions of good jobs," said Sen. Bernie Sanders, I-Vt.

## **SF mayor proposes carbon tax to curb global warming**

By Lisa Leff, Associated Press Writer

In the S.F. Chronicle, Thursday, Dec. 6, 2007

San Francisco (AP) -- Mayor Gavin Newsom plans to ask voters next year to approve a "carbon tax" on businesses that he says would provide a financial incentive for conserving energy and motivating workers to use public transportation.

The ballot measure would increase the city's 5 percent commercial utilities tax by an as-yet-undetermined amount to encourage energy-saving steps by hotels, offices and other nonresidential buildings, Newsom said in a recent interview with The Associated Press.

To keep the higher rates from becoming an economic drag on the city, the initiative would carry a corresponding decrease in the 1.5 percent payroll tax on for-profit businesses in San Francisco, according to the mayor.

Last year, Boulder, Colo., became the first U.S. city to adopt a tax to combat global warming, specifically an electricity bill charge on kilowatt-hours used. Officials in Portland, Ore., last month proposed charging developers for every home they build that does not greatly exceed the city's energy efficiency building requirements.

Newsom said that by tying the revenue from the proposed carbon tax to lower payroll taxes, his proposal would make San Francisco the first city taking a business friendly, "revenue-neutral" approach to the idea of pollution pricing.

"That's the exciting debate that is taking shape around this country — replacing a job hindrance tax with a tax that should be taxing something that is inherently bad, which is greenhouse gas emissions," he said.

The mayor's staff still is writing the measure, which Newsom said he intends to submit for the November 2008 ballot.

The plan, as it stands now, is to include a second payroll tax cut for businesses that succeed in getting more of their commuting employees to give up cars for public transportation, said Jared Blumenfeld, director of the San Francisco Department of the Environment.

A third piece of the carbon tax proposal would raise garbage collection and dumping fees for both homes and businesses on each bin of waste that is destined for a landfill instead of ready to be recycled, Blumenfeld said.

Under the working draft of the proposal, the payroll tax decrease linked to higher utility bills would come as a fiscal year-end rebate, said Ted Egan, the mayor's chief economist. How big a payroll tax cut businesses get would depend on how much revenue is generated by the higher utility tax, Egan said.

Every business that pays both taxes would receive the same percentage cut to their payroll taxes, regardless of how much they curb their gas and electricity use, Egan said. Those that fail to adopt

energy efficient measures, however, would not enjoy as much savings as companies that embrace the concept because their utility bills would be higher, Newsom said.

"Net neutral does not mean there won't be an increase for those who do absolutely," said the Democratic mayor, who last month was re-elected to a second term. "They should pay more, and that's the point."

If enough businesses take significant steps to reduce their reliance on conventional energy sources, the utility tax over time would theoretically cease generating extra revenue that could be returned to them through the payroll rebate, Egan said.

In that case, the city could either approve another carbon tax or be satisfied with its contribution to combating global warming, he said.

Jim Lazarus, vice president of public policy for the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, said it was too soon to say whether local businesses would back the ballot initiative because too many details remain to be worked out.

Among the questions Lazarus had was how a carbon tax would affect different types of businesses, whether companies that already have adopted significant energy-saving measures would be penalized, and if the payroll tax reductions would be financed over the long-term.

But the chamber has generally supported legislation to reduce global warming, he said, including a law signed last year by Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger that requires California air regulators to create laws and incentives that would reduce the state's greenhouse gas emissions by 25 percent by 2020.

"We are very supportive of all the steps the mayor and the city have taken to get in front of reducing the carbon foot print of the residents and businesses in San Francisco," Lazarus said. "Lots of issues have to be worked out, but we look forward to sitting on whatever committee the mayor appoints to work all of this out."

## **Charbroilers in eateries face controls**

### **Air board sets down emission rules for restaurants cooking large amounts of beef**

By Denis Cuff, Staff Writer

Contra Costa Times, Thursday, Dec. 6, 2007

The Bay Area's clean air board is breaking new ground in the growing effort to cut restaurant charbroiler smoke out of American's diet of air pollution.

In a decision opposed by many restaurant owners, the board agreed Wednesday to require emission controls on open-grill restaurant charbroilers -- such those in larger dining establishments like Black Angus and Applebee's -- that cook high volumes of steaks, hamburgers and other beef.

Clean air agencies elsewhere are watching the rule -- the first of its kind in the nation by a regional air district.

Bay Area air regulators say the controls will reduce public exposure to fine soot particles, which can cause asthma and bronchitis problems, heart attacks and strokes, and stunted lung development in children.

"I like to eat at some of these restaurants with charbroilers, but the fine particles they produce is a health concern," said Mark Ross, a Martinez city councilman who heads the Bay Area Air Quality Management Board.

The rule will be expensive, costing restaurants about \$30,000 or more to install scrubbers and filters to comply, plus more money to operate them, the California Restaurant Association said.

"This rule is not cost-effective," Johnnie Foster Downs, the restaurant association's director of local government affairs, told the nine-county air board at its meeting in San Francisco. "Why don't they go after the bigger sources of particulates first, like diesel trucks and vehicles?"

Air district engineers say commercial charbroilers emit 6.9 tons a day of fine soot particles and 1.1 tons a day of smog-forming gases.

Most Bay Area restaurants would be exempt from the rule because their grill size or beef use falls below a threshold aimed at regulating only the highest-polluting restaurants, officials said.

Beef was singled out because its higher fat content produces more fine particles when the juices flare up on a hot grill.

Steakhouses or other restaurants with open, slotted charbroiler grills heated from below would be regulated if they cook 800 pounds of beef a week and the grill is at least 10 square feet in size. This is the part of the rule that is unique, according to Jack Broadbent, the air district executive officer.

Fast-food restaurants with chain-driven charbroilers that heat hamburgers from above and below on a conveyer belt would require controls if they cook 400 pounds a week, according to the rule. Chain-driven charbroilers already are regulated by pollution districts in the Los Angeles, San Joaquin Valley and Ventura air basins.

About 200 Bay Area restaurants with underfired charbroilers, including Black Angus and Applebee's, would be affected by the rule on Jan 1, 2013, air district engineers said.

About 450 restaurants with chain-driven charbroilers, including Burger King and Carl's Jr., would require filters by Jan. 1, 2009. McDonald's is exempt because it cooks its hamburgers on large griddles.

To avoid the steep cost of new filters, Vic Stewart's steakhouse in Walnut Creek may switch to cooking steaks in an ovenlike broiler drawer with flames above the meat, said Tyler Dwyer, the head chef.

"Thirty five thousand dollars for a filter is painful," Dwyer said Wednesday.

Dwyer said he's not happy about the new rule. However, he said the taste of steaks will be as good if they're cooked in the broiler drawers. "We're looking into our options," he said.

## **Industry groups want consistent fuel economy rules**

By Ken Thomas, Associated Press Writer

In the S.F. Chronicle and other papers, Wed., Dec. 5, 2007

WASHINGTON, (AP) -- Industry groups are pressing House Speaker Nancy Pelosi to create consistent rules for new fuel efficiency standards being considered by Congress, a move that could conflict with aggressive requirements being pushed by California.

Automakers and their allies in Congress have pushed for the energy bill to clarify the authority of two federal agencies that regulate emissions and gas-mileage standards.

Pelosi rejected attempts by Rep. John Dingell, D-Mich., to include a provision that would ensure that any regulations by the Environmental Protection Agency and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration be consistent and not create conflicts that would be difficult for the auto industry to meet.

In a letter Wednesday to Pelosi, D-Calif., and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., eight trade groups said the bill should require EPA and NHTSA to "work together to establish a single national fuel economy standard as established by Congress."

"If this issue is not addressed in this legislation, it is likely to cause great confusion, complicating and delaying the work of the agencies charged with implementing this bill," the industry groups wrote.

The trade groups included the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, American Petroleum Institute, National Petrochemical and Refiners Association and the National Association of Manufacturers, which is led by former Michigan Gov. John Engler.

Pelosi spokesman Drew Hammill said they had received the letter and were reviewing it. Dingell, who leads the House Energy and Commerce Committee, told reporters on Saturday that he planned to examine the EPA-NHTSA consistency issue in his committee.

Environmental groups have raised concerns that such an approach would prevent California from moving forward with its strict tailpipe emissions standards, which would require automakers to build vehicles that produce 30 percent less greenhouse gases by 2016. More than a dozen other states have vowed to adopt them.

California can't enforce the tailpipe rules for cars sold in the state until it gets a waiver from the EPA exempting it from national greenhouse gas pollution standards set under the federal Clean Air Act. The state can set its own vehicle pollution standards because it started regulating air pollution before the EPA's creation.

The EPA is expected to make a decision on the waiver before the end of the year and is drafting new regulations in response to the Supreme Court ruling in April that said the agency could regulate vehicle tailpipe emissions.

NHTSA was given the enforcement authority of fuel economy standards when the law was created in 1975, so automakers have cautioned they may be forced to comply with two different standards.

## **Ports may get tighter pollution guidelines**

STAFF AND WIRE REPORTS

Contra Costa Times, Thursday, Dec. 6, 2007

LOS ANGELES -- California regulators are taking aim at major shipping companies and thousands of individual truckers with two landmark measures intended to cut air pollution at large state ports and rail yards.

The proposed regulations would force operators of cargo ships and other large vessels to use land-based electric power while docked, and require trucks operating at major ports and rail yards to reduce emissions.

If approved, California would be the first state to impose such requirements on the shipping and transportation industries.

Port of Oakland officials said they were instrumental in formulating proposed truck regulations, which they support, and hopeful that the shore-side power supply regulations will permit the port to use alternatives to hooking up to the local electric grid, such as portable generators that run on liquefied natural gas.

California ports account for more than 40 percent of all cargo container traffic into the United States.

The California Air Resources Board has scheduled two days of public hearings in El Monte beginning today. Votes on the two measures are expected to take place by Friday.

The board also will vote on whether to mandate that the state's largest oil refineries, electricity plants and other facilities report their greenhouse gas emissions beginning in 2009.

Currently, businesses can voluntarily track their emissions and report them to the nonprofit California Climate Action Registry. The state's initiatives come amid growing concern among residents living near major cargo ports about health risks due to air pollution.

The communities, particularly cities near the neighboring ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, have benefited economically from a boom in cargo imports from the Far East.

In recent years, the state's port complex neighbors have begun pressing for industry and the state to do more to curtail the emissions generated by ships and trucks servicing the ports.

Mary Nichols, who leads the air resources board, said the proposed rules will do just that.

"Residents from San Pedro to Oakland will breathe easier as a result of our aggressive actions to clean up diesel emissions from ports throughout the state," she said in a statement issued Wednesday. "We owe it to the long-suffering ports communities to continue our quest of reducing all the emissions we can from ships, trucks and trains."

The regulation aimed at cutting pollution from docked ships requires cargo container, passenger and refrigerated cargo ships to shut off their auxiliary diesel engines while berthed and to tap electric power from a land-based source.

The rule would apply to ships visiting California's busiest ports, including the Los Angeles, Long Beach, Port Hueneme in Ventura County, San Diego, Oakland and San Francisco.

A study by the board found that emissions from docked ships elevated the risk of cancer to greater than 10 in a million for the more than 2 million people living near the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

"We're very supportive of the regulation," said Tim Leong, an environmental scientist for Oakland's port authority. "We think we did a good job here. They actually spent a lot of time on this, they actually came up with something that I think will work."

He said that port management set up contacts between the air board and local drivers and freight companies to help craft the new rules.

[Modesto Bee commentary Thursday, Dec. 6, 2007:](#)

### **OTHER VIEWS: Rejecting Kyoto: United States**

Excerpted from Tuesday's Philadelphia Inquirer:

And then there was one. With new Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd's announcement that his country will ratify the Kyoto agreement, the United States became the only major industrialized nation that refuses to sign the protocol limiting greenhouse gas emissions. The Bush administration has insisted the Kyoto accords, which went into effect in 2005, would unreasonably limit this nation's ability to address climate change in ways that recognize its specific environmental and economic concerns. But the inability of the United States to craft a domestic energy policy that would reduce its reliance on fossil fuels hardly engenders optimism in Bush's we'll-go-solo approach. Americans concerned about high gasoline prices must hope that more can be accomplished to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. A big step came Friday when House Democrats negotiated an agreement to require automakers to make more fuel-efficient vehicles. The House bill would mandate new cars and light trucks to average 35 miles per gallon by 2020. But Republican opposition is strong in both houses of Congress, and Bush is threatening to whip out his veto stamp. Effective energy policy shouldn't be piecemeal. It's time for Congress to take the right steps.

[Letter to the Modesto Bee, Thursday, Dec. 6, 2007:](#)

### **The cry of global-warming wolf**

Roger Bales' assertion ("UC Merced researchers gather data on warming," Dec. 2, Page B-7) that the climate is changing and "humans have caused it" is typical of the arrogance broadcast by the academic community. I have seen Al Gore's film -- it is not a documentary but rather a self-serving propaganda film filled with soulful shots of Prince Albert wandering down lonely hallways and staring wistfully out of airplane windows. The fact that Gore won a Nobel Prize for this piece of tripe demonstrates how politicized and empty the award has become over the years.

Perhaps Bales and his cohorts should travel to China and persuade their leaders to cut emissions as they flood the marketplace with their products. Or maybe they can find a way to stop a rogue asteroid that will one day impact the Earth and render arguments about global warming as transitory as the last bit of sunlight before the perpetual night of a savage and endless winter.

*William Roman, Modesto*