

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

* * * * *

IN RE: PENNSYLVANIA CLEAN VEHICLES PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD PUBLIC HEARING

* * * * *

BEFORE: PATRICK HENDERSON, Chair
 Arleen Shulman, Member
 Brian Trowbridge, Member
 Kristen Campfield, Member
 Marjorie Hughes, Member

HEARING: Monday, March 20, 2006
 7:00 p.m.

LOCATION: Rachel Carson State Office Building
 Room 105
 400 Market Street
 Harrisburg, PA 17105

Reporter: Daniel B. Urie

Any reproduction of this transcript
is prohibited without authorization
by the certifying agency

A P P E A R A N C E S

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

- NANCY PARKS
- REVEREND SANDRA STRAUSS
- MICHAEL FEDOR
- KEVIN STEWART
- GREG DANA
- JAN JARRETT
- KIM ANDERSON
- TED LEONARD
- JEFF SCHMIDT
- JAMES ELLIOT
- JOEL TOLUBA
- HOLLY WILLIAMS
- MARY HOFFMAN
- ANNA HEMMERS
- JOHN LENAHAN

I N D E X

1		
2		
3	OPENING STATEMENT	
4	By Patrick Henderson	6 - 9
5	TESTIMONY	
6	By Nancy Parks	9 - 15
7	TESTIMONY	
8	By Reverend Sandra Strauss	16 - 23
9	TESTIMONY	
10	By Michael Fedor	23 - 30
11	TESTIMONY	
12	By Kevin Stewart	30 - 40
13	TESTIMONY	
14	By Greg Dana	40 - 47
15	TESTIMONY	
16	By Jan Jarrett	47 - 50
17	TESTIMONY	
18	By Kim Anderson	50 - 51
19	TESTIMONY	
20	By Ted Leonard	51 - 57
21	TESTIMONY	
22	By Jeff Schmidt	58 - 61
23	TESTIMONY	
24	By James Elliott	61 - 67
25		

I N D E X (CONTINUED)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TESTIMONY

By Joel Toluba

67 - 70

TESTIMONY

By Holly Williams

70 - 73

TESTIMONY

By Mary Hoffman

73 - 74

TESTIMONY

By Anna Hemmers

75

TESTIMONY

By John Lenahan

76 - 78

CERTIFICATE

79

E X H I B I T S

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

		Page
<u>Number</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Offered</u>
Henderson	Opening Statement	--
Parks	Testimony of Nancy Parks	--
Strauss	Testimony of	
	Reverend Sandra L. Strauss	--
Stewart	Testimony of Kevin M. Stewart	--
Dana	Testimony of Gregory Dana	--
Jarrett	Testimony of Jan Jarrett	--
Leonard	Testimony of Ted Leonard	--
Williams	Testimony of Holly Williams	--

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIR:

Welcome to the Environmental Quality Board public hearing on the proposed amendments to the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program. The purpose of this hearing is to formally accept testimony on this proposed rulemaking. My name is Patrick Henderson representing Senator Mary Jo White, a member of the Environmental Quality Board. As a EQB representative, I call this hearing to order at 7:00 p.m.

With me today from the Department of Environmental Protection are Arleen Shulman and Brian Trowbridge, Air Resources Management Division, Bureau of Air Quality; Kristen Campfield, Bureau of Regulatory Counsel; and Marjorie Hughes, Regulatory Coordinator.

The Environmental Quality Board will hold three public hearings to accept comments on this proposal to amend 25 Pa.C. 126(d), relating to new motor vehicle emissions control program. The amendments propose to postpone the compliance date from model year 2006 to model year 2009 and update the definitions in Section 121.1, relating to definitions, for terms that are used in the substantive provisions

1 in Chapter 126(d). The amendments also propose to
2 clarify the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program in
3 Chapter 126(d) and to specify a transition mechanism
4 for compliance with the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles
5 Program.

6 The regulation, if approved, will be
7 submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency as a
8 revision to the State Implementation Plan. The SIP,
9 which is a requirement of the Clean Air Act, is a plan
10 that provides for the implementation, maintenance and
11 enforcement of the National Ambient Air Quality
12 Standard. On February 11, 2006, the EQB published
13 these proposed regulations for public review and
14 comment in the Pennsylvania Bulletin. In addition,
15 notice of this hearing has been published in 13
16 newspapers statewide.

17 This is the second public hearing for the
18 purpose of accepting comments on the Proposed
19 Rulemaking. In order to give everyone an equal
20 opportunity to comment on the proposals, the following
21 ground rules are established: (1) The witnesses who
22 have pre-registered to testify at this hearing will be
23 called first. After hearing from these witnesses,
24 other interested parties present will be given the
25 opportunity to testify as time allows. (2) The

1 testimony is limited to ten minutes for each witness.
2 (3) Organizations are requested to designate one
3 witness to present testimony on its behalf. (4) Each
4 witness is asked, but not required, to provide three
5 written copies of their testimony to aid in
6 transcribing the hearing. Please hand me your copies
7 prior to presenting your testimony. (5) Please state
8 your name, address and affiliation for the record
9 prior to presenting your testimony. (6) Your help in
10 spelling names and terms that may not be generally
11 familiar is appreciated so that the transcript may be
12 as accurate as possible. (7) Because the purpose of
13 the hearing is to receive comments on the proposal,
14 EQB or DEP staff may question witnesses; however, the
15 witnesses may not question the EQB or DEP staff.

16 As noted in the Pennsylvania Bulletin and
17 the newspaper notices, interested persons may also
18 submit comments in writing or electronically.
19 Specific instructions on submitting these comments can
20 be found in the Bulletin or newspaper notices. Copies
21 of the PA Bulletin Notice are available at the sign-in
22 table. All comments received at this hearing, as well
23 as those received in writing or electronically during
24 the public comment period of February 11 to April 12,
25 2006 will be considered by the Department in the

1 finalization of these regulations. Anyone who is
2 interested in a copy of the transcript of this hearing
3 may contact the reporter here to arrange to purchase a
4 copy. With that, I will now call the first witness.
5 The first witness is Nancy Parks from Pennsylvania
6 Sierra Club.

7 MS. PARKS:

8 Good evening and happy first day of
9 spring everyone. I am Nancy Parks. I reside at 201
10 West Aaron Square, Aaronsburg, Pennsylvania 16820. I
11 am also the chair person for the Sierra Club,
12 Pennsylvania Chapter's Clean Air Committee. In
13 Pennsylvania, we need all the help that we can get to
14 reduce air pollution, whether it be from our vehicles
15 or from our businesses. And within our ozone, smog
16 and acid deposition pollution reduction programs here
17 in Pennsylvania, we now control the low-hanging fruit
18 of nitrogen oxide pollution, called NOx, and volatile
19 organic chemical pollution called VOC. Now, that is
20 the NOx and VOC that are easiest and cheapest to
21 control and the largest existing sources like power
22 plants and our own motor vehicles.

23 That low hanging fruit controls only
24 about 25 percent, for example, of all the NOx emitted
25 and measured here in Pennsylvania. Therefore, there

1 still remains a large inventory of ozone, smog and
2 particulate soot-forming pollution that is, frankly,
3 ready available to make the lives and the health of
4 all Pennsylvanians miserable.

5 The Clear Air Act protects all Americans
6 by requiring that dangerous pollutants be controlled
7 with, in statutory language, an ample margin of
8 safety. The Pennsylvania DEP did the right thing when
9 they chose to evaluate and consider the best possible
10 programs for reducing dangerous air pollutants from
11 cars, pick-up trucks and mini vans. They chose to
12 examine and to propose for adoption the best possible
13 pollution reduction program that can help Pennsylvania
14 provide that ample margin of safety to our citizens
15 with chronic respiratory disease and other vulnerable
16 populations.

17 Now, I've given you a little bit of
18 health data and I will do a much more extensive
19 analysis of that in written comments. And I don't
20 intend to describe health effects to you tonight,
21 because I'm happy to see that my able colleague, Kevin
22 Stewart, from the American Lung Association in
23 Lancaster is here tonight to give you that kind of
24 information. I would like to describe to you the
25 extent of the problem from motor vehicle pollution for

1 a number of both urban and rural areas of the state.

2 The most recent emissions inventory with
3 certified data is from the year 2002. The emitted
4 pollution in Pennsylvania from motor vehicles is shown
5 below in two tables for each of the two major
6 pollutants for highway and off-highway pollution and
7 the percent of total pollution emitted for the
8 particular area of the state. This is actual measured
9 and verified pollution and not an estimated and
10 modeled SIP implementation plan inventory.

11 As you'll see on page three, I've given
12 you two tables. One is for nitrogen oxide pollution
13 and this is in tons per year. The other is volatile
14 organic chemicals. Again, in tons per year.

15 In the first column, if we look at the
16 state of Pennsylvania, we can see that we have both
17 over 346,000 tons per year of highway pollution. That
18 is our personal vehicles. And 123,000 plus tons per
19 year of off-highway, including construction and
20 agricultural vehicles. If you look at both highway
21 and off-highway percentages, the percent of all NOx
22 pollution in the state of Pennsylvania produced by our
23 personal vehicles is 39 1/2 percent. Including
24 off-highway movement, you have a total of 53.6 percent
25 of all the NOx emitted in the state and measured is

1 caused by multiple sources of pollution.

2 When you look at Philadelphia, it's much
3 higher. The total of both highway and off-highway
4 pollution for nitrogen oxide is 70 percent.
5 Philadelphia being our largest metropolitan area in
6 the state. But interestingly enough, Lancaster
7 outskirts at 72 percent for both highway and
8 off-highway emissions for NOx. Pittsburgh is
9 certainly lower, actually, at 44 percent.

10 And what's most interesting to me,
11 because this is my home area, the State College area
12 of Centre County, 71 percent of all the nitrogen oxide
13 emitted and measured in that county is, which people
14 think of us being the clear air county, and it is not.
15 Seventy-one (71) percent of that is coming from motor
16 vehicles of all types.

17 I think it is important to note what is
18 happening in these rural areas. While we do have some
19 transports running southwest and northeast through
20 Pennsylvania through the Western Pennsylvania power
21 plants into our area, it is still the mobile sources
22 that are making a huge difference to us. We are a
23 borderline area for control of eight-hour ozone. We
24 are also fairly borderline --- close to the borderline
25 for PM soot 215. Both of these pollutants, ozone MPM

1 and particulate matter in general, are very specific
2 health risks specific to Pennsylvania. And we have
3 very large numbers of counties --- about half of our
4 counties are in trouble with different air pollution
5 control requirements.

6 For volatile organic chemicals and for
7 those of you on the EQB may not know, there are many
8 thousands of volatile organic chemicals that are
9 produced in the United States every year --- or used
10 in the US every year. Eighty (80) percent of them are
11 toxic. They tend to be controlled in large numbers,
12 but they are carbon-based pollutants. And these are
13 the pollutants that combine. They provide the carbon
14 source that combine with nitrous oxide to reduce the
15 smog in our urban areas.

16 And as you can see, they're also now
17 affecting our most rural areas of Pennsylvania. As
18 you can see from State College, being one of the
19 areas, that it needs to be controlled. For volatile
20 organic chemicals, you can see that, again, we have
21 really huge numbers, 176,000-plus tons per year for
22 highway and for off-highway, almost 85,000 tons per
23 year.

24 For the entire state of Pennsylvania,
25 46.7 percent of all the volatile organic chemicals in

1 the state are produced by motor vehicles of both
2 personal vehicles and construction and agricultural.
3 In Philadelphia, those numbers are now at 41.7 percent
4 for both, but 26 percent alone is for highway personal
5 vehicles, in the Lancaster area, almost 35 percent,
6 and Pittsburgh, just under 33 percent, and in State
7 College, 17.1 percent.

8 And even though, what's interesting about
9 State College is, we have a lot of budget in emissions
10 because we have a lot of state forest that surrounds
11 our area, but in spite of that fact, we have enough
12 carbon-based pollution to provide enough carbon for
13 ozone to form readily and accumulate in the State
14 College area.

15 This information, I believe, is important
16 because these tables show that NOx and VOC pollution
17 emitted in Pennsylvania is emitted in very large
18 quantities. And then it's ubiquitous in our
19 environment and in our air. It is, in fact, a
20 significant detriment to human health in both urban
21 and rural areas of Pennsylvania.

22 We need pollution controls on our
23 vehicles to help in controlling ground-level ozone
24 smog, still with acid rain and with tiny soot
25 particles. We need these pollution controls that

1 Pennsylvania DEP has proposed to meet our federal
2 obligations under the 1990 Cleaner Act Amendment, a
3 law that is truly complex, but has also been truly
4 successful in reducing air pollution over the long
5 term.

6 I have devoted the last 24 years of my
7 professional life to, hopefully, helping to clean up
8 air pollution in Pennsylvania, especially, but also
9 across the nation. And I have fought for inspections
10 to clean up and maintain our personal cars. I have
11 fought for the federal Tier II standards. But now we
12 have the opportunity to join with ten other states,
13 many in the northeast, like New York and New Jersey,
14 to support a regulation that is better than Tier II.

15 This regulation will get us to the point
16 where we need to be, where we must be. The point
17 where we are protecting the health of our most
18 vulnerable citizens. With that, ample margin of
19 safety as is required under the Clean Air Act.

20 And the Sierra Club asks you to approve
21 the best possible regulation to control air pollution
22 for motor vehicles. And that is Pennsylvania DEP
23 Clean Vehicles Program Regulation as it has been
24 presented to the EQB. And I thank you for the
25 opportunity to testify tonight.

1 CHAIR:

2 Thank you very much. Our next witness is
3 Reverend Sandra Strauss with the Pennsylvania Council
4 of Churches.

5 REVEREND STRAUSS:

6 I do thank you for this opportunity to
7 speak this evening. I am the Reverend Sandra L.
8 Strauss. I'm a resident of the City of Harrisburg and
9 Director of Public Advocacy for the Pennsylvania
10 Council of Churches. As an organization made up of 43
11 member bodies representing 20 Anglican, Orthodox and
12 Protestant communions, we represent thousands of
13 persons of faith throughout the Commonwealth. I'm
14 here to testify today, because this is an issue of
15 significant concern to the Council's constituents.

16 As stated in the Council's Principles for
17 Public Advocacy, we believe that in a healthy society,
18 the well-being of all is a priority. We also hold up
19 the principle of sustainability, which suggest
20 priorities that may include, but not be limited to,
21 preservation of clean land, air and water, and greater
22 responsibility in use of energy. Because we support
23 the health of well-being of all, the creation of a
24 cleaner environment and policies that promote the
25 sustainability and responsibility in the use of our

1 precious natural resources, we support the proposed
2 amendment to the rules governing the Pennsylvania
3 Clean Vehicles Program and full implementation of the
4 program as recommended by the Department of
5 Environmental Protection.

6 Pennsylvania has some of the worst air
7 quality problems in the country. Over half of
8 Pennsylvania's counties, 37 of 67, are dealing with
9 smog pollution that exceeds federal health standards.
10 This is a particular problem for thousands of
11 Pennsylvanians in vulnerable populations. Older
12 persons and children are particularly vulnerable to
13 respiratory illnesses like asthma and bronchitis. And
14 this kind of pollution has the potential to exacerbate
15 health problems for persons with heart disease and
16 other respiratory illness. In fact, the American Lung
17 Association of Pennsylvania reports that there is
18 greater risk for children in areas with high
19 concentrations of ozone, acid vapor, nitrogen dioxide
20 and particulate pollution to develop chronic breathing
21 problems due to poor lung development than for
22 children in less polluted areas. These pollutants are
23 all produced by automobile emissions.

24 The impact on Pennsylvania's environment
25 and the environment of the world around us are great

1 as well. Our Principles state, we believe creation
2 belongs to God and that we are called to act as
3 stewards of creation on God's behalf. Though there
4 are those who continue to deny it, the preponderance
5 of evidence that the global warming is a reality. We
6 are only now beginning to see what many believed to be
7 the impact of global warming, such as greater numbers
8 of and more intense storms, melting and reduction of
9 the polar ice cap and the retreat of glaciers that
10 threaten to cause flooding in low lying areas due to
11 higher sea levels, as well as negative changes to
12 ecosystems due to loss of habitat and species, and
13 change in water temperatures that threaten to have
14 significant influence on climates due to disruptions
15 in ocean flow patterns, resulting in both higher and
16 lower temperatures that are expected to cause negative
17 impacts on the areas affected.

18 Pennsylvania has been a significant
19 contributor to the problem of global warming, emitting
20 more greenhouse gases into the atmosphere than 105
21 other nations combined. The proposed amendments to
22 Pennsylvania's Clean Vehicles Program could result in
23 as much as a 30-percent reduction in emissions from
24 our vehicles with little or no cost to Pennsylvanians.
25 By implementing the Clean Vehicles Program as amended,

1 Pennsylvania has the opportunity to dramatically
2 reduce this embarrassing contribution to the global
3 warming problem.

4 When we have the technology to improve
5 emissions standards in our cars, it's fundamentally
6 wrong not to do so, because of pressures from industry
7 groups that the cost is too high. This complaint
8 about costs comes not just from the manufacturers, but
9 from groups like the American Automobile Association,
10 who claims that the price of cars will increase
11 anywhere from \$1,000 to \$3,000 to meet the California
12 LEV standard. It is our understanding based on price
13 comparisons done by the DEP that this is not true.

14 The larger question for us is what the
15 cost will be if we fail to design cars and allow cars
16 with lower emissions. These costs might be expected
17 to manifest themselves in a variety of ways. We've
18 seen unprecedented increases in the cost of fuel in
19 the wake of Katrina. Continued conflict in Iraq and
20 the threat of other conflicts could result in even
21 higher costs. Lower emission vehicles are more fuel
22 efficient. The California Air Resources Board has
23 estimated that by 2012 cars with lower emissions
24 standards are estimated to save the owners
25 approximately 1,048 gallons of gasoline over the

1 ten-year life of a vehicle. At today's prices,
2 consumers would save on average \$2,250 to \$2,500. At
3 a time of dwindling supplies, however, along with
4 conditions like natural disasters and conflicts that
5 create shortages and disruptions of supply, the price
6 of fuel can only be expected to rise, intensified by
7 pressures of supply and demand and the greater cost to
8 extract fuels from difficult to reach and
9 environmentally sensitive areas, such as the Arctic
10 National Wildlife Refuge. Therefore, over time,
11 savings on fuel costs due to greater fuel efficiency
12 will probably grow.

13 Healthcare costs to address illnesses
14 caused or exacerbated by air pollution are high and
15 have the potential to grow even higher at a time when
16 many Pennsylvanians are uninsured or lack access to
17 adequate healthcare for a variety of reasons. Those
18 who are most vulnerable to the effects of pollutants
19 from vehicle emissions, children and older persons,
20 are also most likely to be affected by a lack of
21 access to healthcare. Our citizens will pay one way
22 or another. Those who are insured will continue to
23 see increases in the cost of healthcare coverage.
24 Those who are uninsured or underinsured will find
25 themselves hopelessly mired in debt, or society will

1 pay the cost in the form of government-sponsored
2 healthcare programs. We believe it is wrong and
3 injustice for our citizens to ignore the rising costs
4 of healthcare due to illnesses caused by air pollution
5 that is preventable.

6 There's also an economic issue at stake
7 for the Commonwealth and its citizens. In an
8 environment where Pennsylvanians are already
9 struggling to keep, much less expand industry, in
10 order to expand employment opportunities for its
11 citizens, having smog pollution levels that already
12 exceed federal health standards in over half of our
13 counties, will severely limit business and industry
14 growth opportunities in these counties. We believe
15 that Pennsylvania must do what it can to promote
16 economic justice and opportunities. And therefore,
17 Pennsylvania cannot afford to keep losing
18 opportunities for industry and employment growth to
19 other states that are meeting federal health standards
20 for smog pollution.

21 Finally, we do not yet know what the
22 costs of global warming may be. Many believe that in
23 an era of global warming, storms like Katrina will
24 become more commonplace. If that is true, there will
25 certainly be costs, and they'll likely be great.

1 According to "Human Creatures as Part of the Whole of
2 Creation," in Sign of Peril, Test of Faith:
3 Accelerated Climate Change, from the World Council of
4 Churches, as human beings, we have to respect God's
5 order if we are to live on earth. When the limits set
6 by God are transgressed, the fragile balance can
7 easily be broken. Humans are creatures whose life
8 flourishes only as they respect their connection as a
9 whole. The patterns of behavior and industry that we
10 establish for ourselves are often at odds with the
11 ecological cycle in to which they need to fit.

12 And finally, from our Principles for
13 Public Advocacy, we believe dangerous outcomes result
14 when short-term practices such as human population
15 pressures, excessive consumption and abuse of the
16 global climate and ozone layer continue unabated.
17 Sustainability results when the quality of life for
18 future generations is not compromised by current
19 practices and when decisions affecting an immediate
20 locale, such as a state like Pennsylvania, do not
21 ignore the larger impact on the entire planet and its
22 ecosystems.

23 Based on scientific evidence concerning
24 the environmental impact of pollution from vehicles,
25 technology that permits reduction of cleaner vehicles

1 at no extra cost, the potential benefits to
2 Pennsylvania's citizens and industry through lower
3 costs, cleaner environment, better health and improved
4 business environment, the Pennsylvania Council of
5 Churches, guided by our Principles calling for
6 protecting the environment and the health and welfare
7 of our citizens, urges the Environmental Quality Board
8 to adopt these proposed amendments to the Pennsylvania
9 Clean Vehicles Program and promote full implementation
10 of the program at the earliest possible date. Thank
11 you.

12 CHAIR:

13 Thank you very much. Our next witness is
14 Michael Fedor, I apologize if I don't pronounce your
15 name correctly, Pennsylvania League of Conservation
16 Voters.

17 MR. FEDOR:

18 You got it right. It is Fedor. Most
19 people screw that up, but thank you for ---.

20 CHAIR:

21 Thank you.

22 MR. FEDOR:

23 Good evening and thank you for the
24 opportunity to testify before the Board this evening.
25 My name is Michael Fedor and I am the Executive

1 Director of the Pennsylvania League of Conservation
2 Voters. We are a statewide non-profit that works to
3 educate Pennsylvania voters about the environmental
4 records and positions of elected officials and to help
5 elect pro-environment candidates to office.

6 The primary interest of the voters, I
7 work to educate and bring out to vote year after year,
8 including this year, is the future of this
9 Commonwealth. I'm here this evening to provide
10 comments in favor of the DEP Clean Vehicles Program
11 and its proposed amendments and its implementation.
12 Because the League believes this program will, in
13 fact, make this State cleaner, healthier and safer now
14 and for our children.

15 I want to clarify what we're talking
16 about before I go any further. Some refer to this as
17 the California Clean Cars Program, but that seems to
18 suggest we're adopting the same vehicles emissions
19 program top to bottom that residents of California
20 live under and that's simply not the case. PALCV
21 believes this is the right step at the right time for
22 Pennsylvania and we would be joining a healthy group
23 of states who are already acting to clean up the air
24 they breathe. In fact, nine states, besides
25 California, have chosen to adopt similar programs to

1 the one we're all here to comment on this evening.

2 All of these programs attempt to take the
3 offense on this specific source of air pollution, the
4 nearly 250 million motor vehicles on our nation's
5 roads. These nine states are New York, New Jersey,
6 Connecticut, Rhode Island, Vermont, Maine,
7 Massachusetts, Oregon and Washington. Notice
8 something about that list? Many of them are states
9 some of us visit regularly because they are in our
10 backyard. We drive our cars and SUVs to see their
11 museums, their ski resorts, their waterfalls or their
12 sports teams, and nine times out of ten we don't think
13 about the pollution we left behind in the trip.

14 These are not states on the fringes of
15 environmental action. Five of those states have
16 sitting Republican governors, two of whom are
17 seriously considering running for President of the
18 United States. New York and Vermont have economies
19 similar to ours, which focus on the service in
20 agricultural industries. That is to say that fears
21 over what these standards might be for consumers in
22 those states have been identified and assessed and the
23 program went forward.

24 For private white collar-city dwellers
25 who drive 40 minutes one way to work to blue-collar

1 rural residents who work on their farms or drive 30
2 minutes to the nearest grocery store, anyone driving a
3 vehicle on Pennsylvania roads is adding to our air
4 quality issues, and therefore, could benefit from a
5 higher standard for the vehicles available for
6 purchase. If the actions of ten states is not enough
7 to show validity of this program, then know that
8 because of the actions of these state governments, of
9 these ten states, 82 million Americans live under
10 Clean Car Programs. That's over a quarter of this
11 country's population that is benefiting already from
12 cars that are --- that use less fuel and emit fewer
13 tons of pollutants into the air each day.

14 Forty-eight (48) million of these
15 Americans live within a reasonable driving distance of
16 Pennsylvania. The question facing us now is whether
17 our 12 million residents should benefit from the same
18 forward-looking programs as our neighbors. The
19 Pennsylvania League of Conservation Voters believes
20 the citizens of this State want us to do more to stem
21 the type of pollution to our air.

22 In 2003, approximately 47 percent of
23 Pennsylvanians rated our air quality as fair or poor
24 according to a National Conservation Trust Study.
25 It's realistic to say in three years, it has not

1 improved. There are more cars on our roads now than
2 in 2003. There are certainly more drivers on our
3 roads than in 2003 and commutes are not getting any
4 shorter as anyone here can testify. Our suburbs and
5 exurbs are exploding in population, yet citizens
6 continue to work in the cities.

7 The proposed Clean Vehicles Regulations
8 are a step in the right direction and provide an
9 opportunity. An opportunity for Pennsylvanians to be
10 a leader on the environment again, to be at the
11 forefront of the new way of doing business that
12 benefits this county.

13 Is there a need to curtail vehicle
14 emissions? Over a million Pennsylvanians suffer from
15 asthma, which on a good day is an inconvenience and a
16 hot day in July when air pollution effects are felt at
17 their greatest degree, can be debilitating to the
18 young or elderly.

19 We can either let the federal government
20 dictate a national standard from on high that does not
21 reflect the reality here in Pennsylvania, or we the
22 citizens of this State, who travel the roads, hunt in
23 its woods, fish in its streams, hike in its parks, can
24 make the determination of how we can best turn the
25 corner towards cleaner air sooner rather than later.

1 As a comment on where the voting public
2 is today, many people vote with their dollars.
3 Vehicles that would qualify for the Clean Vehicles
4 Program the EQB is considering, are already in
5 production and is sold in growing numbers across the
6 United States. Some are even cornerstones to the 2006
7 model year, such as the Ford Escape Hybrid, which
8 qualifies as the super ultra-low emission vehicle.
9 You might know that the new Escape's marketing program
10 features Kermit the Frog and the slogan is, I guess it
11 is easy being green. It's tallied by Ford as 99.4
12 percent cleaner on average than an unregulated vehicle
13 and is the first hybrid built in North America.

14 Then there is GM's flex fuel program,
15 which boasts a growing fleet of vehicles that burn the
16 alternative fuel ethanol 85. GM claims this
17 technology reduces dependency on foreign oil or
18 reduces greenhouse gas and smog-forming emissions. Do
19 Pennsylvania consumers and voters want cleaner cars?
20 The DEP Hybrid, Electric and Alternative Fuel Vehicle
21 Rebate Program, which enables residents to apply for a
22 \$500 rebate for purchasing a hybrid car in
23 Pennsylvania, is about to run out of money early. Yet
24 another sign that Pennsylvania consumers want more
25 efficient and cleaner vehicles for sale in

1 Pennsylvania.

2 So what is the League's recommendation?
3 The people of Pennsylvania care about the environment
4 and the legacy we're running for our children. They
5 want cars that go farther on a gallon of gas, pollute
6 less in the process and they believe it should be done
7 at the expense of the industry that makes the
8 vehicles, not the taxpayers. There's your bottom
9 line. We should expect the auto industry to do a
10 better job of offering better products, of investing
11 in better technologies that give us cleaner cars, so
12 the average consumer can drive to work, little league
13 practice, polling booth or the grocery store without
14 adding to our problems in ways that are significantly
15 preventable.

16 What's the cost of waiting another year
17 or two or ten to adopt tougher emission standards?
18 Every day that passes without this program, is one day
19 longer our children will have to live in a time when
20 they'll wonder how short-sighted and selfish we all
21 were for not doing something sooner. Every day that
22 passes is adding exponential amounts of emissions into
23 our air that cannot be recaptured.

24 The question for this body quickly
25 becomes, why shouldn't we join that quarter of this

1 nation in making our air healthier, our state cleaner
2 and this nation safer by reducing our dependency on
3 natural resources that come in the largest quantities
4 from the most volatile portion of the globe? If
5 Pennsylvania is going to survive, then we've got to
6 lead it and stop finding every excuse in the universe
7 not to.

8 The PALCV and the voters who care about
9 the environment ask you to implement a responsible and
10 ambitious Clean Vehicle Program as proposed of the
11 regulations of Pennsylvania. Thank you and good
12 night.

13 CHAIR:

14 Thank you very much. Our next scheduled
15 witness to be Senator Jim Ferlo, but unfortunately his
16 schedule does permit him to attend. We understand he
17 will submit comments for the record. That leads us to
18 our next witness, Kevin Stewart of the American Lung
19 Association of Pennsylvania.

20 MR. STEWART:

21 My name is Kevin Stewart. I am Director
22 of Environmental Health for the American Lung
23 Association of Pennsylvania at 101 Good Drive,
24 Lancaster, PA 17603. Good evening. Mr. Chairman, on
25 behalf of the American Lung Association of

1 Pennsylvania, I thank the Environmental Quality Board
2 for the invitation to submit comments today. We
3 represent not only well over a million Pennsylvanians
4 who suffer from chronic lung disease, but also the
5 millions more who desire to breath clean air and so
6 protect their good health.

7 Founded over a century ago to fight
8 tuberculosis, the Lung Association is the oldest
9 voluntary health organization in the Commonwealth.
10 Now we are dedicated to prevention of lung disease and
11 the promotion of lung health. The Lung Association
12 represents a body of scientific knowledge on the
13 subject of lung disease, and specifically, on
14 well-established links between air pollution and lung
15 disease.

16 Let me begin by stating our position
17 clearly. The American Lung Association of
18 Pennsylvania supports the proposed rulemaking on the
19 Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program currently before
20 the EQB. Specifically, we agree with the three
21 primary purposes of this rulemaking. (1) To postpone
22 the compliance date for model year 2006 to model year
23 2008. (2) To include a three-year early credit
24 earning period that will (a) provide flexibility for
25 the vehicle manufacturers during the implementation

1 period, and (b) help insure that the regulation meets
2 the necessary identity requirements of the Federal
3 Clean Air Act. (3) To update, in the Pennsylvania
4 Clean Vehicles Program, incorporation by reference to
5 the LEV II Program contained in the California Code.
6 The Lung Association recognizes as do both the
7 Commonwealth and the EPA that the LEV II Program is
8 understood to include to neither Zero Emission
9 Vehicles nor California fuel requirements, is
10 currently the legally effective program for
11 Pennsylvania.

12 Today, we are urging the members of the
13 EQB to reject any proposals that would prevent the
14 Commonwealth from implementing the Pennsylvania Clean
15 Vehicles Program, but rather to accept this proposed
16 regulation as a sensible and appropriate step to help
17 the Commonwealth move forward in the implementation of
18 the established policy. And here's why:

19 Pennsylvania has one of the nation's most
20 serious air pollution problems. Ozone smog and fine
21 particle pollution are perhaps the two worst air
22 pollutants plaguing the Commonwealth, leading to the
23 exacerbation of respiratory and cardiovascular
24 problems, including premature mortality in high risk
25 groups and triggering hundreds of thousands of asthma

1 attacks each year in Pennsylvania. According to our
2 most recent State of the Air report, 12 Pennsylvania
3 metro areas ranked among the worst 50 nationwide for
4 ground-level ozone or particle pollution or both. And
5 7 of these metro areas ranked among the worst 25 for
6 at least one of these pollutants.

7 Last year's record of Air Quality Action
8 Days and health advisory days is sufficient to show
9 that our problem is far from being solved. In deed,
10 37 Pennsylvania counties are in nonattainment for the
11 national ozone standard, comprising about five-sixths
12 of the Commonwealth's population. Seventeen (17) of
13 these counties did not attain the standard for fine
14 particle pollution.

15 And in recognition of nearly a decade's
16 worth of additional scientific study, the air quality
17 standards need to be tightened. The current standards
18 are inadequate to protect public health. In short,
19 while we've made progress, we need to do much more to
20 improve air quality.

21 We are compelled to point out that the
22 nonattainment status of more than the half the
23 counties in the Commonwealth has been determined with
24 respect to what was once the new national air quality
25 standards for ozone and particle pollution, the

1 standards that were promulgated by EPA in 1997. Those
2 standards were established based on the weight of the
3 evidence of what was known to medicine and science at
4 that time, with findings that adverse consequences of
5 exposure to elevated air pollution levels range from
6 more lost school and work days, more frequent and
7 severe asthma attacks and increased use of medication
8 to irreversible lung damage, more hospitalizations,
9 more emergency department visits and more deaths.

10 In what has been nearly a decade since
11 1997, it is fair to state that thousands of new
12 studies on the health and environmental effects of
13 ozone and particle pollution have been published in
14 peer-reviewed literature. Although, I don't have time
15 to read through them, a fiend of the published --- I'm
16 sorry, of the conclusions of studies released after
17 the establishment of 1997 standards, is that air
18 pollution is linked to more adverse health effects at
19 lower levels of exposure than ever before. So there's
20 a whole part that I'm not going to read to you.

21 I have also provided the EQB with our
22 recent report of 2005 Research Highlights. I stress
23 that this report, like the preceding unread litany of
24 research conclusions, only scratches the surface of
25 the extensive research being currently undertaken. A

1 few examples from the current report are, for fine
2 particle pollution, levels below the current air
3 quality standard led to a reduction in risk for death
4 due to cardiovascular respiratory disease. Risk of
5 premature mortality was nearly three times greater
6 than was previously reported and diabetics were found
7 to be more vulnerable.

8 For ozone, three independent research
9 reviews done at Yale, Harvard and NYU separately
10 confirm that increases in daily average ozone levels
11 were linked with an increased risk of death, not only
12 on the day of exposure, but for up to two days
13 following, even when controlled for confounders such
14 as particle pollution and temperature. Many other
15 studies linked ozone air pollution often at levels
16 below the current standards with effects as disparate
17 as heart arrhythmias, heart attacks, reduced birth
18 weight, difficulty breathing among infants of
19 asthmatic mothers, retardation of lung function
20 growth, reduction in acute lung function among mail
21 carriers, et cetera. Again, I stress this review
22 merely scratches the surface of what is known.

23 Mobile sources contributed about a third
24 of the emissions in Pennsylvania and no other sector
25 produces as much as you've heard from Nancy.

1 Pollutants include ozone precursors, volatile organic
2 compounds and nitrogen oxides, as well as fine
3 particles, toxic and carcinogenic programs. Keeping
4 the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicle Program will provide
5 significantly greater reductions in air pollution than
6 would adopting the federal Tier II standards.

7 The American Lung Association of
8 Pennsylvania estimates that over the period from 2010
9 through 2025, by which time full fleet turnover is
10 expected. Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program would
11 prevent ozone precursors from being emitted in the
12 amount of about 50,000 tons and perhaps as much as
13 80,000 tons beyond the reductions achievable by the
14 federal vehicle standards. And of course, the
15 benefits will continue in the amount of 6,000 to 9,000
16 tons for every year beginning with full
17 implementation.

18 The more that both VOC and NOx emissions
19 are decreased, the more we can expect to see decreased
20 ozone air pollution levels. And there are millions of
21 Pennsylvanians now at an increased risk from exposure
22 to air pollution who stand the benefit. It is my duty
23 today to remind all of us that the reason we have air
24 pollution control programs is that, first and
25 foremost, air pollution worsens and causes disease and

1 even deaths for real people.

2 My full comments include estimates of the
3 millions of Pennsylvanians at risk. Of course, some
4 individuals are included in two or more risk
5 categories, such as children with asthma or senior
6 citizens with heart disease. But a little analysis
7 soon makes it plain that about half of the
8 Commonwealth population is described by at least one
9 of these categories. So it is very probable that your
10 family is home to one of these individuals.

11 And that's why I must implore you to keep
12 two things in mind. Every one of these millions is a
13 real person, not a nameless statistic. Every one of
14 these people is a family member, a neighbor, a
15 co-worker, friend. Take a moment to remember those
16 whom you know personally. Now, multiply that to cover
17 over 12 million Pennsylvanians.

18 Asthma and other chronic lung diseases
19 are potentially serious illnesses. Among people who
20 have them, air pollution can result in an increased
21 need for medication, hospitalization and even death.
22 I ask you to think about your own last respiratory
23 episode or one you witnessed when someone couldn't
24 easily catch his or her next breath. Put yourself in
25 that person's place or into the place of a parent of a

1 child with such an illness. Now, ask yourself if that
2 6,000 to 9,000 tons a year of air pollution really
3 ought to be allowed to go into the air.

4 Costs. Estimates for what the
5 Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program will add to the
6 sticker price of new cars when it's fully implemented
7 range up to \$33,000. We must remind you that it is
8 clear from the history of regulation of the auto
9 industry, that such estimates invariably,
10 significantly overstate the costs that consumers
11 experience when such air pollution control measures
12 are actually implemented.

13 Based strictly on the persistent
14 historical pattern of such overestimates, we would not
15 be surprised to find, at full implementation, that
16 costs would be in the ballpark of only \$600 or \$700
17 per vehicle. These are incremental initial costs on
18 the order of two percent. A ratio, by the way, in the
19 same range that some in this debate have claimed is
20 small enough not to make a difference.

21 Moreover, using the now quite
22 conservative assumption that gasoline would \$1.74 per
23 gallon, the California Air Resources Board found that
24 the increase in purchase price would be more than
25 offset by savings and fuel expenditures over the life

1 of the vehicle. The inescapable conclusion here is
2 that these air quality benefits are free. Even
3 figuring in the additional initial vehicle cost, the
4 true cost effectiveness witnessed by the consumer over
5 the life of the vehicle, i.e., how much additional
6 money they're spending to reduce air pollution would
7 negative, that's a savings, compared to the federal
8 Tier II program.

9 I must remind the Board that even as we
10 deliver it, we are all already paying as a part of our
11 medical expenses, insurance payments and economic
12 costs for our failure to control air pollution. The
13 serious consequences of outdoor air pollution in
14 Pennsylvania result in a total loss on the order of
15 \$1 billion per year, over the half of the total that's
16 accounted for by healthcare costs.

17 The remainder includes costs due to lost
18 work, lost productivity and premature mortality.
19 Estimates for premature mortality among Pennsylvanians
20 due to air pollution range from about 2,000 a year to
21 about 5,000. Of course, the preceding does not begin
22 to characterize the human suffering involved. In
23 contrast, analysis shows that cost in the economy of
24 implementing pollution control measures are recouped
25 many times over in savings, in health, work and lives.

1 In conclusion, the American Lung
2 Association of Pennsylvania asks the Board not to
3 underestimate the interest in and the importance of
4 having the strongest vehicle emissions standards
5 available. We strongly encourage the EQB to support
6 the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program and to reject
7 any proposal that would have the effect of preventing
8 its implementation. Please continue to give this
9 issue your full and deliberate attention. Respect for
10 our citizens requires it. The public's health demands
11 it. Thank you.

12 CHAIR:

13 Thank you. Our next witness is Greg Dana
14 from the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers.

15 MR. DANA:

16 Good evening. My name is Greg Dana. I'm
17 Vice President of Environmental Affairs for the
18 Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers. We are a trade
19 association of nine car makers --- car and light truck
20 makers. We're based in Washington, D.C. at 1401 I
21 Street, Washington, D.C. 20005.

22 Let me start by saying that Pennsylvania
23 did not intend to adopt the California Low Emission
24 vehicle standards of 1998. The Pennsylvania Clean
25 Vehicles program included adoption of the LEV

1 standards as a temporary measure or backstop, in case
2 EPA's National Low Emission Vehicle program was not
3 implemented or if the federal standards cleaner than
4 NLEV were not adopted. In fact, the Pennsylvania
5 Department of Environmental Protection expressed its
6 intent to utilize the Federal Tier II program before
7 and after the Tier II program started in 2004.

8 I was one of the five negotiators in
9 Pennsylvania at the time. I was working with Jim Sipe
10 (phonetic), who was with the DEP. I can tell you for
11 a fact that it was not the DEP's intention to develop
12 this program, 'cause I was here to talk with them at
13 the time.

14 The Federal Tier II emission standards
15 were designed to meet the needs of the Northeastern
16 and Mid-Atlantic states areas of the country. These
17 standards focus on NOx reductions that are a
18 particular concern in this region of the country. In
19 contrast, California LEV II focuses on hydrocarbon
20 emission reductions.

21 The federal program currently being used
22 in Pennsylvania also established the maximum feasible
23 emission reductions considering the local fuels
24 available in this area. The California LEV program
25 will not include the California fuel volume that is

1 critical to meet California emission requirements.

2 You've heard some data on emissions.

3 Attached to my statement is this model chart that
4 you've probably seen before. This is a computer
5 replica of a global emissions model and what's
6 important about this model is it looks into the future
7 of Tier II. And what this shows you is that by 2020
8 when the fleet turns over completely to the new
9 standards, according to the EPA, there's a one-percent
10 benefit in hydrocarbons and two-percent benefit in air
11 toxins.

12 Now, why is it important to look at the
13 EPA assumptions? Because the EPA will give you the
14 SIP credits that they've kept for adopting California
15 LEV. So the only benefits you would get out of the
16 EPA would be the one-percent hydrocarbon, two-percent
17 air toxins. Now, let's look at a snapshot in time.
18 Any model always gives an assumption you wouldn't.
19 EPA has just proposed last month new federal air toxic
20 regulations from mobile sources. Those standards
21 will, in fact, reduce hydrocarbon emissions, both
22 evaporable and tailpipe. That will mitigate that one
23 percent and two percent air toxins benefits of the
24 program when they go into effect in 2010. So I can
25 sit here before you saying that according to this

1 modeling data and according to the standards that are
2 being proposed by EPA, there will be no benefit to the
3 California LEV program or the federal Tier II program,
4 but that it's fully phased and on its way.

5 Now, the Sierra Club presenter made a
6 comment about 2002. I'll stand up with my right hand
7 and say, yes, in 2002, motor vehicles were a 40
8 percent cause of urban pollution in this country, but
9 that's not the point. In 2002, cars were meeting a
10 NOx standard of 0.2 grams per mile. Under the federal
11 Tier II program in 2004, we're meeting an average
12 standard of 0.7 grams per mile. That's over an
13 80-percent reduction in nitrogen oxide emissions under
14 those standards.

15 When those standards are fully phased in,
16 cars will no longer be 40 percent of air pollution, it
17 will be eight percent. That's a full phase in of that
18 effect of the area, so we become a much smaller piece
19 of the pie once these are fully phased in.
20 Unfortunately, it does take 15 years for the public to
21 phase in, because everyone doesn't buy a new car every
22 year.

23 Now, that's supposed to take full account
24 of the investment costs and accountabilities in the
25 industry, indicating the average cost is increased in

1 vehicles. Under the California Greenhouse Gas
2 Program, it will be more than \$2,000 per vehicle on
3 average. This is not a cost that is fully covered by
4 fuel cost safeties. Even if you have any car
5 troubles, this is with car service, they're over
6 \$1,000 per year. That is a huge price increase for
7 vehicles, which will have less function and utility.

8 It's important to understand the
9 difference between low emission vehicles and
10 greenhouse gases. The Low Emission Vehicle program
11 cars in California have a slight cost increase over
12 federal cars. Manufacturers choose what price to sell
13 cars at. Most of them choose not to reflect that cost
14 difference in the price of cars, so it's easy to
15 compare retail price of cars and say there's no
16 difference in price. You can also look at what
17 manufacturers do to sell cars. They put \$3,000
18 rebates on cars, so it's clear that the price has
19 nothing to do with the cost of the vehicle. That's a
20 selling position by the manufacturer.

21 Now, cars that are \$1,000 per vehicle, we
22 found numerous errors in costs and we fully believe
23 that it's more like \$3,000 per vehicle when the
24 greenhouse gas program is fully phased in, in 2016.
25 These cars, if we have to build them, would be very

1 different than cars we see on the road today. They'd
2 be much smaller. Trucks wouldn't be able to carry as
3 many loads. They wouldn't be able to haul as big a
4 load or carry as many people.

5 So what people would be getting in this
6 state for a much more expensive vehicle, you would get
7 a vehicle with less function plus utility. We think
8 that's a bad choice for consumers. Consumers are in
9 the driver's seat, right where they should be.
10 Consumers are the ones who will choose which vehicles
11 and technologies meet their needs. Consumers will be
12 the ones to decide how much they value fuel economy
13 relative to other factors, such as performance or
14 cargo-carrying capability.

15 Measures like these proposed greenhouse
16 gas rules fail to account for the consumer preferences
17 and have the effect of limiting consumer choice.
18 Indeed, consumers are increasingly choosing light
19 trucks as citizens such as contractors, repair people,
20 builders, farmers and other trades people rely on
21 these vehicles to earn their livelihoods. We believe
22 that these choices should continue to be made by
23 consumers, not by the government.

24 Federal law is clear. Federal law
25 prohibits states from adopting or enforcing laws or

1 regulations to fuel economy standards. This
2 preemption language was put into place because of the
3 impact that divergent fuel economy standards would
4 have on the national economy. The U.S. Congress
5 reserved the issue of regulating vehicle fuel economy
6 to the federal government to avoid a patchwork quilt
7 of state regulations, which would hurt businesses and
8 consumers alike.

9 Because carbon dioxide and fuel economy
10 are synonymous, there is no question that California's
11 AB 1493 regulations and Pennsylvania's corresponding
12 regulations would represent attempt by the state to
13 control motor-vehicle fuel economy. And as such, they
14 are federally preempted. This is the primary thrust
15 of the Alliance's ongoing litigation in California.

16 And it's important you understand that
17 whether or not the state actually adopts greenhouse
18 gas standards or the California, if you have LEV
19 standards you will get the cars meeting the greenhouse
20 gas standards. You'll get the cars that are much
21 smaller and less capable than the cars that you have
22 today.

23 In summary, because these proposed
24 regulations would increase the price of all new
25 vehicles by about \$3,000 on average, with no

1 corresponding health or environmental benefit, the
2 Alliance urges the DEP to not enact these rules.
3 Thank you. And we'll submit written copies for the
4 record.

5 CHAIR:

6 Thank you very much. Our next witness is
7 Jan Jarrett of PennFuture.

8 MS. JARRETT:

9 Good evening. My name is Jan Jarrett.
10 I'm Vice President of PennFuture. We are at 610 North
11 Third Street in Harrisburg. I'd like to thank you for
12 the opportunity to present testimony tonight about
13 changes to the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program.
14 PennFuture fully supports the proposed amendments to
15 the Clean Vehicles Program. The program, that adopts
16 the California Low Emission Vehicle standards for
17 tailpipe emissions, is necessary for Pennsylvania to
18 attain health-based clean air standards.

19 Right now, 37 counties that are home to
20 more than half of Pennsylvania's population do not
21 meet clean air standards. About one-third of the air
22 pollution in the Commonwealth originates from cars and
23 trucks which emit nitrogen oxides and volatile organic
24 compounds, which are precursors to ozone smog,
25 pollution and benzene, which is a toxic air pollutant

1 that can cause cancer.

2 The health consequences of air pollution
3 are serious and profound. More than one million
4 Pennsylvanians live with chronic lung diseases, like
5 asthma that make them sensitive to air pollution. A
6 soon-to-be released report by PennEnvironment shows
7 that ozone smog pollution triggers 300,000 asthma
8 attacks per year, sends 7,000 people to the hospital
9 each year because of other respiratory problems,
10 causes 2,000 new cases of asthma each year and causes
11 900,000 missed school days.

12 The California Low Emissions Vehicle
13 standard will achieve reductions of pollution
14 significantly greater than the federal Low Emission
15 Vehicle standards. Full implementation of the Clean
16 Vehicles Program will reduce nitrogen oxide pollution
17 by nine percent, the emissions of volatile organic
18 compounds by six to twelve percent and toxic benzene
19 emissions by seven to fifteen percent lower than
20 reductions that would result from the federal car by
21 2025.

22 If reductions in these air pollutants do
23 not come from cars and light trucks, further
24 reductions of pollution will be required from power
25 plants and industries, making it hard to locate new

1 businesses and expand existing businesses in areas
2 that do not meet clean air standards.

3 These pollution reductions can be
4 achieved now at no additional cost to the consumer.
5 Right now, cars that meet the cleaner California
6 standards are selling for exactly the same price as
7 the federal car. Since the cleanest cars are also the
8 most fuel efficient, any future increase in initial
9 price would be offset by savings at the gas pump. In
10 addition, automobiles meeting the California tailpipe
11 standards carry better warranties for the emissions
12 control systems, which can save consumers additional
13 out-of-pocket maintenance repair costs as the vehicles
14 age.

15 Ten other states, including New York, New
16 Jersey and all the New England states except for New
17 Hampshire, either have already adopted the cleaner
18 California standard or are in the process of enacting
19 the program. A report by the National Academy of
20 Science's National Research Council, released last
21 week, found that California's role in setting
22 emissions standards has been scientifically valid and
23 necessary to achieve clean air goals in parts of the
24 country struggling to clean up the air. The report
25 also found that the California standards have helped

1 speed up technological air pollution control
2 innovations.

3 PennFuture fully supports full
4 implementation of the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles
5 Program. It is good for public health, good for the
6 environment and good for the economy. Thank you.

7 CHAIR:

8 Thank you. Our next witness is Kim
9 Anderson. And if you could state your name and your
10 address for the record, we'd appreciate it.

11 MS. ANDERSON:

12 I sure will.

13 CHAIR:

14 Thank you.

15 MS ANDERSON:

16 My name is Kim Anderson. And my address
17 is 470 Mount Zion Road in Dillsburg, Pennsylvania.
18 And I guess I represent the Anderson family. And I'm
19 here to testify, because I support Pennsylvania
20 Department of Environmental Protection's adoption of
21 the Clean Vehicles Program. It represents our
22 opportunity to act now to improve how we get around.

23 The automobile is the preferred mode of
24 transportation and why not support a better
25 technology. I don't have a copy of my testimony. I

1 apologize. I could've easily sent this by e-mail, but
2 I though it was very impersonal. And I wanted to
3 share a comment made by my 15-year-old son, who
4 actually, I hope, will call Pennsylvania his home when
5 he's an adult. And we were having dinner one night
6 and we were discussing the Clean Vehicles Program,
7 believe it or not, and my husband asked if there was
8 any reason why this would not come into effect. And
9 my son was just surprised and he answered, why? Who
10 knows where it could lead? So I'm here to support my
11 son and ask where could it lead? And I agree with
12 him.

13 And you know, who knows where promoting
14 clean vehicles is really going to take us. The auto
15 industry could not only produce a cleaner vehicle, but
16 continue to produce cleaner vehicles. And perhaps,
17 Pennsylvania could start the race to the top, you
18 know, who could sell the most cleanest vehicles. As a
19 consumer also, I want to know that I will have these
20 choices when I go to buy my next car. Thank you.

21 CHAIR:

22 Thank you very much for coming out. We
23 appreciate it. Our next witness is Ted Leonard of the
24 Pennsylvania AAA Federation.

25 MR. LEONARD:

1 Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of
2 the Environmental Quality Board. My name is Ted
3 Leonard. I'm the Executive Director of the
4 Pennsylvania AAA Federation. Our office is here in
5 Harrisburg at 600 North Third Street, Harrisburg,
6 17101. Thank you for this opportunity to present our
7 views on the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program and
8 EQB proposed rulemakings to adopt the California LEV
9 II.

10 We support the Commonwealth's
11 continuation in the federal Tier II program. Those
12 vehicles have actually been in the Pennsylvania fleet
13 since model year 2004. We will submit more detailed
14 and documented comments to the proposed legislation.
15 First and most importantly, we do not believe that
16 this issue is a debate between a clean car and a dirty
17 car. Both the federal Tier II and the CA LEV II
18 program produce exceptionally clean cars with large
19 emission reductions over the National Low Emissions
20 Vehicle, NLEV.

21 The federal Tier II program has
22 unfortunately been mischaracterized as a dirtier car
23 and a weaker emissions standard. And another
24 mischaracterization of the debate has been that
25 Pennsylvania is somehow backing off emission standards

1 if the state decides to maintain participation in the
2 federal program. And obviously, neither of these
3 assertions is true.

4 AAA was appointed as a member of the 1992
5 Pennsylvania Low Emissions Vehicle Commission and a
6 member of the various 1999 DEP Ozone Stakeholder
7 Groups, formulating strategies to reduce ozone in
8 Pennsylvania. And other groups in this room were also
9 members of these various Ozone Stakeholder Groups. In
10 its Final Report of the Pennsylvania Low Emissions
11 Vehicle Commission, submitted to Governor Casey in
12 August of 1993, the LEV Commission rejected adoption
13 of a California LEV program. Ozone Stakeholder
14 Groups, likewise, in their final reports to the DEP,
15 recommended adoption of a federal Tier II program, not
16 a CA LEV program.

17 Other EPA and DEP documentation shows
18 that the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program
19 established the Clean Air Act Section 177 California
20 standards as a backstop in the event that auto
21 manufacturers did not produce an acceptable NLEV. In
22 a June 1997 report to the General Assembly on the
23 Clean Vehicles Program in Pennsylvania, DEP commented
24 that a National Low Emissions Vehicle program would be
25 more cost effective and equitable than individual

1 state Low Emissions Vehicle programs once contemplated
2 throughout the Ozone Transport Region.

3 DEP noted in the report that the
4 Department was developing a new motor emissions
5 control regulation that would allow Pennsylvania to
6 opt into the NLEV program. However, since there was
7 still uncertainty about the NLEV program in
8 Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania would establish a
9 Commonwealth Clean Vehicles program, but allow
10 automakers to opt into NLEV as an alternative to a
11 Pennsylvania specific program.

12 In a July 1999 letter to the EPA, DEP
13 stated that Pennsylvania strongly supported the
14 proposed federal Tier II regulations, the federal Tier
15 II program being the even cleaner successor to the
16 NLEV program. In fact, DEP was pleased that Tier II
17 emphasized reductions in nitrogen oxide, or NOx, since
18 a NOx reduction was most important for states like
19 Pennsylvania. It's important to point out that the
20 federal Tier II program emphasizes reductions in NOx,
21 while the CA LEV program does not.

22 This is noteworthy as ozone in
23 Pennsylvania has been characterized as being NOx
24 driven. This little bit of history is necessary as to
25 debate over Tier II and California LEV programs has

1 often mischaracterized Pennsylvania as having always
2 participated in and desiring to participate in a
3 California program. This is not true.

4 It does not appear that the CA LEV
5 program provides any additional emission reduction
6 benefits relative to the federal Tier II. In a 2004
7 letter, the USEPA expressed concern that the
8 overstated benefits of the California car may entice
9 states to adopt the California program when those
10 benefits may not actually be realized. EPA estimated
11 the relative benefit of the California program to be
12 one percent in VOCs and two percent in air toxics in
13 the year 2020. EPA made no mention of additional
14 California program NOx benefit.

15 Adoption of the CA LEV program would
16 incur some costs and may even be counter-productive to
17 air quality improvement efforts. Consumers would,
18 under the California LEV II regulations, face higher
19 vehicle costs ranging from \$1,000 to \$3,000, which are
20 the CARB and auto manufacturer estimates,
21 respectively. Higher vehicle costs will reduce or
22 slow new vehicle sales.

23 Slowing vehicle fleet turnover would mean
24 older vehicles with higher emissions would remain on
25 the road longer. Vehicle fleet turnover has been a

1 major contributor in reducing mobile source emissions.
2 Consumers would also be restricted in vehicle choice
3 under the CA LEV program, as certain vehicles would be
4 modified in weight and capability to meet fuel economy
5 restrictions, and some vehicle models will be
6 eliminated altogether.

7 In a conscious and documented decision by
8 the CARB, the California program eliminates consumer
9 access to diesel passenger vehicles. And a look at
10 EPA's list of 2006 model year fuel economy leaders,
11 shows four diesel passenger vehicles in the top seven
12 vehicles. It's hardly a step in the right direction
13 of increasing fuel economy, particularly in light of
14 the recent trend of increasing fuel prices to
15 eliminate consumer access to some of the most
16 affordable, efficient and fuel economical vehicles on
17 the market.

18 Federal law in the Clean Air Act Section
19 177 requires state participation in either the federal
20 Tier II or the CA LEV program. Adoption of the CA LEV
21 program comes as a package and ties any state adopting
22 the California program to any and all changes made by
23 the California Board. Pennsylvania would have no
24 representation on that board and the people of
25 Pennsylvania and their elected representatives would

1 have no say and no recourse to any program changes
2 that may benefit California, but could harm
3 Pennsylvania.

4 Due to its population density,
5 geographic, meteorological and other reasons,
6 California's air quality issues differ in nature and
7 severity to those of Pennsylvania. I have lived in
8 California, both in San Diego and in Los Angeles, and
9 I can tell you that the air quality problem in
10 California is certainly different than that of
11 Pennsylvania.

12 The decisions of the California Board are
13 intended to address California's air quality problem,
14 not that of Pennsylvania. The decisions of how to
15 best address Pennsylvania air quality issues should
16 remain in Pennsylvania. We believe that Pennsylvania
17 made the right decision in 1997 to participate in
18 national low emissions vehicle program and its
19 successor, Tier II, which began with the model 2004
20 vehicles. It was the right decision then and we
21 believe it is the right decision now.

22 CHAIR:

23 Thank you very much. Our next witness is
24 Jeff Schmidt. If you could state your name and your
25 address for the record, we'd appreciate it.

1 MR. SCHMIDT:

2 Yes. Good evening. My name is Jeff
3 Schmidt. I'm here tonight as a private citizen. I
4 live in Perry County in the Shermans Dale area. My
5 address is 55 Green Light Lane, Shermans Dale.

6 I'm here to support full implementation
7 of the Clean Vehicles Program and the proposed changes
8 that are being presented to the Environmental Quality
9 Board. And I oppose the efforts that are being made
10 to appeal the Clean Vehicles Program, which are being
11 promoted the auto manufacturers and AAA.

12 I'm here in part because I have a
13 personal stake in this issue. I have a 79-year-old
14 mother who has a chronic respiratory ailment, often
15 called COPD. And for those of you that know people
16 who have respiratory illness, such as COPD, you know
17 what that means on a bad ozone day. My mother, who
18 still drives and can get around, although, you know,
19 she's very frail. She has to carry an inhaler. And
20 on smoggy days, if it's pretty bad, she can't go
21 outside. She becomes a prisoner in her own home.

22 If she does go outside, she's fearful
23 that she's going to trigger an attack. And that's
24 happened where I've watched her --- I've observed her
25 gasping for breath, simply the act of walking from her

1 house to her car and then walking from the car to the
2 grocery store, that sort of thing. And when she
3 exerts herself, she can have an attack and might have
4 to go to the hospital. Again, it's fairly difficult
5 to watch someone so close to you in that kind of
6 situation. That's on a bad ozone days. And of
7 course, we know now that the motor vehicles contribute
8 a significant part of the pollution that causes those
9 ozone days.

10 I'm also here, not to formally represent
11 them, but to take issue with the AAA testimony. I'm a
12 AAA member since 1967 continuously. And I simply do
13 not believe that AAA's representing the best interest
14 of its members with the position that was represented
15 here tonight and which has been stated previously.
16 I'm offended by the amount of money that AAA is using,
17 that is, AAA member money to promote its side of this
18 issue.

19 I want the choice to be able to purchase
20 the cleanest vehicles possible. AAA opposes this by
21 opposing the Clean Vehicles Program. They oppose my
22 right to purchase the cleanest vehicles. I want to
23 the choice to purchase the most fuel-efficient
24 vehicles available. And AAA opposes those, because
25 they oppose the Clean Vehicles Program, which would

1 provide much more fuel-efficient vehicles for
2 Pennsylvania.

3 I want to see fuel prices go down. And I
4 believe that a Clean Vehicles Program will promote
5 more fuel efficient vehicles, which will reduce
6 demand, which will, in effect, reduce the need for
7 gasoline, which will then help to reduce prices. But
8 AAA opposes this, 'cause they oppose the Clean
9 Vehicles Program, which means they're actually
10 supporting maintaining high fuel prices, which is
11 against the interest of motorists like myself.

12 I'm just very disappointed that AAA has
13 chosen to take this path. And I don't how well its
14 members know that they're representing on this. In
15 conversations I've had with AAA, they apparently have
16 no process at all to gauge the opinion of their
17 members on a subject like this.

18 I'm also offended when out-of-state
19 lobbyists, such as those from the automobile industry,
20 come into Pennsylvania and tell us that we should not
21 have the right to adopt our own program to control
22 pollution from automobiles in Pennsylvania. In
23 effect, they want us to stay subservient to the
24 federal regulations that are developed by faceless
25 Bureaucrats of the Bush Administration. We would much

1 prefer --- I would much prefer to have the right as a
2 state to adopt a program that we choose, which if it
3 means following the path that California's gone down,
4 give us the right to do that.

5 But AAA and the auto manufacturers oppose
6 our right to maintain our sovereignty in this issue.
7 How dare they tell us we don't have a right to
8 determine what level of protection our citizens should
9 have with this, and to force us to accept the weaker
10 the federal Tier II standards giving up our state's
11 sovereignty?

12 In summary, I'd ask the Environmental
13 Quality Board to support the Clean Vehicles Program
14 and the changes proposed by DEP. I urge EQB to resist
15 efforts to block weakened or watered down Clean
16 Vehicles Program. And I urge the prompt
17 implementation of the program. Thank you.

18 CHAIR:

19 Thank you. Our next witness is James
20 Elliot. If you could state your name and address for
21 the record, we'd appreciate it.

22 MR. ELLIOTT:

23 Yes. I do not have written testimony,
24 but I may submit that later. My name is James
25 Elliott. I am of a resident of Camp Hill Borough.

1 250 North 27th Street, Camp Hill, 17011. I am here
2 speaking as a citizen. I am a member of various
3 organizations, including the Sierra Club, also a
4 member of Republicans for Environmental Protection and
5 longest standing, the AAA, since the 1960s. I also
6 support the comments of the previous speaker with
7 regard to AAA not representing their constituency.

8 My background. I am an environmental
9 engineer, an environmental engineer in private
10 practice for 30 years. Background before that is as
11 an assistant geophysicist. I am here to support the
12 regulatory package that is being proposed. I believe
13 this is essential, because of public health, because
14 of energy conservation for sustainability, our
15 lifestyle and to minimize global warming.

16 I believe it is in the best economic
17 interest of the U.S. automobile manufacturers, which I
18 will explain. And it's also very important for
19 strategic goals in the United States, including
20 concerns expressed by the U.S. Department of Defense,
21 which may be an unusual comment, but in fact, I think
22 we're all in this together.

23 I'm one of, probably, a few people
24 present and the only person present here who had the
25 experience of driving through L.A. Basin in the 1960s.

1 The painful and profound impact of my eyes and lungs
2 was immediate within just a day. Fortunately, I was a
3 casual visitor. But there were millions of people in
4 that basin who lived in that environment all their
5 life.

6 What's happening today is supposed to be
7 mild compared to that, because we have made some
8 stride. But ozone and particle pollution
9 non-compliance in this state is still a human ill
10 impact and it shortens lives. I would reference the
11 testimony by the American Lung Association. Is what
12 is being presented here unprecedented? Absolutely,
13 not.

14 In 1970, the Clean Air Act was signed by
15 President Nixon. The automobile manufacturers were up
16 in arms. They tried to sue. They tried to do
17 everything they could to stall the obligations to
18 impose certain emissions requirements by the model
19 year 1975. William Ruckelshaus, the first EPA
20 administrator, stood by the regulations. What is
21 different than today, is when that law was signed
22 there was no technology that existed on earth to
23 comply.

24 Yet, U.S. scientists, engineers and
25 manufacturers invented the catalytic converter in the

1 process emulated to there. The auto manufacturers
2 retool. By the model year 1995, the U.S. fleet was in
3 compliance with the law that was impossible. The
4 difference today, we readily have the technology. We
5 can employ it and we do employ it. It's not foreign
6 technology. Ford, as well as other manufacturers, has
7 made the technology available.

8 The Sierra Club comment was this is low
9 hanging fruit in comparison with the 1970s was
10 absolutely overhead for us. What is the danger to the
11 U.S. auto industry if we do not implement this, which
12 is feasible? The danger is that we would fall further
13 behind in the economy and competitors. A survey by
14 the Public Opinion Research in November of 2005
15 indicates that four-fifths of Americans desire higher
16 fuel performance vehicles, contrary to what I sensed
17 from the AAA commentary.

18 Further, deferrals will result in delays
19 that will cause the U.S. industry, in general, to
20 invest in the environment. The low emission vehicles
21 also are characterized by high fuel effectiveness,
22 high fuel efficiencies. The public does seek further
23 availabilities under such technologies. Also, with
24 regard to what does the American public want to
25 purchase. A survey was released a couple weeks ago,

1 the ten hottest selling vehicles in America. That is
2 the vehicles that are on the block for the shortest
3 period of time. The Ford Escape Hybrid, less than 30
4 days, on the top ten hottest selling vehicles in
5 America. The Toyota Prius, 12 days.

6 I mentioned the U.S. Department of
7 Defense. Last week I heard some testimony by Dr. Ted
8 Barna, under the Secretary of Defense, dealing with
9 energy matters. The U.S. government is recognizing
10 and approaching crisis in terms of fuel available for
11 military missions. It is an important thing for the
12 American industry and the American government, as we
13 know, for our society today. Conclusions that they
14 came to were that there was an absolute critical
15 necessity in conservation of fuel consumption.
16 There's a necessity to apply new technologies for the
17 use of vehicle fuel and new technologies of
18 manufacture fuel.

19 Earlier this month, there was a
20 conference for the Alternative Fuels and Renewable
21 Energies Council over at the Pennsylvania Senate
22 Bureau One. The members who spoke at that conference,
23 including Dr. Barna, concluded that absent, regulatory
24 requirements through political leadership when U.S.
25 manufacturers of all efficient technologies will

1 continue to fall behind the competitors. It requires
2 leadership and it requires regulations.

3 It is well documented and even President
4 Bush has acknowledged a global climate change as a
5 fact, fortunately, finally. The application of new
6 technologies of fuel efficiency and conservation will
7 work toward reduction of global climate change or
8 aversion of avoiding the rate at which we are entering
9 into it, so that we can continue to enjoy life here
10 within God's creation.

11 Is it true that vehicle performance
12 suffers, as what was just commented? Speaking from a
13 household that owns two Toyota Prius', no, it does not
14 have to suffer. We just took a trip two weeks ago
15 down to North Carolina. I was able to get into the
16 passing lane and zip up to 80 miles an hour. We did
17 not have to suffer because we have selected a
18 fuel-efficient vehicle.

19 In conclusion, support this regulatory
20 package. I think it's critical, because of human
21 health. Because it would employ readily accessible
22 technologies that the U.S. manufacturers here in court
23 are not embracing adequately. It will promote U.S.
24 competitiveness in a global environment. The response
25 to public opinion and consumer demand. It promotes

1 fuel efficiency to benefit reduced contributions of
2 global climate change. It is good for the strategic
3 use of U.S. security and it promotes technological
4 advances that consumers will embrace and make life
5 here in Pennsylvania more enjoyable. Thank you.

6 CHAIR:

7 Thank you very much. Our next witness is
8 Joel Toluba. If you could your name and your address,
9 we'd appreciate it.

10 MR. TOLUBA:

11 Certainly. Joel Toluba. It's spelled
12 T-O-L-U-B-A. I live at 1102 North Third Street in
13 Harrisburg, PA 17102. A little bit about myself.
14 I've been driving a Honda Insight, one of the hybrid
15 vehicles, since the fall of 2002. And in total, I've
16 said hundreds of dollars in gas. And as we saw from
17 Katrina last year, as well as now, turmoil in the
18 Middle East, our supply has been having problems
19 meeting our demand. And there does not appear to be
20 any sign to this trend.

21 Just this past week, walking down Third
22 Street, the price of gas jumped up 20 cents in 48
23 hours. And our summer driving season hasn't even come
24 near, yet. Today is the first day of spring, so we've
25 got another three months before summer officially

1 starts.

2 A little bit about myself. I'm an
3 attorney practicing here in Harrisburg, not in the
4 environmental realm, but insurance defense. And with
5 rising energy costs a problem my clients have been
6 having is spiraling medical costs which are directly
7 related to energy, as well as costs of healthcare ---
8 public healthcare because of increasing bronchitis,
9 asthma, other smog-related diseases.

10 A couple interesting points I picked up
11 listening to some of the previous speakers. Mr. Dana
12 from the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers
13 indicated that by 2020 the decrease in emissions,
14 hydrocarbons and air toxics will be respectfully one
15 percent and two percent. Now, I think we can all
16 think ahead to 2020 and we can all agree that they're
17 assuming that gasoline --- energy remains relatively
18 cheap and available, that there's going to be a lot
19 more drivers on the road. So taking into
20 consideration all these new drivers 14 years from now,
21 one percent, two percent, you know, that's not a big
22 difference. We're basically treading water.

23 But what Mr. Dana doesn't tell us is how
24 much worse the level of ozone emissions will be if we
25 don't implement the Clean Vehicles Program and I'd be

1 interested to see statistics on that, and I'm very
2 concerned that was omitted from what was presented to
3 you prior. There was also indication that
4 implementing the Clean Vehicles Program will lead to
5 higher manufacturing costs \$1,000 to \$3,000 a vehicle.

6 And again, I can testify on a personal
7 level that any increase in vehicle costs would
8 certainly be offset by your savings at the fuel pump.
9 I've already saved at least \$1,000 and looking to the
10 future, if gas is eventually \$4, \$5 a gallon, who
11 knows when that would be, but eventually the savings
12 will only be more.

13 So in summary, I just wanted to emphasize
14 my support for the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles
15 Program. I would like to express my opposition to any
16 of the proposed bills before the Senate or the House.
17 And try to detract from it or throw up any road blocks
18 from it being implemented as been implemented in other
19 states in the Northeast in addition to California.
20 And the documentation that has been submitted
21 previously, I think, proves that beyond a reasonable
22 doubt that this program isn't detrimental to auto
23 manufacturers' business. People still need cars.
24 They'll drive whatever's available and if more
25 fuel-efficient vehicles are available, that's what

1 they'll drive. And in the process they will save
2 money and they will provide for a healthier
3 environment, or at least a less unhealthy environment.
4 Thank you.

5 CHAIR:

6 Thank you very much. Our next witness
7 scheduled is Holly Williams.

8 HOLLY WILLIAMS:

9 Hi. My name is Holly Williams. I live
10 at 1303 Wheatland Avenue in Lancaster, Pennsylvania
11 17603. And I also want to tell you that I'm a retired
12 high school teacher. I'm just here as a consumer. I
13 just wanted to add to the comments that were made.
14 I'm adding to this that as a consumer, I prefer a
15 vehicle that has low emissions. What's the point of
16 me having some big polluter and not being healthy? It
17 just doesn't make sense. Okay.

18 I support the proposed amendments to the
19 rules governing the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles
20 Program. I also support full implementation of the
21 Clean Vehicles Program as recommended by the
22 Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection.
23 The federal Clean Air Act requires Pennsylvania to cut
24 pollution from cars and trucks, and the proposed
25 amendments to the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program

1 are necessary to do that. This is critical because
2 people are driving more miles in bigger cars with
3 declining fuel efficiency.

4 Federal standards pertaining to lower
5 emission vehicles don't go far enough to improve
6 Pennsylvania's ability to comply with the Clean Air
7 Act. The Department of Environmental Protection
8 estimates that the Pennsylvania program will only
9 reduce vehicle emissions six to eleven percent over
10 and above the federal standards. This is a
11 significant difference and there is no cost to someone
12 like me, the consumer.

13 There are 37 counties in Pennsylvania
14 with smog pollution that is higher than allowed by
15 health-based federal standards. That's something to
16 be pointed out. I happen to live in one of those
17 places, so it affects me. That's Lancaster County.
18 Unless we reduce vehicle emissions, there will be no
19 room for the industry to expand in these counties.
20 Other states that meet federal standards are
21 out-competing Pennsylvania for jobs and growth.

22 Vehicles that are CA LEV compliant, that
23 is that they're modeled on the California Low Emission
24 Vehicle standards, are not more expensive than
25 vehicles that meet the federal Low Emission Vehicle

1 standards. Clean cars are more fuel efficient than
2 heavy polluters, and gasoline is expensive. And we
3 all know the prices aren't going to go down. They're
4 only going to go up.

5 Cleaner vehicles will benefit the more
6 than one million Pennsylvanians who suffer from
7 breathing problems that result from or are exacerbated
8 by air pollution. As was stated by the American Lung
9 Association, children who live in communities with
10 high concentrations of ozone, acid vapor, nitrogen
11 dioxide and particulate pollution, are at a greater
12 risk of developing chronic breathing problems due to
13 poor lung development than children who live in less
14 polluted areas.

15 Ten other states have already adopted the
16 California Low Emission Vehicles standards. Joining
17 them would allow Pennsylvania to reduce emissions
18 while remaining economically competitive in the
19 region. Actions required to combat global warming and
20 reducing greenhouse gas emissions is a critical part
21 of that.

22 With the proposed amendments to the Clean
23 Vehicles Program rules, we could see our greenhouse
24 gas emissions from new cars and trucks reduced by as
25 much as 30 percent, all at little or not cost to us,

1 the consumers.

2 This measure is an easy and
3 cost-effective way to improve our air quality and the
4 health of our planet. We owe it to ourselves and to
5 our future to support it. Thank you.

6 CHAIR:

7 Thank you very much. That concludes the
8 list of pre-registered witnesses. Is there anyone
9 else present who would like to comment on this
10 proposal?

11 MS. HEMMERS:

12 May I?

13 CHAIR:

14 One second, please. I saw this lady's
15 hand. Would you like to comment?

16 MS. HOFFMAN:

17 I would.

18 CHAIR:

19 Okay. You go ahead and we'll get to you
20 then after that. And if you could, please, state your
21 name and your address for the record.

22 MS. HOFFMAN:

23 My name is Mary Hoffman. I live at 2311
24 North Front Street, Apartment 920, the big brick
25 building on Front, in Harrisburg. And I don't have

1 something prepared, but about two years ago I was
2 extremely ill. We had a drought. I watched the
3 ground daily get worse and worse. I've watched about
4 seven kids. I always thought the air was what pushed
5 me over the edge. I was very sick and I was reading
6 everyday. I would go onto to the weatherchannel.net
7 --- .com and check out the Susquehanna Valley's air.
8 It was always worse than any other area, Baltimore,
9 Newark, Delaware; Newark, New Jersey, anything on the
10 Middle Atlantic coast, and we had a deeper, darker
11 more poisonous home. And maybe you can check that
12 out. That the Susquehanna Valley seems to be, at
13 least according to the Weather Channel Quality Air
14 people, the dirtiest, most poisonous air in the Middle
15 Atlantic region.

16 And it usually said that --- that summer
17 that I was so sick, it usually said that even the
18 healthy shouldn't get up off their couches. And I
19 don't have much money. I don't want to spend a lot of
20 money on a car. I'm not fond of this stuff that leads
21 a short life. But in the long run, I think God is
22 telling us that we do the right thing, which is clean
23 the air pollution up. Thank you.

24 CHAIR:

25 Thank you very much. Anyone else?

1 MS. HEMMERS:

2 Yes. I was asked by the Sierra Club ---.

3 CHAIR:

4 If you could, please, state your name and
5 your address.

6 MS. HEMMERS:

7 Oh, yes. I'm sorry.

8 CHAIR:

9 Thank you. That's all right.

10 MS. HEMMERS:

11 My name is Anna Hemmers. 1619 Green
12 Street, Harrisburg. When I was notified of this
13 meeting by the Sierra Club, I was asked if I wished to
14 speak or just sit back and listen. And I said, I'll
15 sit back and listen, but I'm truly upset. I expected
16 the lobbyists from Washington and the automobile
17 association to be here. But I did not expect someone
18 from AAA sitting here saying they're representing me.
19 I don't think that the membership of AAA of
20 Pennsylvania know that this is happening. Here in
21 Pennsylvania, we have the second largest, oldest
22 population in the United States. I am asking you to
23 adopt this change. If it would mean --- even if it
24 would mean increased cost in automobile costs, my
25 health benefits would balance that out and more so.

1 And at 81, I do have those problems and thank you.

2 CHAIR:

3 Thank you. Anyone else who would like to
4 comment?

5 MR. LENAHAN:

6 I do thank you for giving me the
7 opportunity to speak. My name is John Lenahan. I
8 live at 40 Circle Drive in Danville. I'm one of these
9 people that are --- I don't know what name you want to
10 give to me, some people might say I'm cheap. I don't
11 buy cars frequently. I always know I always buy cheap
12 and when I buy cars --- 'cause I don't do it that
13 often, 'cause I know I'll have that car for a long
14 time to come. I try and think it's true. I make sure
15 that I get the vehicle that's best for my needs.

16 The last time I bought a car --- and like
17 I said I don't buy them very often, the last time the
18 issue was safety. The affordable cars, the makes and
19 the models that I wanted to buy only offered an air
20 bag for the driver, not for the passengers. Some of
21 you may remember that. The passenger had to deal with
22 like a little seat belt that moves up and down on the
23 door frame and never --- it seemed like it never fit
24 right. It wasn't like a real seat belt.

25 I can't understand why if they could make

1 one air bag, why they couldn't they make two of them
2 in the makes and models that I was looking at. So
3 what I did is I waited. I waited maybe two years,
4 maybe three years until, finally, the models that I
5 wanted gave the two air bags and two real seat belts.
6 And as I recall, the price didn't go up at all. If
7 anything, it might have gone down a little bit while I
8 was waiting.

9 So anyway, I bought that car and know
10 that I'm happy with it. Now, it's time to shop again.
11 I went to the auto show a couple months ago. Does
12 anyone still hear from the industry? I want to
13 compliment them. It was a good show. I enjoyed it.
14 You see the cars and pick up the brochures.
15 Inevitably, on the brochure it would claim that this
16 pertinent model met certain emission standards. There
17 are several different standards.

18 But they brag that, you know, say this
19 particular model meets a certain standard, but there
20 would be little asterisks. And you know, you'd see
21 that little asterisk and then you'd go down to the
22 bottom of the page to see what it meant. Inevitably,
23 what it meant was, in certain states are mentioned,
24 using New York. In other words, that model sitting
25 there on the floor, the one that I liked, did not get

1 the same emissions as the same model across the state
2 line.

3 Now, here we go again. If I'm going to
4 be buying a new car, you mean I'm going to have to
5 wait until this model is available in Pennsylvania?
6 Or I guess I'm a little better off this time 'cause I
7 do have a second option. That's to go out of state
8 and buy the car. I don't understand why the vehicle
9 that's selling in New York, why, far as I can tell, is
10 the same price as the one in Pennsylvania, and so why
11 would I --- why would anyone want to buy the one in
12 Pennsylvania? Thank you.

13 CHAIR:

14 Thank you very much. Does anyone else
15 wish to comment on this proposal? Seeing no other
16 witnesses present, on behalf of the Environmental
17 Quality Board, I liked to thank you for your interest
18 and participation this evening. And I hereby adjourn
19 this hearing at 8:38 p.m. Thank you.

20 * * * * *

21 HEAIRNG CONCLUDED AT 8:38 P.M.

22 * * * * *

23
24
25