

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
PENNSYLVANIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

\* \* \* \* \*

IN RE: PENNSYLVANIA CLEAN VEHICLES PROGRAM

\* \* \* \* \*

BEFORE: Ken Bowman, Chair

Marjorie Hughes, Member

Arleen Shulman, Member

HEARING: Tuesday, March 14, 2006

1:00 p.m.

LOCATION: Department of Environmental Protection

400 Waterfront Drive

Pittsburgh, PA 15222

WITNESSES: Suzanne Seppi, Rachel Filippini,

Heather Sage, Rachel Martin, Steve Karas,

Donald Gibbon, Andrea Boykowycz,

Brian Ramsey, Joseph Shirk, Al Bennett,

Liz Hughes, Laryn Finder, Janice Hodge

Reporter: Valerie Beth Gregory

Any reproduction of this transcript

is prohibited without authorization

by the certifying agency.

I N D E X

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

OPENING REMARKS

By Chair 4 - 7

TESTIMONY

By Suzanne Seppi 7 - 13

By Rachel Filippini 13 - 16

By Heather Sage 16 - 19

By Rachel Martin 19 - 21

By Steve Karas 21 - 22

By Donald Gibbon 22 - 26

By Andrea Boykowycz 27 - 28

By Brian Ramsey 29 - 30

By Joseph Shirk 30 - 32

By Al Bennett 32 - 34

By Liz Hughes 34 - 35

By Laryn Finder 35 - 36

By Janice Hodge 36 - 37

CLOSING REMARKS

By Chair 37

CERTIFICATE

39

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

<u>Number</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u> <u>Offered</u>
---------------	--------------------	-------------------------------

NONE OFFERED

## P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIR:

It's 1:00 p.m. Welcome to the Environmental Quality Board, or EQB, public hearing on the proposed amendments to the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program. The purpose of the hearing is to formally accept testimony on the proposed rulemaking.

My name is Ken Bowman. I am the regional director of the DEP Southwest Regional Office. On my left is Arleen Shulman from our Bureau of Air Quality, Mobile Sources Section. On my right is Marjorie Hughes, our DEP Regulatory Coordinator.

The Environmental Quality Board will hold three public hearings to accept comments on this proposal to amend 25 *Pa. Code*, Chapter 126, Subchapter D, relating to new motor vehicle emissions control program. The amendments propose to postpone the compliance date from model year 2006 to model year 2008 and update definitions in Section 121.1, relating to definitions, for terms that are used in the substantive provisions in Chapter 126, Subchapter D. The amendments also propose to clarify the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program in Chapter 126, Subchapter D and to specify a transition mechanism for

1 compliance with the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles  
2 Program.

3           The regulation, if approved, will be  
4 submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency, or  
5 EPA, as a revision to the State Implementation Plan,  
6 known as SIP. The SIP, which is a requirement of the  
7 Clean Air Act, is a plan that provides for the  
8 implementation, maintenance and enforcement of the  
9 National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

10           On February 11th, 2006, the EQB published  
11 these proposed regulations for public review and  
12 comment in the Pennsylvania Bulletin. In addition,  
13 notice of this hearing has been published in 13  
14 newspapers statewide.

15           This is the first of three public  
16 hearings for the purpose of accepting comments on the  
17 Proposed Rulemaking. In order to give everyone an  
18 equal opportunity to comment on the proposals, the  
19 following ground rules are established.

20           First, the witnesses who have  
21 pre-registered to testify at this hearing will be  
22 called first. After hearing from these witnesses,  
23 other interested parties present will be given the  
24 opportunity to testify as time allows. Two, testimony  
25 is limited to ten minutes for each witness. Three,

1 organizations are requested to designate one witness  
2 to present testimony on its behalf. Four, each  
3 witness is asked, but not required to provide three  
4 written copies of their testimony to aid in  
5 transcribing the hearing. Please hand me your copies  
6 prior to presenting your testimony. Five, please  
7 state your name, address and affiliation for the  
8 record, prior to presenting your testimony. Six, your  
9 help in spelling names and terms that may not be  
10 generally familiar is appreciated so that the  
11 transcript can be as accurate as possible. Seven,  
12 because the purpose of the hearing is to receive  
13 comments on the proposal, EQB or DEP staff may  
14 question witnesses; however, the witnesses may not  
15 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 Pennsylvania Bulletin are available at the  
22 sign-in table.

23           All comments received at this hearing, as  
24 well as those received in writing or electronically by  
25 April 12, 2006 will be considered by the Department in

1 the finalization of these regulations. Anyone who is  
2 interested in a copy of the transcript of this hearing  
3 may contact the reporter here this evening to arrange  
4 to purchase a copy.

5 I now call the first witness, which would  
6 be Suzanne Seppi. Suzanne, there's a microphone back  
7 there if you'd like to use it.

8 MS. SEPPI:

9 Hello, my name is Suzanne Seppi. I live  
10 at 140 Oakhurst Road, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 15215.  
11 And I am on staff at Group Against Smog and Pollution,  
12 and I represent them.

13 Thank you for the proposed updated  
14 rulemaking titled, The Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles  
15 Program, to improve air quality in Pennsylvania and  
16 for providing these hearings around the state. As I  
17 said, I represent Group Against Smog and Pollution, a  
18 southwestern Pennsylvania organization working for a  
19 healthier environment in this region for 35 years.  
20 The seven-county Pittsburgh metropolitan area was  
21 designated in 2004 as nonattainment for the eight-hour  
22 ozone standard. There were eight exceedances of the  
23 eight-hour ozone standard in 2005 in Allegheny County.  
24 Fine particulates remain a serious problem in our  
25 region and concerns about toxic exposure have resulted

1 in an ongoing monitoring study in the Pittsburgh area.  
2           GASP supports the proposed amended  
3 Pennsylvania Clean Vehicle Program and believe it will  
4 make a valuable contribution towards much-needed,  
5 healthier air. Thirty-seven (37) Pennsylvania  
6 counties have been named by EPA as a nonattainment  
7 area for exceeding the eight-hour health-based ozone  
8 standard. According to the Pennsylvania Department of  
9 Environmental Protection, about one-third of  
10 Pennsylvania's ozone-forming pollution comes from  
11 motor vehicles.

12           Ozone pollution contributed to 370,000  
13 asthma attacks in Pennsylvania in ozone season 1997.  
14 A study of 95 American cities between 1987 and 2000  
15 estimated 3,767 premature deaths annually.  
16 Researchers recently found that even for days that  
17 currently meet the EPA limit for an acceptable level  
18 of ozone, 80 parts per billion for an eight-hour  
19 period, there was still an increased risk of death  
20 from the pollutant.

21           With these problems at hand, more  
22 pollution reductions of ozone precursors, nitrogen  
23 oxides and volatile organic compounds are clearly  
24 indicated. The Pennsylvania DEP asserts that after  
25 fleet turnover in 2025, the California LEV II



1 standards will result in additional emission  
2 reductions of 6 percent to 12 percent in VOCs, and a  
3 nine percent reduction in NOx. Reductions also  
4 include a 5 percent to 11 percent reduction in six  
5 toxic air pollutants. According to the U.S. EPA  
6 National Assessment of Air Toxics, mobile sources  
7 contribute 66 percent of all toxics.

8           States have the opportunity to be in a  
9 federal program for vehicle emissions control known as  
10 Tier II or to opt into California LEV II.

11 Pennsylvania has elected to follow California LEV II.  
12 There are several reasons why the CA LEV II Program is  
13 preferable to the federal Tier II Program as follows:

14           Analysis by DEP consultants at Michael  
15 Baker, Jr., Inc. concludes that the emission  
16 reductions under LEV II are larger than those under  
17 Tier II. LEV II program evaporative and tailpipe  
18 hydrocarbon standards are more stringent than the Tier  
19 II standards. LEV II provides a Zero Emission Vehicle  
20 component and a greenhouse gas reduction element,  
21 pushing cleaner technology and providing needed states  
22 leadership in addressing the global warming problem.

23           California has historically revised its  
24 standards more frequently than the federal government.  
25 The result has often been more stringent standards in

1 California for a period of some years before the  
2 federal standards catch up.

3           The program is part of the state's  
4 federally enforceable State Implementation Plan and  
5 therefore, should it be abandoned, there would have to  
6 be a plan for making up the pollution reductions  
7 achieved under the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles  
8 Program. There are also sanctions that could be  
9 imposed. It is unclear how Pennsylvania will allow  
10 for an unenforceable period for the Clean Vehicles  
11 Program as stated in part D, Purpose and Background to  
12 the Preamble.

13           Does this mean that the existing  
14 Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program, which is a part  
15 of the SIP, will be enforced until the amendatory  
16 rulemaking of the program is complete? It would seem  
17 that there should be enforcement.

18           Even as Pennsylvania is moving towards  
19 the amended Clean Vehicles Program, it is  
20 disappointing that the state is not adopting the CA  
21 LEV II Zero Emission Vehicle component. Many nearby  
22 states have adopted the California ZEV program,  
23 including New York, Massachusetts, Vermont and New  
24 Jersey. Taken together, these states represent about  
25 one-fourth of the market for new motor vehicles sold

1 in the country.

2           There appears to be additional emission  
3 reductions available from incorporation of ZEV. For  
4 example, Michael Baker, Inc. consulted with DEP in  
5 2004 to analyze the California LEV II program and the  
6 Tier II program. The report comments, a comparison of  
7 the bin structure illustrates how the LEV II program  
8 could produce NOx benefits over the Tier II program.  
9 Based on information provided in the NESCAUM study,  
10 auto manufacturers may concentrate Tier II vehicle  
11 sales around Bin 5 to avoid mid-year corrections in  
12 vehicle sales to ensure that the fleet average  
13 emissions standards are met. Under the LEV II  
14 program, it is expected that nearly 50 percent of  
15 vehicle sales will be PZEV vehicles used to meet the  
16 ZEV mandate. PZEV vehicles will be compliant with the  
17 SULEV standards with additional evaporative emission  
18 improvements. The NOx emission bins for SULEV  
19 vehicles is lower than Bin 5 value under the Tier II  
20 standard.

21           Innovative transition programs have been  
22 accomplished in the LEV II states, including resolving  
23 credit problems for the ZEV program. Popular electric  
24 hybrid vehicles can partially satisfy the ZEV program  
25 requirements. These vehicles are not a hard sell and

1 have been among the few vehicle types that often have  
2 a waiting list. GASP has sponsored test drive events  
3 for hybrid vehicles for several years and these events  
4 have drawn avid owners to talk about their cars as  
5 well as good crowds to test drive the vehicles.  
6 Advocating and implementing cleaner automotive  
7 technology may be one of the most important parts of  
8 the CA LEV II program. Pennsylvanians will likely  
9 have less vehicle choice and Pennsylvania will have  
10 lost an important leadership opportunity taken on by  
11 several neighboring states by not adopting the ZEV  
12 component of California LEV II.

13           Some arguments against the Pennsylvania  
14 Clean Vehicles Program involve cost. The argument is  
15 questionable. The Pennsylvania DEP conducted an  
16 internet and auto manufacturer web study of dealer  
17 on-lot inventory window stickers with manufacturer  
18 suggested retail price for Ohio, New York and  
19 Pennsylvania for most popular 2005 models as reported  
20 by Forbes, in addition to some random choices. The  
21 draft report showed in almost all cases that the price  
22 was the same. Additionally, there should be reduced  
23 vehicle operating costs under LEV II.

24           In summary, we urge the Environmental  
25 Quality Board to move forward with the proposed

1 rulemaking for the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles  
2 Program, but strongly suggest that the Zero Emission  
3 Vehicles, ZEV component, be a part of the program.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIR:

6 Thank you. Mr. Neil Bhaerman.

7 NO RESPONSE

8 CHAIR:

9 Rachel Filippini.

10 MS. FILIPPINI:

11 Good afternoon. My name is Rachel  
12 Filippini. I live at 154 Silvis Road in Export,  
13 Pennsylvania, and I've come here today to speak as a  
14 citizen of Pennsylvania.

15 I would like to urge you not to appeal  
16 the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicle Program. Requiring  
17 auto manufacturers to sell within Pennsylvania the  
18 most fuel-efficient, cleanest cars that meet the  
19 California tailpipe standards is common sense.

20 As a consumer, I want the option to buy a  
21 cleaner, more fuel-efficient vehicle. If affordable  
22 technology exists to make such a car, then there's  
23 absolutely no reason not to apply it. Auto  
24 manufacturers will still be allowed to sell  
25 gas-guzzling SUVs, pickups and vans, as long as they

1 sell the cleaner models as well. Let me, the  
2 consumer, make the choice. If I choose to buy a car  
3 that may be a little more expensive but that will  
4 allow me to save considerably at the gas pump each  
5 month, let me make that choice. If I choose to buy a  
6 car in which the cancer-causing, asthma-triggering  
7 emissions are dramatically reduced, let me make that  
8 choice. Let me choose a vehicle that is healthier for  
9 my family and my community.

10                   Pennsylvanians are clearly interested in  
11 more fuel-efficient vehicles, as evidenced by the  
12 success of the Alternative Fuel Incentive Program,  
13 which is due to run out of rebate money sometime in  
14 April.

15                   I live in Westmoreland County which is  
16 part of the Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley Ozone  
17 Nonattainment Region. Our region's poor air quality  
18 would benefit from the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles  
19 Program, which would provide an additional 6 to 12  
20 percent reduction of VOC emissions and a 9 percent  
21 reduction of nitrogen oxide emissions, which are  
22 greater reductions than the federal program would  
23 offer. In addition, the Clean Vehicles Program will  
24 reduce tailpipe emissions of carbon dioxide and  
25 cancer-forming benzene by as much as 15 percent. The

1 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency estimates that  
2 half of all cancers attributed to outdoor air toxics  
3 come from cars, trucks and bus exhaust.

4           Our region is going to have to come up  
5 with a plan in order to reach attainment for ozone, as  
6 well as for fine particulates. And this is not  
7 optional. We have to do this. While a large focus  
8 will be concentrated on stationary sources such as  
9 coal-fired power plants and coke-making facilities,  
10 automobiles cannot and should not be ignored. We have  
11 only so many control technologies available to aid us  
12 in reaching attainment. It's imperative that we  
13 control mobile sources as well as stationary sources.  
14 The less you require of one sector, the more will be  
15 necessary for another. Reducing air pollution from  
16 passenger vehicles is one of the easiest ways for the  
17 state to come into compliance with federal air quality  
18 standards.

19           States have the opportunity to choose the  
20 weaker, minimum federal emissions standards or to opt  
21 into the California LEV II. Thus far, Pennsylvania  
22 has elected to follow California LEV II, and with many  
23 good reasons as described by me and others. The  
24 Pittsburgh/New Castle metropolitan region ranked 17th  
25 worst for ozone air pollution. This should be an

1 indicator as to what we need to do. Health of the  
2 environment must be the priority here and the  
3 misinformation being spewed by AAA, the Alliance of  
4 Automobile Manufacturers and some members of the  
5 Pennsylvania General Assembly should be viewed as just  
6 that, misinformation.

7 Thank you very much for the opportunity  
8 to testify today.

9 CHAIR:

10 Thank you, Rachel. Heather Sage.

11 MS. SAGE:

12 Good afternoon. My name is Heather Sage  
13 and I live at 454 44th Street, Pittsburgh,  
14 Pennsylvania, 15201. I'm here today to testify in  
15 support of the changes proposed by the Department of  
16 Environmental Protection to the Pennsylvania Clean  
17 Vehicles Program. I also speak in support of full  
18 implementation of this program as suggested by the  
19 DEP.

20 The Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program  
21 regulations need to be updated to reflect changes in  
22 California requirements upon which our program is  
23 based and to give automobile manufacturers flexibility  
24 in meeting the standards while the program is being  
25 implemented. Pushing back the compliance date for



1 model year 2006 to 2008 won't resolve the significant  
2 delays in the sorts of air quality improvements that  
3 we as citizens will realize as a result of this  
4 important program.

5           Federal standards pertaining to low  
6 emission vehicles do not go far enough to improve  
7 Pennsylvania's ability to comply with federal air  
8 laws. The Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program and the  
9 changes proposed to it by DEP will do far more to  
10 protect our health, the economic competitiveness of  
11 many parts of the state like the Pittsburgh region and  
12 our choice as consumers to have a variety of options  
13 in vehicles sold.

14           Pennsylvania DEP has done in-depth,  
15 state-specific analyses to determine the benefits from  
16 our Clean Vehicles Program as compared to the federal  
17 program. These analyses included data from the  
18 Pennsylvania Department of Transportation regarding  
19 vehicles traveling on our state's roads, Pennsylvania  
20 fuels, et cetera. The air quality, and more  
21 importantly, the public health benefits of the  
22 Pennsylvania program exceed the federal program.

23           For example, this program, when fully  
24 implemented, will result in up to 12 percent more  
25 reduction in volatile organic compounds and 9 percent

1 more reduction in NOx than would the federal program.

2           Those percentages matter immeasurably to  
3 the one million Pennsylvanians who suffer from  
4 breathing problems that result from and are made worse  
5 by air pollution. The Pittsburgh area alone saw 11  
6 days last year where our air was literally unsafe to  
7 breathe, as we exceeded ozone standards. There are  
8 new studies that demonstrate ground-level ozone, even  
9 at levels below the federal standards is extremely  
10 unhealthy and in fact, deadly to those with problems  
11 like asthma.

12           We also need to make significant progress  
13 on reducing our contribution to global warming, now  
14 more than ever, with the complete lack of federal  
15 leadership on this critical problem. With the  
16 program, we could see as much as 30 percent reduction  
17 in greenhouse gas emissions from new cars and trucks  
18 sold in Pennsylvania. Since we as a state contribute  
19 more to global warming gases than 105 other nations  
20 combined, we have a serious obligation to reduce our  
21 contributions as soon as possible. This is one easy  
22 way to do that.

23           The bottom line is that we need the  
24 Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program. Without it, we  
25 will not get far enough, fast enough in most corners

1 of the state, and in other areas we won't be able to  
2 meet air quality standards at all. In southwestern  
3 Pennsylvania, a region where we are simply hampered in  
4 our ability to grow our economy while our air quality  
5 remains as poor as it is, we can't afford not to take  
6 every opportunity to get the problem under control.  
7 Industry has done and continues to do its part in  
8 improving air quality. We need to do our part to  
9 reduce our contribution to the problem.

10           The Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program  
11 is a simple, easy, cost-effective way to do that.  
12 It's already working in neighboring states, and the  
13 costs of cars there are not more expensive than  
14 vehicles here, yet they pollute far less. It's a win  
15 for Pennsylvania.

16           Thank you.

17           CHAIR:

18           Thank you, Heather. Rachel Martin.

19           MS. MARTIN:

20           Hello. My name is Rachel Martin, and I  
21 live at 311 Pitt Street in Wilkinsburg, Pennsylvania,  
22 15221. I'm here today to state my support for the  
23 Department of Environmental Protection's proposed  
24 changes to the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicle Program.

25           When I moved to Pittsburgh just a couple

1 of years ago from Clarion County, I was struck by the  
2 visible smog I could see on hot summer days, obscuring  
3 the view of the Pittsburgh skyline. My husband and I  
4 have had some concerns about moving to the area,  
5 primarily since he has asthma and we were concerned  
6 that the poor local air quality would make it worse.  
7 But we moved here anyway and it's gotten worse.

8           I've talked to a lot of older folks in  
9 the area and they remark on how much cleaner the air  
10 is than it was in the past. They tell stories of days  
11 when you couldn't see the sun for the smoke and soot.  
12 Clearly, the region's air quality has improved from 50  
13 years ago, but we still have a very long way to go.  
14 Emissions reductions that would result from  
15 implementation of Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program  
16 are an important step in making our air cleaner and  
17 healthier. A recent study sponsored by the EPA and  
18 the CDC found that any reduction in smog-forming ozone  
19 would benefit public health by decreasing premature  
20 deaths. The difference in emissions reductions  
21 between the California LEV II Program and the federal  
22 Tier II standards is not trivial, it can be measured  
23 in lives saved.

24           We know we need to clean up our air. We  
25 know we need to find ways to reduce oil consumption

1 and to curb global warming. The Pennsylvania Clean  
2 Vehicle Program does both of these while saving  
3 consumers money at the pump and providing more  
4 fuel-efficient vehicle choices. This is really a  
5 no-brainer. Again, please support the DEP's proposed  
6 changes to the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicle Program.  
7 Thanks.

8 CHAIR:

9 Thank you, Rachel. Steve Karas?

10 MR. KARAS:

11 My name is Steve Karas. I live at 607  
12 Braddock Road, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 15221.  
13 Basically, I'm here today when I heard about the  
14 hearing as a concerned citizen who also has an  
15 interest in environmental issues including air. I am  
16 a health professional. I am a home care physical  
17 therapist. And I often see elderly people in the area  
18 with obstructive pulmonary diseases and secondary  
19 problems from asthma, it may inhibit their walking and  
20 their ability to get around the community. And these  
21 obviously are made worse by the quality of the air and  
22 days when there is unsafe ozone quality.

23 We do in Allegheny County, and obviously  
24 Pittsburgh, have a large elderly population. And I  
25 believe that by making these rule changes, the elderly

1 population, which is pretty large in this area, will  
2 benefit substantially from a health point of view.

3           So I also think that by supporting the  
4 DEP's proposed changes to the PA Clean Vehicles  
5 Program, that we'll be able to better sell our region,  
6 which we know is losing population, as a healthier and  
7 cleaner region for people to live and to raise  
8 families. And I think that's an important part that  
9 needs to be said for this regulation. Thanks.

10           CHAIR:

11           Thank you. Donald Gibbon.

12           MR. GIBBON:

13           My name is Donald Gibbon. I live at 205  
14 Elysian Street, 15206. I want to append my remarks to  
15 all those that went before me, and I want to add two  
16 notes to my written remarks. My voice is the way it  
17 is because I have throat cancer. I didn't smoke, I  
18 got someone else's throat cancer. By that I mean the  
19 normal origin of throat cancer was not applicable to  
20 me. There's every possibility that it may have been  
21 from the breathing of the unsafe air. I present this  
22 testimony not only to you, the audience, but to the  
23 public at large.

24           I'd like to open my testimony by  
25 commenting that last Friday night as I drove home with

1 my wife from the theater, I pointed to a gauge on the  
2 dashboard of my car which shows the average miles per  
3 gallon I am getting on the current tank of gas. It  
4 read a very satisfying 48.9 miles per gallon.

5 I'd like to ask each of you in the room  
6 today, do you know what mileage you personally are  
7 getting on your own vehicle? If you do, I ask if you  
8 are satisfied with that knowledge and is that a good  
9 thing. And if you don't, then I would ask you why  
10 don't you. Do you think, as a responsible consumer of  
11 one of the most important products in our contemporary  
12 society, you ought not to know how fast you are  
13 personally burning it up?

14 I would like to follow that question with  
15 another. How did you feel when you paid the bill for  
16 your last tank of gas? What do you think you can do  
17 about that? Complain to your legislator about how the  
18 oil companies are gouging the consumer, or just stop  
19 buying so much of their product?

20 The point of these rather aggressive  
21 questions is that we all have choices. I have  
22 choices, you have choices. But the corporate sector  
23 of our country has only one objective, make as much  
24 profit today as they can, given their limited  
25 perspective. American corporations seem so focused on

1 the current bottom line that they cannot even look to  
2 their own long-term profitability. And they certainly  
3 don't voluntarily do anything that increases current  
4 costs, no matter what it does for society at large,  
5 which they ultimately depend on. The corporate sector  
6 is again trying to limit or delay access to wise  
7 consumer choices.

8           Here's an example of how that works. In  
9 1959 I was stationed in France in the Army. I bought  
10 myself a 1954 Citroen sedan, one of those long, low  
11 black jobs so popular as Paris taxis. Its front  
12 wheels were wider set than the rear wheels and it had  
13 front wheel drive. I remember driving it through a  
14 rare snowfall along the curving banks of the Loire  
15 River, feeling as though the car were on tracks. It  
16 drove fabulously. I came back to the States a year or  
17 so later and had to buy myself a new car. I went to  
18 the American dealership and asked about front-wheel  
19 drive. Guess what their answer was? Can't be done.  
20 Actually, at that very time, Oldsmobile had a high-end  
21 model on the road that had front-wheel drive and  
22 within a couple of decades, America had gotten the  
23 idea and now it's the norm.

24           Here's another example. My first new car  
25 was a '64 VW Camper, a German car that was the



1 forerunner of our minivans. America caught the wave  
2 again about 20 years later. I bought my first Dodge  
3 Caravan in 1989, a stick-shift vehicle with the  
4 smallest engine available. I got between 27 and 29  
5 miles to the gallon. I kept it for five years, then  
6 bought a '94, again a stick shift with the smallest  
7 engine available. This one got 25 to 27 miles per  
8 gallon. I kept it for ten years and then got a 2004,  
9 smallest engine available but couldn't get a stick  
10 shift this time. Now the mileage was down to 18 to 22  
11 miles per gallon, a loss in average fuel efficiency of  
12 almost 30 percent over 15 years from the same basic  
13 model of vehicle. America increased its dependence on  
14 imported fuel by something like 50 percent over the  
15 same period of time.

16 I was so disgusted with this that I  
17 dumped the Dodge after less than two years and bought  
18 a Toyota Prius hybrid for about the same price as the  
19 Caravan, counting the tax breaks and the Pennsylvania  
20 rebate. Now my gas mileage has jumped by about 250  
21 percent and my fill-up cost is in the \$15 range. Yes,  
22 we have choices.

23 The point of this catalog of choices is  
24 to emphasize that America's car manufacturers are  
25 almost always dragging their feet to their own

1 detriment and to the detriment of the consumer.  
2 Everything about that hybrid vehicle I'm driving is  
3 good for me, good for my neighbor and good for the  
4 nation, everything except the fact that no American  
5 company builds its equal, so the profit and the jobs  
6 from it go overseas.

7                   This vehicle burns fuel more cleanly and  
8 burns less of it than almost any other car on the  
9 road. I predict that common sense will ultimately  
10 triumph. I believe that in ten years or so, the  
11 highways will be filled with hybrids and it will be  
12 hard to get rid of a standard model internal  
13 combustion vehicle. But until that happens, we need  
14 the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program to protect our  
15 people from the noxious impact of the inefficient  
16 vehicles that pollute our air, sicken our people, sap  
17 our fuel reserves and makes us dependent on unstable  
18 sources of gasoline. It's totally logical that we  
19 should support our people in making wise choices.  
20 Delaying those choices or in any way weakening the  
21 program is destructive for the people. That's what  
22 the Clean Vehicles program is about. Thank you very  
23 much.

24                   CHAIR:

25                   Thank you, Don. Andrea Boykowycz.

1                   MS. BOYKOWYCZ:

2                   My name is Andrea Boykowycz. I live at  
3 3440 Parkview Avenue in Pittsburgh, PA, 15213. Good  
4 afternoon. Thank you for allowing me this opportunity  
5 to comment on the proposed amendments to Chapter 126,  
6 Subchapter D relating to Pennsylvania's Clean Vehicle  
7 Program. I support the proposed amendments which  
8 postpone the compliance for model year 2006 to model  
9 year 2008 and updates definitions in the substantive  
10 provisions to Subchapter D to reflect post-1998  
11 amendments of the California provisions incorporated  
12 by reference to this program.

13                   As I said, my name is Andrea Boykowycz  
14 and I'm a resident of Oakland, one of Pittsburgh's  
15 busiest and most vibrant neighborhoods. Oakland is  
16 home to the University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Mellon  
17 University, three UPMC hospitals, the main Carnegie  
18 Library and the Carnegie Museums of Art and Natural  
19 History as well as Schenley Park, one of Pittsburgh's  
20 oldest and largest green spaces. Our neighborhood is  
21 also bounded on one side by six lanes of I376, the  
22 main artery for transportation into and out of  
23 Pittsburgh from the East and South. Needless to say,  
24 we get a lot of traffic.

25                   While our neighborhood is comparatively

1 well-served by Port Authority buses and private  
2 transportation companies, our streets are still very  
3 heavily clogged with automotive traffic virtually  
4 around the clock. And now that our local steel and  
5 coke mills have closed, it's clear what an enormous  
6 impact car pollution has on our air quality.  
7 Furthermore, with recent increases in the price of  
8 gasoline, it has become increasingly evident how  
9 fiscally prudent it is to ensure that our cars run as  
10 efficiently as possible and, of course, we recognize  
11 that clean vehicles are also more efficient than heavy  
12 polluters.

13                   My neighbors and I are enthusiastic  
14 supporters of the Clean Vehicles Program because we  
15 are concerned about our health, the cleanliness of our  
16 environment and the sustainability of our local  
17 economy. Furthermore, we support the proposed  
18 amendments which will not add additional costs and  
19 will ease compliance without compromising the emission  
20 standard goals of the program. Thank you.

21                   CHAIR:

22                   Thank you. Allison Heinrichs (phonetic)?  
23 You're just here to ---?

24                   MS. HEINRICHS:

25                   Yes.

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

CHAIR:

Brian Ramsey?

MR. RAMSEY:

I'm Brian Ramsey, 5 Perry Road, Pittsburgh, PA. And it's 7:08. I'm here as a private citizen but I would also like to say that I live in Anderson Towers Condominium and we have some 200 units there. A large portion are our elderly. I just recently left the governing board there and although I can't speak formally as a representative of Anderson Towers, I am well-known to many of the members and I talk to them frequently. So I think I am representative of their views. We have many elderly people there with problems with asthma, respiratory problems. But we also have a few children that live in Anderson Towers who have asthma. So air quality is a very important concern for us.

I also speak as a retired professor emeritus of chemistry. I taught environmental chemistry for 20 years at Rawlins College. And I realize there are names in this area associated with Rawlins College that are more famous than not. But nonetheless, let me say that I regard ozone professionally as a very corrosive, dangerous reactive species. And I would set the allowed levels at about

1 15 or 20 parts per ---.

2 I honestly see no way to reduce ozone  
3 levels, oxidized hydrocarbons, porosity acetyl and  
4 those types of things. I see no way to reduce these  
5 levels other than decreasing dramatically the amount  
6 of gasoline that we burn. We just have to find some  
7 way to burn less gasoline. That's just my  
8 professional opinion and I hope you can do something  
9 about this as quickly as possible.

10 CHAIR:

11 Thank you, Brian. Joseph Shirk  
12 (phonetic).

13 MR. SHIRK:

14 I'm sorry, I don't have a handout. I  
15 really wasn't prepared on the way here to plan a  
16 speech. I'm speaking from the heart and I'll leave  
17 part of that with you for the record. My name is  
18 Joseph Shirk. I live at 504 Bingham Road, Mt.  
19 Washington, here in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in  
20 Chatham Village. And I have lived most of my  
21 professional life in Chicago, Illinois and I retired  
22 from there. I know there are many places less  
23 expensive than Chicago to retire on my Social Security  
24 and my pension plan. And I did a lot of research.  
25 I've never been to Pittsburgh, but in researching

1 everything about Pittsburgh, it seemed like an ideal  
2 place to live, great culture, great universities,  
3 theater, low cost of living, low taxes, even though  
4 people always complain about their taxes. Relative to  
5 Chicago, there are low taxes here.

6           So I really enjoy Pittsburgh and  
7 everything, but I'm a little concerned now when I read  
8 about the air qualities. But what I'd like to point  
9 out, I control what I can about my life. I have ---  
10 in my house, I have an activated charcoal, whole house  
11 water filter system, so my water is pure. I only eat  
12 organic vegetables when I can possibly get them. I  
13 eat hormone-free meat and produce. So I control  
14 everything I can. I walk 10,000 steps or more a day.  
15 I do everything I can to be healthy. But the one  
16 thing I can't do anything about is the air. Only you  
17 can do something about the air. I have no control  
18 over --- unless I bought a gas mask.

19           So it's very important to me that, you  
20 know, you help us, help me so I can live longer.  
21 Because I am an anomaly here. I retired --- I chose  
22 Pittsburgh to retire here. There are a lot of people  
23 make me feel young here because there's a heavy  
24 population of older people here and they really have  
25 problems with the air.

1           So in my research of checking out  
2 Pittsburgh, in particular about the cost of living and  
3 the housing index and so on and so forth, the one  
4 thing I could not check out or I did not check out was  
5 the true cost of living, and that is the air quality.  
6 And I was amazed to get on the American Lung  
7 Association website and see that the metropolitan area  
8 is most polluted by short-term particulate matter.  
9 Well, we're no better than Chicago there. We're  
10 number four. They're not even on the list, if you  
11 call that better. And if you look at long-term, we're  
12 number five. Chicago isn't on the list. If you look  
13 at the worst ozone pollution, we're number 17. Here  
14 again, Chicago isn't on the list.

15           So I checked everything out I could as  
16 far as cost of living. This is one cost of living I  
17 didn't check out and I should have checked out. But  
18 hopefully the state can help us out by ensuring  
19 vehicles we drive, such as my Prius, helps the air  
20 quality. Thank you.

21           CHAIR:

22           Thank you. Al Bennett.

23           MR. BENNETT:

24           My name is Alfred B. Bennett. I live at  
25 956 Pine Avenue in Castle Shannon, 15234. My wife and



1 I retired here after 18 years of working for the  
2 California State Library in Sacramento. And I guess  
3 the main reason we retired here is I concluded that  
4 the most important thing is just go where your wife  
5 wants to go. She grew up in the South Hills. Every  
6 day we lived in California, she missed the South  
7 Hills.

8                   So here we are back again and I really  
9 love Pittsburgh. But I'm speaking in support of the  
10 proposal before us and anything that we can do to  
11 improve our air quality. I look forward to the day  
12 that, here in Pittsburgh, we will be able to drive in  
13 to our local movie theater as we did in Davis,  
14 California, where we lived previously, and plug in the  
15 car while we're watching the movie. When I was in  
16 California, just to suggest what is possible, I bought  
17 a car in 1984. There were only a few of them  
18 available, but the state had required that there be  
19 some demonstration of cars. This was a Ford Escort,  
20 and I'm sorry to say, it was a diesel.

21                   But what I'm glad to say is that the  
22 average fuel consumption that I got on that car, which  
23 I drove for 275,000 miles, was about 65 miles to the  
24 gallon on the highway. It could do 73 driving 55  
25 miles an hour back and forth to L.A., but it actually

1 got that much. I know it's possible for us to get  
2 much better fuel consumption. It ought to be without  
3 diesel, of course. I look forward to Pennsylvania  
4 taking the lead among many states in assuring that air  
5 quality is improved. Thank you.

6 CHAIR:

7 Thank you, Al. Liz Hughes.

8 MS. HUGHES:

9 My name is Liz Hughes. I live in  
10 Squirrel Hill. I'm here for two reasons, personal and  
11 political. Personal is my sinuses are lousy. I'm  
12 afraid to go out and play in the environment. And I'm  
13 suffering from car sickness because my car is broken  
14 down and I'm so dependent on it, I feel I am going to  
15 have a nervous breakdown. However, I'm here because  
16 my friends from GASP brought me and I support  
17 everything they have to say and I've learned a lot  
18 just listening to the zero emission, and I'm all for  
19 that.

20 But even more, political, I'm co-chair of  
21 the Allegheny County Green Party and some of you may  
22 know that our registration is going up as the other  
23 two parties are going down. And I think people are  
24 looking for an alternative. And we certainly support,  
25 number one, mass transit. And it's the second best

1 thing to the vehicles that you drive that are clean.

2           But I just --- what else did I want to  
3 tell you? Oh, and participatory democracy is one of  
4 our number one things, and that's what we're seeing  
5 here, I hope, is participatory democracy where these  
6 very intelligent citizens are expressing an extreme  
7 concern. And I support everything they have to say  
8 and know that we, the Green Party, will certainly  
9 bring these issues up in our meetings, in our  
10 campaigns. And by the way, if anybody wants to sign a  
11 petition, we're running a congressional candidate for  
12 the 14th District. So thank you.

13           CHAIR:

14           Thank you. Does anyone else wish to  
15 comment on this proposal? Yes, ma'am, come on up.

16           MS. FINDER:

17           My name is Laryn Finder. I'm from 205  
18 Troutwood West Drive in Upper St. Clair, 15241. I  
19 believe in the bill that is up because I know that  
20 what exists now would suddenly run all the cars that  
21 are on the road off the road. I'm a proud owner of a  
22 Prius. I would much rather have an American car than  
23 a Japanese car, but I have to in order to get good  
24 mileage. And I go up and down hills and I get a  
25 minimum of 40 miles per gallon in my car. So I know

1 the technology is there and it can be done, and we can  
2 pass all these wonderful rules. But if we don't  
3 enforce them, we don't get anywhere. We just have  
4 rules on the table that the industry ignores. So  
5 somehow we have to get in touch with people that run  
6 the industry and tell them that this is what's good  
7 for the country, not just a few people or for their  
8 stockholders. And I hope that you will work hard in  
9 enforcing what you pass. Thank you.

10 CHAIR:

11 Thank you. Would you spell your last  
12 name, please?

13 MS. FINDER:

14 F as in Frank, I-N-D-E-R. It looks like  
15 Finder. And it's L-A-R-Y-N.

16 CHAIR:

17 Thank you. Is there anyone else that  
18 would like to speak? Yes, ma'am, come on up. Would  
19 you state your name and address for us, please?

20 MS. HODGE:

21 My name is Janice Hodge. I live at 7772  
22 East Pittston Street, Verona, 15147.

23 CHAIR:

24 Thank you.

25 MS. HODGE:

1                   Thank you. I didn't want to get the  
2 chance to speak, I just wanted to be supportive. But  
3 for our fuel, we need to not only take care of the air  
4 for ourselves, but for our children. And we have to  
5 think of future generations, what we're doing to not  
6 only our children, but people around the world.  
7 Somebody, I think Heather, quoted how much we  
8 contribute to global warming, lessening the dependency  
9 on oil is going to lessen wars. It's going to help us  
10 in the quality of life. And it will also help our  
11 healthcare, our economic situation and start to spread  
12 the wealth around, rather than in the stock portfolios  
13 of these oil companies.

14                   But I just want to get back to our  
15 children because they are our future generation. And  
16 no matter how much money we have in the bank to give  
17 them, if they don't have a livable planet, this just  
18 isn't fair to them. Thank you.

19                   CHAIR:

20                   Thank you. Anyone else that would like  
21 to speak? Going once. With no other witnesses  
22 present and on behalf of the Environmental Quality  
23 Board, I do thank you for your interest and your  
24 testimony. And I hereby adjourn this meeting at 1:46  
25 p.m. Thank you very much for coming.

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

\* \* \* \* \*

MEETING CONCLUDED AT 1:46 P.M.

\* \* \* \* \*