

County broke environmental laws for mining firm, judge says Black Diamond's expansion plan challenged in lawsuit.

By Corinne Reilly

Merced Sun-Star, Wednesday, Feb. 13, 2008

Merced County violated environmental law when it OK'd a local mining company's plan to expand, a judge has ruled.

Black Diamond Aggregates Inc., based in Modesto, applied in 2006 to expand its aggregate mine two miles outside Snelling. The company supplies rock and gravel for use in construction projects.

The Merced County Board of Supervisors approved Black Diamond's plans late that year. In January 2007, two environmental groups filed suit against the county over its decision.

The environmental groups, the San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center and Protect Our Water, argued that the county should have required Black Diamond to complete costly, thorough studies on how its expansion plan would affect the environment.

Instead, the county approved the project without those studies. The environmental groups claimed that violated the California Environmental Quality Act.

On Feb. 7, a Merced County judge sided with the environmental groups. "The court finds substantial evidence to support a fair argument that this project may have a significant effect on the environment," presiding judge John Kirihara wrote in the ruling, which the county received Monday.

Kirihara's ruling cancels the Black Diamond approval. To move forward with its expansion, the company will have to complete detailed studies examining how wider operations at the mine would affect wildlife, air quality, traffic and the area's water supply.

In their lawsuit, the groups claimed the county's decision to approve the expansion ignored letters from both the California Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers expressing concern over the project's effects on the environment. Kirihara agreed.

He also ordered the county to pay the environmental groups' attorney fees.

A Merced County spokesman, Mark Hendrickson, said the county respects the court's decision. He said the ruling won't mean any expense for taxpayers, as Black Diamond agreed in 2006 to pay legal expenses resulting from the expansion's approval.

An attorney for Black Diamond declined to comment on the ruling Tuesday.

Raptor Rescue Center attorney Marsha Burch said her client is pleased with the suit's outcome. "We really felt strongly that this required a much deeper look at the environmental impacts," Burch said. "When these folks are proposing an expansion, they're doing it because it will be lucrative for them. ... With that profit potential comes the responsibility to look out for the public."

Food processing waste changes include insurance, fee requirements

By TIM MORAN

Modesto Bee, Wednesday, February 13, 2008

A new ordinance regulating use of food processing waste won the unanimous approval of the Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors today.

The ordinance is the latest effort by the county to satisfy the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, which is concerned about potential ground and surface water contamination from use of food processing waste on farm land.

The county has been involved in a 25-year-old program that takes about 600 million pounds of waste material from food processors, such as tomato skins and peach pits, and spreads them on farm fields as fertilizer. The program was developed by a team that included the Farm Bureau, the University of California Cooperative Extension, the county agricultural commissioner, the food processing industry and the waste hauling companies.

The program saves processors millions of dollars it would cost to haul the material to specialized landfills in other counties.

The water board became concerned five years ago about possible acid and salt contamination, triggering a series of meetings, negotiations and studies.

The ordinance approved today was developed by county staff, food processors, California State University professors and a consultant. It requires a permit to put food processing waste on land, feed it to animals, dehydrate it or compost it.

The new law requires performance bonds and insurance and charges a research project fee of 10 cents per ton. It sets up conditions for using waste material and prohibits high concentrations of salts or other components that might harm the environment.

The waste material is to be analyzed for chemical content, pH levels and the percentage of volatile solids, and soil samples from the fields also will be analyzed.

Dennis Shuler, environmental affairs manager at Gilton Resource Recovery, told the supervisors Tuesday that he was concerned about another layer of regulation. Gilton does not handle food processing waste, but could in the future, he said.

The company already deals with sometimes conflicting regulations from the [San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control Board](#), the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the state Integrated Waste Management Board, Shuler said.

"We are extremely regulated now. We aren't afraid of regulation; we just want to know if it is absolutely necessary," Shuler said.

Supervisor Dick Monteith said Gilton has the choice of whether to enter into the food processing waste recycling business.

Jim Mortensen of Del Monte Foods in Modesto thanked the board and county staff for working out the ordinance. "It's prudent that we put all these things in an ordinance. The program has been going on for 25 years, and it should go forward as it has. It has maintained the viability of our business," he said.

Supervisor Jeff Grover said the ordinance was important so the county could properly document how food processing waste is used in hopes of preventing attacks on the program in the future.

Supervisor Jim DeMartini noted that the program has been operating for more than two decades without a problem.

"We are doing this because the state is threatening to step in and regulate it more," DeMartini said.

Supes adopt green building requirements

Supervisor Rich Gordon questions cost

By Julia Scott, STAFF WRITER

Tri-Valley Herald, Wednesday, Feb. 13, 2008

Green homes will be the rule, not the exception, from now on in unincorporated San Mateo County.

The county Board of Supervisors on Tuesday took a major step toward addressing global-warming-causing emissions from buildings of all kinds when they voted to add a sweeping set of mandatory green building construction requirements to take effect later this year.

Under the new regulations, a home or industrial construction project will be required to earn a minimum of 50 "green points," or achieve a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design rating, and pass muster with an outside green building inspector. The county will offer the incentive of a faster turnaround time for a building permit and a quicker visit from a building inspector on projects that earn 75 to 100 green points.

The changes, which must first be approved by the California Energy Commission, would affect all new residential projects and residential remodels of 50 percent or greater, as well as all new commercial and industrial buildings of 3,000 square feet or more.

It is the most aggressive and far-ranging mandatory green building program in San Mateo County, also rivaling those adopted by San Diego, San Francisco and Marin counties. It was developed over the past seven months by a committee of builders, real estate agents and environmentalists, and passed by the Planning Commission in January. Presenting the plan Tuesday, Planning and Building Director Lisa Grote said studies have shown that even the most modest of changes - such as purchasing an energy-saving appliance, installing a low-flow toilet, insulating windows or using sustainable or recycled construction materials - can reduce carbon dioxide emissions, save water and energy, and even create a healthier living environment.

"It's estimated that 50 percent of landfill waste is traditionally the result of construction projects," Grote said. "We'd like to reduce that."

Residential building projects can earn green points based on a system developed by Build it Green, a Bay Area-based nonprofit. For instance, adding a range of Energy Star appliances is worth nine points and using paints and wood-coatings low in volatile organic compounds is worth six points. Homeowners are free to earn any combination of points, as long as they add up to 50 or more.

Many of the people who spoke at the meeting said the changes were overdue. Supervisor Mark Church agreed with them. Although he originally supported voluntary standards that would eventually become mandatory, Church said he was quickly convinced that the program was both practical and necessary - even urgent.

"The Planning Commission feels the 50 points are easily obtainable," Church said. "We are at a critical point with the issue of climate change, and things need to be done now."

However, the program is not without its expenses. Although the costs of installing special appliances or water-saving landscapes are often recouped over time, homeowners will be required to pay between \$800 and \$1,000 to hire a specialized green building inspector to verify their project for the county. Commercial projects can expect to pay between \$2,500 and \$3,500, according to Grote.

Applicants are also required to post a \$5,000 bond prior to receiving a building permit, which will be released when the 50 points are verified. A free appeals process is included in the language of the code amendment.

Supervisor Rich Gordon took issue with the cost and incentive structure of the program, noting that a homeowner would pay all the expenses but get no reward from the county.

"If I'm a homeowner, I get no incentive between 50 and 75 points," Gordon said. "We've increased the cost and given folks nothing back in return. At the 50-point level, I get no benefit. In fact, it costs me \$1,000 more to get the inspection."

Gordon asked whether county building inspectors could double as green building inspectors to save money, but Grote said the county was too understaffed to handle the job. Despite his concerns, Gordon voted in favor of the new requirements, which the board approved unanimously.

The program will undergo a review in six months to make sure it is running smoothly and not delaying the building department's overall permit process or workload.

Community Digest

Air district, City to hold Chevron hearing

Katherine Tam

Contra Costa Times, Wednesday, Feb. 13, 2008

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District and the city of Richmond will hold a community meeting to discuss the Chevron Energy and Hydrogen Renewal Project's effect on air quality.

The public meeting is scheduled for 6 p.m. today at the RRC Social Hall, 3230 Macdonald Ave., Richmond.

Chevron is proposing to replace its existing hydrogen plant, power plant and reformer at its refinery in Richmond. Chevron would process the same amount of oil as it does now, but the new equipment would allow it to refine a wider range of crude, according to the project's final environmental impact report.

The project needs approval from the city of Richmond, air quality district and the California Energy Commission.

TCEQ to hold final hearing in Asarco air permit

By Alicia A. Caldwell, Associated Press Writer

In the Contra Costa Times, Wednesday, Feb. 13, 2008

EL PASO, Texas-The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality is set to decide the future of a shuttered West Texas copper smelter.

The three commissioners charged with deciding if Asarco, a Tucson-based copper company with a smelter in El Paso, should be granted a renewed air quality permit are to meet in Austin Wednesday afternoon.

El Paso city officials have opposed the bankrupt company's plans to reopen the plant, which closed in 1999 amid a global drop in copper prices. They will be at the hearing to remind the commission of the city's staunch opposition.

Mayor John Cook told reporters last week that the city plans to sue if the TCEQ does grant the permit.

"I'm optimistic that in the end we will win," Cook said. "We will fight until we have used the last argument we can get our hands on to object to the permit renewal."

State Sen. Eliot Shapleigh, an El Paso Democrat and one of Asarco's most vocal opponents, said the commission's decision will decide the future for the city of nearly 600,000 people.

"Asarco wants to put 7,000 tons of contaminants in the air every year, so this permit is the turning point for El Paso," Shapleigh said. "We go to a clean air future or take a step back to a polluted past."

New Mexico Gov. Bill Richardson sent a letter to Gov. Rick Perry on Tuesday expressing New Mexico's opposition to renewing the permit for the El Paso smelter. Richardson said the smelter "has a sad history of fouling the air and potentially harming the health of citizens in southern New Mexico."

The city and a coalition of residents opposed to the reopening plan have argued that the copper company is a major polluter whose previous operations have left toxins, including lead and arsenic, in the soil in residential neighborhoods near the century-old smelter. Opponents have also argued that if the plant reopens, it will produce more air pollution in El Paso.

Asarco officials have routinely denied that the plant's operations would cause or contribute to air pollution, a requirement to renew the permit first issued in 1992.

"We have faith in the process and the rule of law and are looking forward to the Commissioner's Agenda Meeting on Wednesday," plant manager Bob Litle said in a written statement.

If the permit is granted, Asarco's smelter would be allowed to produce thousands of pounds of pollutants, including sulfur dioxide, lead and carbon monoxide, annually.

Asarco, in the midst of a federal bankruptcy case that includes as much as \$6.5 billion in environmental liabilities, has argued the plant would bring hundreds of high paying jobs to the area and contribute nearly \$1 billion to the region's economy.

The permit battle has been ongoing for about six years and has cost the city about a \$1 million, according to Cook.

In 2005 a pair of administrative law judges concluded that Asarco should be denied a new permit because the company "failed to prove that its operation ... if renewed would likely not cause or contribute to air pollution or that its compliance during its last five years of operation under that permit warrants renewal."

But last year the executive director of the TCEQ recommended renewing the permit if the company took a series of steps to ensure "effective pollution control equipment and practices."

At the time, a lawyer for Asarco said the company would accept those conditions if allowed to reopen the plant.

State offers settlement to Mesquite chemical plant

The Associated Press

In the Contra Costa Times, Wednesday, Feb. 13, 2008

LAS CRUCES, N.M.-The state Environment Department has offered to settle allegations of air quality violations at Helena Chemical Co.'s fertilizer plant in Mesquite for \$270,600.

The state in November notified Helena Chemical of 15 violations, including two labeled major. The department has offered to settle 11 violations, and withdrew the other four.

The Collierville, Tenn.-based company has 30 days to accept or decline the offer dated Feb. 8.

Company officials said in a statement that it believes the remaining violations are in record keeping.

Ed Brister, Helena's director of regulatory compliance and engineering, said Helena's operations have never posed a threat to human health or to the environment.

The violations, discovered during routine inspections between last March 30 and June 15, include failure to enclose emissions, failure to control dust emissions and poor record-keeping.

Helena Chemical has settled previous violations twice before. In 2006, the company paid the state a \$238,000 settlement for alleged air quality violations, and last year it paid \$36,000 to settle groundwater violations when it failed to report a chemical fertilizer spill.

"Helena Chemical fails to understand the gravity of its past environmental violations and continues to disregard the welfare of residents by its lax behavior," Environment Department Deputy Secretary Jon Goldstein said in a statement.

London to triple the toll for gas guzzlers in town

Thomas Wagner, Associated Press

SF Chronicle, Wednesday, Feb. 13, 2008

Drivers of gas-guzzling cars will have to pay nearly \$50 a day to enter central London, triple the current charge, while the most fuel-efficient vehicles will get a free ride, the mayor said Tuesday.

Mayor Ken Livingstone, who introduced the daily congestion charge on trucks and cars entering central London in 2003 to cut traffic and pollution, said the change is primarily aimed at the big cars owned by people in wealthy parts of the capital.

The mayor, who has the power to make the change without legislative approval, said it will go into effect Oct. 27.

"The CO2 emissions from the most high-powered 4-by-4s and sports cars can be up to four times as great as the least-polluting cars," he said.

Livingstone said 17 percent of the cars that visit central London each day -- or about 33,000 -- will pay the \$49 charge, while 2 percent will go free. The remaining 81 percent -- and trucks -- will continue to pay the current \$16 fee.

London's congestion charge is widely credited with reducing traffic and changing commuting patterns for the better in the capital. Officials from other large cities around the world have studied the plan or discussed imitating it.

Last month, New York state's traffic commission voted to recommend that New York City charge drivers an \$8 daily fee to bring their cars into Manhattan below 60th Street. That would require the approval the state Legislature.

On Tuesday, groups such as Greenpeace praised Livingstone's changes.

But Phil Popham, the managing director of Land Rover, said: "We believe it will have immediate costs for our business, but doubtful benefits from an environmental perspective."

Tiny Nations Seek Climate Help at UN

By JOHN HEILPRIN, The Associated Press
Washington Post Tuesday, Feb. 12, 2008

UNITED NATIONS -- The day's first word went to a tiny island nation with a big sinking feeling.

Leading off the U.N. General Assembly's second day of talks on climate change, Tuvalu issued a cry for help Tuesday on dealing with the impact of global warming on its 10,000 people, who live on nine low-lying coral atolls in the South Pacific being lapped at by rising seas.

"Adaptation is undoubtedly a crucial issue for an extremely vulnerable small, island nation like Tuvalu," said Tavau Teii, the deputy prime minister and environment chief.

"I only need to highlight the fact that our highest point above sea level is only four meters (a little over 13 feet) to emphasize our vulnerability to the impacts of climate change, especially sea level rise," he said. "It is very clear that financial resources for adaptation are completely inadequate."

He was followed by speaker after speaker from small countries who rose to ask the richest nations to pony up tens of billions of dollars a year to help the littler guys adapt.

The United States and China, the two biggest producers of carbon dioxide and other heat-trapping gases from fossil-fuel burning, sought to assure other nations that they, too, take global warming seriously and will provide what help they can.

"We are committed to do our part to contribute to this global effort," said Alejandro Wolff, the deputy U.S. ambassador.

No less than 117 speakers, representing virtually all the world's nations, signed up to take the stage during talks that dragged into the evening. The glacial pace of their speechmaking belied their expressions of urgency and fear that global warming will test the world -- and the U.N. -- in ways never before seen.

"Climate change has the potential to redraw the face of our planet," said Dr. Janez Podobnik, Slovenia's environment minister who spoke for the European Union. The EU, he said, puts global warming "on the top of its political agenda."

The U.N. Development Program said in November that industrialized nations must provide \$86 billion a year by 2015 to help the people most vulnerable to more catastrophic floods, droughts and other disasters that scientists fear will accompany warming.

"We are on the edge of a tipping point and time has run out," said Dr. Angus Friday, Grenada's ambassador to the U.N. who represented an alliance of small island states. "We have said again and again that this is a matter of survival for us."

"No island left behind," he added. "We cannot wait to adapt."

General Assembly President Srgjan Kerim, a Macedonian diplomat and economics professor, convened the two-day conference to shape U.N. policy and support its negotiations toward a new global climate treaty in 2012.

Delegates from nearly 190 nations agreed at a U.N. conference in December to adopt a blueprint for controlling "greenhouse" gases before the end of 2009. Their hope is to replace the Kyoto Protocol, which requires 37 industrial nations to cut emissions by 5 percent on average, when it expires in 2012.

On Monday, British billionaire Richard Branson offered to set up an "environmental war room" that would serve as a tool for the U.N. to lead the world's efforts to find technological fixes for global warming.

[Bakersfield Californian, Editorial, Tuesday, Feb. 12, 2008:](#)

Tough advocate needed

The departure of Fresno County Supervisor Judy Case from the California Air Resources Board last month should make the state Legislature's air-quality goals abundantly clear.

Californians deserve and demand clean air. Any wavering from that objective is unacceptable.

State Sen. Dean Florez, D-Shafter, led the charge to oust Case, who lasted less than a year after Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger named her to fill a position reserved for a member of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District board. She replaced former Kern County Supervisor Barbara Patrick.

Detractors said Case, who grew up on a farm, was overly indebted to industry interests. Environmentalists and medical experts were concerned that Case joined fellow board members in voting to delay until 2024 the deadline for a smog cleanup plan for the Central Valley, which has some of the worst air in the nation.

Case was also criticized for her opposition to a bill -- widely endorsed throughout the valley and signed into law by Gov. Schwarzenegger last year -- that puts more public health and local government representatives on the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Board. Farm groups opposed the board's expansion.

"I'm not sure this nominee can step away from the agriculture interests that have driven her to ... bad decisions on clean air," Florez told the committee.

The Central Valley needs and demands clean-air advocates willing to aggressively pursue stringent standards.

Our recommendation: incoming valley air district board member Raji Brar, who, as an Arvin city councilwoman, represents a community that is forced to breathe the dirtiest air in the nation.

[Bakersfield Californian, Editorial, Wednesday, Feb. 13, 2008:](#)

Feebate concept sound

A proposal that would reward Californians who purchase clean-burning new cars and penalize those who buy high-polluting vehicles needs some tweaking, but it deserves approval.

Assemblyman Ira Ruskin, D-Redwood City, withdrew his so-called "feebate" bill on Jan. 30 because it didn't have the required votes -- thanks, in no small part, to automobile-industry opposition. But Ruskin should try again with a few changes to the bill. He has promised to do so.

The "feebate" plan would have imposed surcharges of up to \$2,500 on vehicles that spew the highest levels of greenhouse gases, and give rebates of up to \$2,500 for those that emit the smallest levels. The fees would pay for the rebates.

Many vehicles would have smaller rebates or fees, and 24 percent would come with no associated fee or rebate.

With California's groundbreaking effort to reduce global warming emissions stalled by a long-running battle with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the innovative feebate plan looks like our best chance to slow climate change caused by vehicles.

Ruskin's plan would encourage consumers to buy clean, fuel-efficient cars and make socially responsible purchasing decisions. It would compel car makers to build more fuel-efficient, cleaner cars, and it would accomplish it without costing the government money.

The rebates and surcharges would range from \$100 to \$2,500, depending on the amount of emissions. A Toyota Prius hybrid would come with a \$2,500 rebate; a Hummer would come with a \$2,500 surcharge.

Makes sense.

But Ruskin must address valid concerns that the feebate plan penalizes small businesses and large families. If he can address those problems, his plan deserves support.

[SF Chronicle, Open Forum, Wednesday, Feb. 13, 2008:](#)

Better biofuels before more biofuels

By Alexander E. Farrell

It's all about the land, not the crops. While California and the nation pursue biofuels for energy security and climate change, we must ensure that cleaner technologies are the result, not irreversible damages.

New research suggests that corn ethanol may have greenhouse gas emissions nearly double the emissions of gasoline. The reason is that the way we make biofuels today increases the global demand for land and accelerates the clearance of wilderness for new farms.

For example, if a farmer in the United States shifts from a corn/soybean rotation to continuous corn in order to supply a new ethanol facility, U.S. exports of soybeans go down. This causes the global price of soybeans to go up slightly, and farmers worldwide will find it profitable to clear a little more land to grow soybeans. Of course, population growth and greater meat consumption are also causing land clearance for new farmland, but increasing production of biofuels accelerates the process.

Unfortunately, farmland expansion today often means clearing rainforest: burning the trees, releasing carbon dioxide from the soil into the atmosphere, and losing biodiversity.

This is not about corn or sugarcane, or even switchgrass; the key idea is that climate-friendly biofuels should not use fertile land. There are at least three ways to get away from the food-fuel-wilderness competition.

The first approach is to use to make biofuels from wastes, such as garbage headed to the landfill, or agricultural residues such as rice hulls and corncobs. The second is to use land that cannot be used for food crops, which might include planting natural prairie grasses on abandoned farmland or growing algae in the desert. The third is to integrate biofuel production into agriculture without diminishing CROP yields.

All of these approaches require "second generation" biofuels, but we also need greater energy efficiency in our cars and trucks, as well as for new technologies like affordable electric vehicles.

We can see real progress toward climate friendly biofuels today. Many scientists in university and private laboratories are working on this goal, and the U.S. Department of Energy has helped to fund half a dozen advanced biofuel pilot plants that are now under construction.

Effective leadership to develop better biofuels requires further support for research and development, effective climate policies to create market demand for better biofuels, and help for developing countries to both achieve economic growth and protect their ecosystems.

The Bush administration has failed at all three tasks. Just last week it proposed to slash research on efficiency, renewable energy and climate science. It has effectively blocked meaningful climate legislation for its entire term of office. And it has offered only hollow promises to the rest of the world.

The new research also raises an immediate problem for California: What to do about biofuels and our climate change goals?

In general, California is on the right track. The state is supporting research, and developing regulations to control greenhouse-gas emissions across the entire economy without picking technological winners. These rules should use market-based tools to minimize the costs, and should ensure other important goals such as reducing air pollution and protecting ecosystems are achieved.

Specifically, the low-carbon fuels standard established last year by the governor's executive order should require biofuels with lower greenhouse-gas emissions, both direct and indirect. Accurate accounting of these emissions will prevent harmful changes in land use. Similarly, the section of the 2007 federal energy law that requires new biofuel production to account for land-use changes is also a good step forward. These provisions are crucial to ensuring that biofuels improve the environment.

But we also need to avoid rules that lead to shocks in our fuel-supply system, like trying to stop the use of biofuels immediately. This would be expensive and might slow the development of more climate-friendly technologies.

Land-use change is a problem of inadequate protection of forests and wetlands. We need an international carbon regime - an agreement that goes beyond Kyoto - that rewards nations for keeping their forests intact. Here, national leadership is needed.

Today's biofuel industry needs to change rapidly in order to avoid worsening the climate-change problem, but doing so will put it on a path toward a sustainable and profitable future. Global agriculture can produce enough food and fuel for our growing world - but we need to make sure that the cheapest way of doing so is also the best for our planet and people.

Alexander E. Farrell is an associate professor of energy and resources at UC Berkeley.

[Letter to the Contra Costa Times, Wednesday, Feb. 13, 2008](#)

Global warming

There is much confusion about global warming. Some people use emissions and global warming interchangeably. However, the term emissions includes both carbon dioxide and pollutants, whereas global warming is due to carbon dioxide alone.

Scientists agree that global warming is occurring naturally, but it is being increased by the burning of fuels in automobiles, power plants and factories.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District proposes to charge an annual fee to thousands of businesses based on the amount of greenhouse gases they emit.

They do not seem to realize that the generated greenhouse gases are a function of the electrical and product needs of the communities.

Businesses have no way to reduce greenhouse gases significantly and still serve the needs of the community.

This means that the proposed fee would simply be a new tax on businesses.

It is encouraging that Congress has passed a bill calling for a large increase in automobile fuel economy by the year 2020.

This will reduce carbon dioxide generation proportionally. It is the best way to reduce the growth of global warming.

A long-term way to reduce greenhouse gasses is to plant more trees, shrubs, and grasses.

Plants consume carbon dioxide and convert it to oxygen, which we need.

John Ingamells, Pleasanton

Ingamells is a retired Chevron engineer.

[Note: The following clip in Spanish discusses the request for EPA to listen to their scientists made from the Union of Concerned Scientists. For more information on this clip, contact Claudia Encinas at \(559\) 230-5851.](#)

Pide la Unión Nacional que la EPA escuche a sus propios científicos

Noticiero Latino

Radio Bilingüe, Wednesday, February 13, 2008

Una organización que representa a más de cien mil científicos estadounidenses inició una campaña para pedir al administrador de la Agencia Federal de Protección Ambiental que escuche las recomendaciones de sus propios científicos.

La Unión de Científicos Preocupados por el sobrecalentamiento terrestre pidió en su portal que las peticiones sean enviadas al subadministrador de la Agencia de protección ambiental (EPA, por sus siglas en inglés), para que se lo informe al administrador.

La campaña hace referencia a audiencias del Senado y a por lo menos 13 gobiernos estatales listos para poner en práctica sus propias leyes de protección ambiental.