

Refinery settles lawsuit with firm

By Stacey Shepard, Californian staff writer
Bakersfield Californian, Monday, Jan. 7, 2008

A legal settlement was reached last week between owners of the Flying J refinery and an engineering firm that claimed it was owed \$3 million for work it performed at the Rosedale Highway facility.

Irvine-based Applied Utility Systems recorded a lien against the refinery property in September, alleging the refinery hadn't fully paid for air pollution controls the company installed on refining equipment. In November, Applied Utility Systems filed a lawsuit to have a judge validate the lien and issue a judgment against the refinery.

The refinery is owned and operated by Big West of California, a subsidiary of Ogden, Utah-based fuel distributor Flying J. The facility is commonly referred to as the Flying J refinery.

Several subcontractors who supplied materials and labor for the project also sued Applied Utility Systems and Big West seeking payment for materials and labor supplied for the project.

The settlement covered all parties' claims, said Applied Utility Systems' attorney Timothy Pierce. Neither Pierce nor a refinery official specified settlement details.

Of the lawsuit, refinery Health, Safety and Environmental Director Bill Chadick said only that "there was a dispute over the terms of an engineering contract that (Applied Utility Systems) was supposed to fulfill."

Under California law, a contractor that has performed work but not been paid for it can file what's known as a mechanic's lien, a claim on the value of the property. If a judge determines the lien is valid, the contractor could potentially ask to be paid by foreclosure of the property.

Mechanic's liens are common but Pierce said foreclosure rarely occurs because the company being sued usually pays up by that point.

San Mateo optimistic about green plan

Some changes will be controversial, funding problematic, some say

By Julia Scott, staff writer
Tri-Valley Herald, Tuesday, Jan. 8, 2008

SAN MATEO — An ambitious climate-change action plan with potential impacts on every city resident received a cautiously enthusiastic response from City Council members Monday night, who noted it came with no price tag attached.

City officials praised the "sustainable initiatives plan" presented at a study session by consultant Jill Boone, but made no commitment to adopting it beyond discussing its recommendations for transportation, building, planning and waste management — some with more potential to generate controversy than others.

The plan, prepared by a committee of city officials and local residents over six months, is a long and ambitious laundry list of what San Mateo's city facilities, businesses, and residents will need to do to meet the goal of reducing carbon dioxide emissions to a level below what they were in 1990 by 2020, and further reduce emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. The pressure has already started to build: The first phase, which begins in 2009, calls for bringing CO2 emissions to below the "carbon footprint" baseline the city established for itself last year.

San Mateo is the first city in San Mateo County to measure how much CO2 it emits and to propose a point-by-point plan to cut back. But it won't be easy, as city officials acknowledged

on Monday — especially because it will involve trying to change lifestyle habits beyond their control. Transportation accounts for 55 percent of all emissions by San Mateo workers and residents, and single-driver commuting represents the biggest piece of the problem.

"We're not going to have to do this all on our own," said Boone. "I think the political climate is going to change and the price of gas is going to go up, and those will be factors that will enable to city to achieve their goals."

Nearly all the rest of the CO2 comes from electricity and natural gas consumed by homes and businesses. The committee has proposed "green" building requirements for new development, but those won't affect the buildings that already exist in a city that's already mostly built out.

The committee's major recommendations include:

- Reduce single-person car trips for a distance of less than five miles by 2020 and reduce all single-person commuting trip by 20 percent by 2020.
- Increase the number of trips on foot and by bicycle from 3 percent to 30 percent by 2020 by adding bikeways and making it easier for kids to walk to school.
- Make parking more expensive downtown to encourage foot traffic and add more shuttle service.
- See to it that residents install 100 solar panels a year, a quadrupling of the current rate.
- Adopt voluntary green building standards for all new buildings as soon as possible and make them mandatory soon after.
- Increase the amount of measurable recycled materials to 50 percent by 2020 and 90 percent by 2050; make recycling and composting mandatory.
- Make sure car trips are reduced 20 percent in any new development plan and reduce development potential in areas not considered transit corridors.

Cost was the biggest unanswered question on Monday night. Mayor Carole Groom predicted the changes would add up to a great deal of city staff time spent figuring out the costs of each goal, becoming trained in the details of green building standards, and working to incorporate the changes into the General Plan when it comes up for discussion this fall. Installing one bikeway alone can cost the city hundreds of thousands of dollars, according to the report.

"Obviously, we have some challenges in the future of how we ... get this funded," Groom said. "We're going to have to be imaginative," she said. City Council members will discuss the plan again on Feb. 25 at a meeting on the city's priorities for 2008.

City Councilman Jack Matthews said changing zoning to reflect density and transportation requirements could prove controversial.

"There's a constituency out there that may not agree with all the recommendations of the plan, and that's going to be a real challenge for us," said Matthews, who later specifically mentioned homeowners' associations as a potential foe.

He also questioned the practicality of a suggestion to expand the number of trees in San Mateo.

"Once we plant them, we have to maintain them, and we haven't been able to maintain the ones we have," said Matthews.

Councilman John Lee said the sustainability plan should rise to the top of the city's priority list, regardless of cost. He admitted his first reaction was to wonder how economically feasible some of the provisions would be, but that changed when he considered the state of the environment.

"I'm an old guy, and I know you can 'pay me now or you can pay me later,'" said Lee. "We absolutely have no choice. The program is outstanding, and it has to move forward."

Pollution is real, undeniable and deadly. It is every human's problem and concern.

Environmental groups sue Shell for excess pollution from refinery

By Juan A. Lozano, Associated Press

In the Contra Costa Times, Tuesday, Jan. 8, 2008

HOUSTON—Environmental groups sued Shell Oil Co. and several of its affiliates on Monday, claiming the oil giant has for years released pollutants from its suburban Houston refinery that are well above state and federal limits.

In their federal lawsuit, the Sierra Club and Environment Texas claim the excess air pollutants, including toxic chemicals benzene and 1,3-butadiene, are a violation of the federal Clean Air Act.

The groups said they sued because they felt the governmental agencies responsible for monitoring Shell Oil—the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency—have failed to bring the refinery into compliance.

Houston-based Shell Oil, an affiliate of Royal Dutch Shell PLC, one of the world's largest oil companies, issued a statement expressing confidence in its attempts to reduce pollution.

"We have a record of continuous improvement in environmental performance achieved through significant investment in emission reduction projects and heightened employee focus on preventing operational incidents," the statement said, noting the company was willing to talk to groups about their concerns.

Dave Bary, spokesman for the EPA's regional office in Dallas issued a brief statement, saying, "The Environmental Protection Agency's strong enforcement program will continue to vigorously enforce our nation's environmental laws to ensure protection of public health and the environment."

The TCEQ said there are various pending cases against the refinery for unauthorized emissions and that nearly \$290,000 in fines have been assessed on the facility since 2003 for such releases and other violations.

"The TCEQ has diligently enforced provisions of the Clean Air Act in accordance with state law and regulations," the agency said in a statement.

The lawsuit alleges that at a rate averaging more than once per week starting in 2003, the refinery has had unauthorized emissions releases due to equipment breakdowns or unscheduled maintenance that have exceeded hourly and annual limits on pollutants.

They want a judge to order Shell to comply with emissions limits and to fine the company up to \$32,500 per day for each violation. The environmental groups allege Shell has committed more than 1,000 violations.

"Shell has not taken the corrective action to keep the volume of emissions from being high. The technology exists to prevent most of these (unauthorized) emissions," Neil Carman, with the Sierra Club's Texas chapter, said at a news conference held in a park in the shadow of Shell's downtown headquarters.

The 1,500-acre refinery is about 20 miles east of downtown Houston, home to one of the world's largest petrochemical complexes and one of the nation's smoggiest cities. The refinery is the nation's eighth largest.

An analysis by the environmental groups of Shell's reports to the TCEQ show that since 2003, more than 2 million pounds of sulfur dioxide, more than 600,000 pounds of carbon monoxide, more than 250,000 pounds of nitrogen oxides, more than 90,000 pounds of benzene and more than 60,000 pounds of 1,3-butadiene have been released at the refinery.

According to the EPA, Benzene and 1,3-butadiene are classified as human carcinogens; nitrogen oxide and carbon monoxide lead to the formation of ozone; sulfur dioxide contributes to respiratory illness.

Shell said benzene emissions dropped by 14 percent from 2005 to 2006 and there was a 67 percent drop between 2005 and 2007 in incidents where unauthorized emissions from the production of chemical products known as olefins had to be burned off through flare systems.

Karla Lands, who lives close to the refinery in nearby Channelview, said the plant shares some blame for her upper respiratory breathing problems.

"Shell needs to run a clean plant and not put the pollution in the air that is harming everyone," said Lands, a Sierra Club member.

The Clean Air Act allows private citizens to file suit if federal and state regulators do not.

The environmental groups suing Shell Oil said they had no choice but to sue the company because the only consequences the oil company has faced are fines.

"In effect Shell is paying to pollute," said Josh Kratka, an attorney for the Sierra Club and Environment Texas. "Nothing the EPA or TCEQ has done has stopped the violations."

Berkeley officials invited to talk at climate conference

National event to focus on what can be done about global warming on community level

Staff reports

Tri-Valley Herald, Tuesday, Jan. 8, 2008

BERKELEY — City officials have been invited to talk about how to develop a greenhouse gas reduction plan and other climate protection initiatives at a national conference later this year.

City officials will make one of two dozen presentations at the Transforming Local Government Conference in Greenville, S.C., in June.

More than 100 cities from across the United States and Canada applied to give presentations at the conference, which is being organized by the nonprofit organization Alliance for Innovation, city officials said.

"Climate change is a global problem, but it has local impacts and local communities have a huge role to play in finding solutions that are going to work," said Climate Action Coordinator Timothy Burroughs.

Berkeley has expertise in the area of protecting the environment and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. In November 2006, voters approved Measure G, a plan to reduce greenhouse gases by 80 percent by 2050. The plan was approved by 81 percent of the voters.

Since then, the city has done community outreach to develop the Measure G plan. A draft of the plan will be circulated to the public in mid-January and submitted to the City Council at the Jan. 29 meeting.

[Fresno Bee commentary, Tuesday, Jan. 8, 2008:](#)

HENRY PEREA: Fresno County's 'year of action' ahead

It's 2008 and we, as Fresno County citizens, have much going for us. We are surrounded by nonprofits that work around the clock in Fresno County and a Board of Supervisors dedicated to serving its citizens.

It's true that times are economically tough. Family budgets, federal budgets, state budgets and Fresno County's budget all are in a financial downturn. So, in a way, as you've heard others say, this is the year of the budget. It has to be. Any financially responsible person, business or governmental institution must tighten their proverbial belts and keep the budget in constant focus.

But to maintain vitality, it's necessary to creatively move forward and reach toward progress while concurrently buckling down on spending. The notion reminds me of the adage: When life gives you lemons, make lemonade.

This year might be the year of the budget for Fresno County, but it's also going to be a year of action. The Board of Supervisors is poised, thanks to the work of great leaders, diligent civil servants and civic-minded citizens, to make a lot happen in 2008, in spite of financially difficult times. It's not going to be easy, and it will certainly require resiliency, but you can count on the board to spend your hard-earned money wisely on programs and services that will benefit you.

Take a look at the board's makeup. We have entered 2008 with an extremely talented and dedicated Board of Supervisors. Expertise in water and agriculture, air quality, public safety and social and human services are but a few of the skills this board will utilize to solve the many challenges facing our community.

Vice Chair Susan Anderson, representing District 2, is a passionate advocate for children and consistently works to make life better for all county residents. Creating a mental health system that works effectively for all, the creation of an acute psychiatric inpatient facility for children and the development of a downtown Fresno child care facility are among her many goals.

Supervisor Anderson is also diligently focused on the construction of a much-needed modern coroner's facility, and expanding programs at the Juvenile Justice Campus, which she originally initiated. She is very interested in protection of the county's agriculture areas from unwarranted urban encroachment and she continues to provide leadership in finding better ways to provide services to citizens. She will continue to be a big part in helping the county rethink the way it does its budget.

Supervisor Phil Larson, representing District 1, is an expert in agriculture and water. The two go hand-in-hand, and you will see leadership from Supervisor Larson for the preservation of the county's rich ag land and the development of a comprehensive integrated strategy for our water supply. He'll also be an integral part of turning Kearney Park into a historic park.

Supervisor Larson will lead the charge on many other issues as well. Look to see spring 2008 groundbreakings on a West Fresno one-stop-shop social services center and a Tranquillity branch library. Moving forward with a Grantland Avenue Expressway and Fresno County Agricultural Center will be on this busy supervisor's agenda as well.

I will be serving District 3, and acting as the chairman to the 2008 Board of Supervisors. I plan to work with Supervisor Anderson on revamping the county's budget process.

The entire board will continue working to bring a medical school to Fresno County, creating a mental health housing project, acting on the jail needs assessment report, turning Fresno County into an environmentally friendly "Cool County" and leading on the implementation of a countywide plan for homelessness.

Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger recently appointed District 4 Supervisor Judy Case to the California Air Resources Board. Any Valley resident knows what an important job it is to clean the air we breathe.

Supervisor Case's work to create a new paradigm for air quality will ultimately provide Fresno County residents with a quality of life almost impossible to measure. We will breathe cleaner air, spend less on medical bills and rest assured our children's lungs will develop in a healthy

manner. Supervisor Case also advocates for agriculture and health, and you can expect to see her bring these issues to the forefront of our planning.

As the 2007 board chairman and District 5 representative, Supervisor Bob Waterston began work on a Fresno County strategic initiatives plan. With the input of other board members, you can expect Supervisor Waterston to continue work on this significant task. He will also continue his efforts to infuse civic awareness into our public education system, thus equipping tomorrow's leaders with some of the tools they need to succeed.

Working with today's leaders, Supervisor Waterston will be a strong voice to bring a joint county/city dispatch center to Fresno. This will provide for joint property and evidence storage and accelerated prisoner processing. You can also expect Supervisor Waterston to lead the charge in entrepreneurial enterprises for Fresno County.

As you can see, there's a lot going on at Fresno County. Look for this board to come together to provide cross-jurisdictional leadership with other agencies to improve the quality of life for all Fresno County residents.

Supervisor Henry Perea represents District 3 and will be sworn in today as chairman of the Fresno County Board of Supervisors.

[Modesto Bee commentary, Tuesday, Jan. 8, 2008:](#)

How paying \$3.50 for gas will help United States

By Jack Z. Smith

Three-digit oil has finally arrived. Crude oil prices hit \$100 a barrel last week for the first time, briefly trading at a peak of \$100.09 Thursday.

Some American motorists no doubt would like to respond with a one-digit salute to Big Oil. But we might instead be asking this question: Is \$100 oil good for America?

It certainly could be. It would be beneficial if it jars us out of our energy-wasting ways and accelerates our shift to alternative energy technologies and stronger conservation measures. We must become less enslaved by fossil fuels and more energy-efficient in multiple ways, whether in driving cars, cooling homes or washing clothes.

We also must reduce emissions from energy consumption, whether it be nitrogen oxides that breed harmful ground-level ozone or greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide that are believed to abet global warming.

You can expect oil prices to stay high for a considerable time to come, with negative consequences for American consumers at the gas pump and in the purchase of countless consumer products made from petrochemicals and shipped by 18-wheelers and freight trains that burn diesel.

Nationally, the average price for regular gas is about \$3.05 a gallon. In California, the largest-consuming state, the average price is closer to \$3.25. The U.S. Energy Information Administration is predicting that prices will hit an all-time high average of \$3.40 this spring, but some analysts are forecasting prices of \$3.50 to \$4.

Diesel prices are even higher. Diesel hit a record high of nearly \$3.50 a gallon in November and recently has averaged about \$3.35 nationally.

Actually, we've already seen some good come from the alarming jump in fuel prices in the past year. Congress, acting a decade later than it should have, finally approved a meaningful increase in fuel economy standards. California went even further and will be joined by at least 16 other states if it gets its way in court.

But we won't see the effects overnight. The federal legislation will raise fuel economy by 40 percent by 2020, to 35 miles per gallon. California would reach the same goal three years earlier.

By the time 2020 rolls around, however, we might already be enjoying some striking advancements in engine technology that will make 35 mpg look mediocre.

Members of Congress, and Americans in general, all should read "Zoom: The Global Race to Fuel the Car of the Future" by Iain Carson and Vijay Vaitheeswaran, journalists for The Economist magazine. Published in 2007, the book offers a highly readable and illuminating look at the global auto industry and potential vehicle technologies of the future, including plug-in hybrids, electric cars and hydrogen fuel cell vehicles.

"Zoom," tailored to a broad audience, is written with an especially keen perspective on how energy and environmental concerns will dramatically shape transportation in coming decades. Those who say the world is about to run out of oil are wrong. But much of the cheap, easily recovered and high-quality oil has been produced. That's especially true in America.

Rising global energy demand and escalating concerns about air pollution and global warming are ample cause for the United States to accelerate energy conservation, development of new vehicle technologies such as plug-in hybrids and reliance on less-polluting technologies such as nuclear and wind power.

If we're going to keep burning coal to generate electricity, we must develop much cleaner coal technology. Meanwhile, the arrival of three-digit oil should send Americans a powerful message: Unless you really want to pay \$4 a gallon for gas, rein in the energy glut. Pronto.

Smith is an editorial writer for the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

[Tri-Valley Herald, guest editorial, Monday, Jan. 7, 2008](#)

See you in court

Editorial from the Fresno Bee, January 3, 2008

CALIFORNIA filed suit against the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on Wednesday, seeking to overturn the agency's denial of a waiver for the state's landmark efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

It's a shame it had to come to litigation, but given the Bush administration's hostility toward efforts to improve the environment, it was inevitable.

California isn't alone. Sixteen other states and a host of environmental organizations are either joining the lawsuit or filing their own. The odds of prevailing seem good, since EPA Administrator Stephen L. Johnson appears to have overridden his own staff's recommendations, both on scientific and legal grounds, to grant the waiver.

The EPA has never issued a complete denial of a waiver request in the entire 40-year history of the Clean Air Act.

That act permits California, alone among the states, to craft tougher environmental protections than the federal standards, but it must first obtain a waiver. Once a waiver has been granted, other states are permitted to follow California's lead or adopt the federal rules.

In this case, 12 other states have already adopted the California emissions standards. Five others are considering such a move. Johnson's action stalled those efforts.

The courts will have plenty to consider. Johnson and the Bush administration argued that the recently passed energy bill, with its higher fuel efficiency standards, accomplish the same goals California sought to achieve.

But that ignores that California's efforts go further than the new federal standards. That's something the state is expressly permitted to do under the Clean Air Act. That power is reiterated in the new energy legislation.

The EPA took its own sweet time reaching the decision to deny the waiver, waiting almost two years before turning it down. And the litigation over that denial will push back California's 2009 deadline for imposing its own new rules. That's too bad. But the EPA and the Bush administration are on the wrong side of science, public opinion and, we believe, the law in this fight. We hope the courts agree.

[Fresno Bee editorial, Tuesday, Jan. 8, 2008:](#)

A fair share for the Valley

State air board must not stiff region when passing out air funding.

State air officials are starting to figure out how much each region will get in air cleanup funding from Proposition 1B, and it looks like the Valley will get shortchanged -- again -- by comparison with Southern California. The fact that this is an old story doesn't make it any less galling.

The staff of the state Air Resources Board has prepared a draft for implementation of the "Goods Movement Emission Reduction Program," and it's a complex set of figures. Basically, they say the state should allocate 25% of the funds in Proposition 1B to the Valley, with 55% of the money going to the southern part of the state.

That's a bigger share than Southern California leaders -- notably Assembly Speaker Fabian Núñez -- wanted the Valley to have, but it's still low.

The Valley is one of four major "trade corridors" designated in Proposition 1B, but it produces 45% of the diesel truck emissions, nitrogen oxides and particulate matter generated in the four corridors. Yet Southern California would get more than half of the funding for cleaning up diesel trucks.

The draft similarly shortchanges the Valley in funding for diesel locomotive replacement and retrofit.

Much of the rest of the money would be spent in Southern California and the Bay Area to address air pollution problems created by activity in those major ports. That's fair; those problems are serious. But money allocated for diesel trucks and locomotives should be spent where emissions from those vehicles do the most damage to health -- and that certainly includes the Valley.

There is also a question of whether the ARB staff focused too intensely on particulate matter effects, to the neglect of NOx problems that plague the Valley.

Some suggest the Valley should be happy to get anything. After all, when Proposition 1B was first being drafted, it focused entirely on ports and their immediate environs. Valley interests objected, and the scope of the proposition was expanded, as it should have been. But now we find ourselves fighting the same battle all over again when it comes to divvying up the money.

No one argues that Southern California should not get help with its air quality problems. Nor is it necessarily unfair that it has the largest share of funding -- it has the largest population, and the best criterion for spending public money is how much impact the funds will have on human health.

But that's not an argument for stiffing the Valley. The problems we face here are every bit as serious -- in health and economic consequences -- as those faced down south. We deserve a fair share of the funding from Proposition 1B, and it's up to our legislators and other leaders to get it.

[Contra Costa Times editorial, Tuesday, Jan. 8, 2008:](#)

Pollution the real issue

IT HAS LONG BEEN KNOWN that air pollution negatively affects people's health and often leads to premature deaths. It's believed to lead to respiratory problems and heart attacks. Everything from microscopic airborne dusts, which can damage lungs, to "dirty" electrical power to ozone pollution can be an issue.

While some bicker about the truth of global warming, there is no doubt, no argument, that too much of a good and necessary thing is dangerous. Too much carbon dioxide in the air disrupts the balance of the ecosystem and is toxic. A new study from Stanford University links CO in the air to human deaths.

No matter where one sides in the global warming argument, everyone should be for less pollution. There should be no debate that humans cause a great deal of pollutants or that, with a concerted effort, can lessen it.

We can demand better from industries, but we must do better individually. The greatest source of emissions is from personal vehicles.

Regardless of one's position in the warming debate, being conscious of our "carbon footprint" is a step that protects health -- ours, our children's and many as-yet-unborn children's -- through the reduction of carbon pollution.

It can start with the purchase of a new vehicle, one that uses less fuel and uses it more efficiently. Support the development of alternatives to oil-based fuels.

But it can start even smaller. Turn off lights when they're not being used. Turn down the heat by a degree or two; turn down your water heater setting by a couple of degrees. Hang your laundry instead of tumble drying. Walk or jog instead of driving to the gym. None of those cost a thing and will actually save money. Many other ways exist to reduce energy use, as well as ways to offset carbon pollution; it's just a matter of believing you can make a difference and wanting to do it.

[Letter to the Fresno Bee, Tuesday, Jan. 8, 2008:](#)

'Protect human health'

I applaud Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger's decision to challenge the Environmental Protection Agency in court regarding California's proposed greenhouse emission standards (story Jan. 3). The Bush administration has been in a state of denial with regard to the role of greenhouse gases in global climate change. It is about time we decide to protect the future of our water and air.

Despite the fact that climate-change research is not an exact science, the evidence is overwhelming that the increased atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases are causing global warming. Few scientists would dispute its detrimental effects on our Valley's water supply and air quality. Studies show the spring snowmelt could decline severely due to the shrinking Sierra snowpack. Global warming will also cause more heat waves, higher electricity demand and more frequent droughts. A new study (story Jan. 3) indicates that carbon dioxide-induced global warming will also be harmful to human health.

Since EPA's primary mission is to protect human health, it has reached the end of the road. No more excuses.

I urge our elected officials to act promptly and decisively to reduce greenhouse gases and ameliorate this serious problem, thus protecting our well-being and the Valley's agricultural economy.

*John Suen, Professor of Earth and Environmental Sciences
California State University, Fresno*

Note: The following clip in Spanish discusses that although the study shows that the risk of getting cancer due to the high levels of pollution in the air has decreased in the last decade in the Los Angeles area, the risk still exists and is considered very dangerous. For more information, contact Claudia Encinas at (559) 230-5851.

Baja pero permanece el riesgo de contraer cáncer por contaminación en California

Noticiero Latino

Radio Bilingüe, Tuesday, January 08, 2008

La Oficina de Gobierno del sur de California determinó este fin de semana que el riesgo de contraer cáncer por la contaminación del aire disminuyó en la última década, pero que todavía se considera muy peligroso.

Durante los últimos diez años el riesgo de contraer cáncer por vivir en la región más contaminada del país bajó en 15 por ciento.

Sin embargo permanece un riesgo de poder enfermar de cáncer, unas mil 200 personas por cada millón de residentes, de acuerdo con un reporte de esa oficina.

Los mayores peligros son para los residentes del área de Los Ángeles, con posibilidades de que enfermen de cáncer dos mil 900 personas por cada millón de residentes.