

Original: 2523

March 14, 2006

Environmental Quality Board
PO Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

RE: Public Comment on Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program proposed Rulemaking

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY
REVIEW COMMISSION

2006 MAR 21 AM 9:17

RECEIVED

My name is Rachel Filippini, I live at 154 Silvis Road in Export, Pennsylvania. I have come here today to urge you not to repeal the PA Clean Vehicle Program. Requiring auto manufacturers to sell within Pennsylvania the most fuel efficient, cleanest cars that meet the California tailpipe standards is commonsense.

As a consumer I want the option to buy a cleaner, more fuel efficient vehicle. If affordable technology exists to make such a car than there is absolutely no reason not to apply it. Auto manufacturers will still be allowed to sell gas-guzzling SUVs, pickups and vans, as long as they sell the cleaner models as well. Let me, the consumer, make the choice. If I choose to buy a car that may be a little more expensive, but that will allow me to save considerably at the gas pump each month, let me make that choice. If I choose to buy a car in which the cancer-causing, asthma triggering emissions are dramatically reduced, let me make that choice. Let me choose a vehicle that is healthier for my family and my community.

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

I live in Westmoreland County, which is part of the Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley 8-hour ozone non-attainment region. Our region's poor air quality would benefit from the PA Clean Vehicles Program, which would provide an additional 6 to 12% reduction of volatile organic compound emissions and a 9% reduction of nitrogen oxide emissions – which are greater reductions than the federal program would offer. In addition the Clean Vehicles Program will reduce tailpipe emissions of carbon dioxide and cancer-forming benzene by as much as 15%. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency estimates that half of all cancers attributed to outdoor air toxics come from car, truck and bus exhaust.

Our region must come up with a plan in order to reach attainment, this is not optional. While a large focus has been concentrated on stationary sources such as coal-fired power plants and coke making facilities, automobiles can not and should not be ignored. We only have so many control technologies available to

aid us in reaching attainment. It is imperative that we control mobile sources as well as stationary sources. The less you require of one sector the more will be necessary for another. Reducing air pollution from passenger vehicles is one of the easiest ways for the state to come into compliance with federal air quality standards.

States have the opportunity to choose the weaker, minimum federal emissions standards or to opt into the CA LEV II. Thus far, Pennsylvania has elected to follow CA LEV II and with many good reasons as described by me and others. The Pittsburgh-New Castle Metropolitan region ranked 17th worst for ozone air pollution.¹ Health and the environment must be the priority here and the misinformation being spewed by AAA, the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, and some members of the PA General Assembly should be viewed as just that, misinformation.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important issue.

¹ <http://www.lungusa.org/site/pp.asp?c=dvLUK9O0E&b=50752>