

Deadline for permits hovers over farmers

By MICHAEL G. MOONEY, MODESTO BEE STAFF WRITER, March 15, 2003

The Environmental Protection Agency hopes farmers won't have trouble figuring out whether they need permits to operate stationary diesel-powered engines.

"We've been working with ag organizations trying to streamline the applications and make the (permit) process as simple as possible," EPA spokeswoman Lisa Fasano said Friday. "We're trying to get farmers all the information they need to meet the May 14 deadline."

Such engines are used to power irrigation pumps in farming operations, among other things.

Farmers are concerned that they won't have enough detailed information in time to complete the applications.

The permit requirement, announced in November, is part of an ongoing effort to improve air quality throughout California and the Central Valley -- the heart of the state's multibillion-dollar agricultural industry.

Federal officials imposed permit requirements because the state did not move fast enough to rescind an exemption allowing farmers to run the engines despite the dirty emissions they may produce.

Later this year, state legislators are expected to consider a bill that would end that exemption -- one of a series of proposals dealing with air pollution.

Last month, environmental activists filed a federal lawsuit to close what they contend are too many loopholes allowing agriculture to pollute the air.

Federal authorities have given cities and counties of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District -- which stretches from Lodi to Bakersfield -- until April to show progress in cleaning soot from the air or face onerous sanctions.

There was no word Friday on what sanctions, if any, the EPA would impose on farmers who ignore the permit requirement or otherwise miss the May 14 filing deadline.

"We'll cross that bridge when we come to it," said Kerry Drake, assistant air director for the EPA's Pacific and Southwest Region.

Fasano said the EPA hopes to use statewide farm groups and organizations such as the California Farm Bureau to help get the word out about the permit requirement, as well as to help farmers with paperwork.

Farmers will not be required to pay a fee, at least this year.

Vito Chiesa, interim manager and past president of the Stanislaus County Farm Bureau, said he was worried about meeting the EPA's May 14 deadline.

"We've got about two months to get this done and no one's got any defining information," he said. "Even the state Farm Bureau people are using ambiguous language when they talk to us. That worries me."

Beginning next week, the EPA will hold a number of workshops to explain the permit requirements to people like Chiesa and train them to help farmers prepare the applications.

"We expect the major agricultural organizations to get the word out to their members," Drake said. "Our workshops really are to get the people who fall through the cracks."

Fasano said the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District and U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service also will provide permit information and guidance on filling out and filing the applications.

Later this year, the EPA plans to issue permit requirements for other aspects of agricultural operations.

Data discredits EPA assurances at ground zero

By CHRIS BOWMAN and EDIE LAU, THE SACRAMENTO BEE, March 16, 2003

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's pollution tests in the smoke-filled days after the World Trade Center collapse did not support the agency's pronouncements that the air around ground zero was safe to breathe, an independent federal investigation has found.

Further, the EPA reached its conclusion using a cancer risk level 100 times greater than what it traditionally deems acceptable for public exposure to toxic air contaminants, according to the EPA's Office of Inspector General.

The "preliminary conclusions," contained in an internal OIG document obtained by The Sacramento Bee, reinforce the views of many doctors and public health advocates involved in the medical evaluations of thousands of firefighters, volunteers, demolition workers and immigrant laborers who toiled in the thick of the dust, smoke and fumes.

"To say that it's safe, which suggests no risk -- we just knew that was wrong," said Jonathan Bennett, spokesman for the New York Committee for Occupational Safety and Health, a labor union advocacy group, which had doctors in a roving van seeing cleanup workers. "The proof of this was in what you saw in the people in the van and in people being seen to this day at the Mount Sinai Medical Center," Bennett said.

More than half the ground zero workers screened by health experts nearly a year after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks continued to suffer from lung, ear, nose and throat problems, according to a study released in January by the Mount Sinai Medical Center in New York.

The federally funded screening program so far has dealt with more than 3,500 of the estimated 40,000 workers directly involved in the rescue, recovery and cleanup.

EPA officials declined comment Friday, noting that the inspector general's investigation is still under way.

"It is inappropriate for the EPA to be commenting on a document that is not final and that is being done independently," said Lisa Harrison, the agency's press secretary.

Many have criticized EPA

The OIG's preliminary findings follow a series of criticisms leveled against the EPA over its response to the towers' collapse.

The EPA's ombudsman at the time, Robert Martin, said in testimony last year before a Senate subcommittee that the EPA "has provided erroneous information to the public." Martin later resigned in protest, saying EPA Administrator Christie Whitman tried to silence him. Whitman denies the charge.

A U.S. Geological Survey team found shortly after the attacks that some of the dust from the blast site was as caustic as drain cleaner because of the high concentration of pulverized cement, an alkaline substance. The team's conclusion, revealed by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch newspaper, was sent to the EPA and other government agencies, but not one made the finding public.

A study published last fall in the New England Journal of Medicine reported that 332 of the 9,914 New York City firefighters on the scene in the week after Sept. 11 developed "World Trade Center cough," a severe and persistent hacking.

In February 2002, scientists at the University of California at Davis reported that dust and fumes from the smoldering rubble exposed Lower Manhattan residents to some of the highest levels of air pollution ever recorded.

Thomas Cahill, a physicist and international authority on air pollution who led the UC Davis study, said his laboratory analyses of air samples showed that the towers' collapse spewed enormous amounts of potentially lethal, extremely tiny particles of crushed and incinerated computers, glass, furniture and other debris unrecognized by the EPA's air monitoring.

The OIG has been investigating the EPA's handling of the World Trade Center fallout for more than a year, a spokeswoman said. Though connected to the EPA, the agency has no authority over the inspection teams, which report results to Congress.

The document obtained by The Sacramento Bee is an OIG "status report" on the World Trade Center investigation. The Jan. 27 report summarizes investigators' preliminary conclusions and outlines work in progress.

OIG spokeswoman Eileen McMahon cautioned that the findings could change before publication, which is expected in mid-May. "The information on there is not solid because our work is not concluded yet," she said.

A chief objective of the investigation is to determine whether air pollution monitoring data from ground zero and in the surrounding financial district support what the EPA told the public about the health risks.

Whitman, the agency administrator, made repeated assurances in the first few weeks after Sept. 11 that the air around the wreckage was safe to breathe.

"Given the scope of the tragedy I am glad to reassure the people of New York and Washington, D.C., that the air is safe to breathe, and their water is safe to drink," Whitman announced one week after the towers fell.

In the January status report, a team of six investigators concludes that Whitman's declarations were premature.

"(The) EPA did not have sufficient data to declare the ambient air 'safe to breathe' when it did," the report states, citing several reasons:

The EPA had data on only four of 14 pollutants that scientists believe the public potentially was exposed to immediately after the collapse of the towers.

The criterion the EPA used to conclude asbestos levels were safe is not health-based. It is a crude standard applied to check contractors' work on schools after asbestos removal.

The agency's air quality standards are not applicable to this kind of pollution event: enormous clouds of finely pulverized glass, concrete and gypsum and a superheated pile of rubble that spewed ultra-fine particles and poisons into the air for weeks.

"Health standards do not exist for (the) cumulative impact of exposure to several pollutants at once or the synergistic impact of air toxins unknown and little studied," the report states.

The inspection team said it learned that the EPA applied a dramatically higher level of "acceptable risk" in making its pronouncements.

The EPA used a one in 10,000 risk that someone will develop cancer from exposure to the WTC pollutants, the report states. The EPA traditionally has defined the acceptable cancer odds as a one in 1 million for the general public, one in 100,000 for occupational exposures.

Role of Bush administration

The OIG is also looking at the role the White House played in drafting the EPA's news releases on the fallout of the World Trade Center collapse. A former EPA chief of staff "acknowledged that the content of the WTC news releases was heavily influenced by (President Bush's) Council on Environmental Quality," the OIG report states. "Selected e-mails indicate CEQ dictated (to the EPA public information office) the content of early press releases," the report says.

One scientist who was on the scene of the disaster said it is difficult to criticize the EPA's decisions given the enormity of the job responding to the chaos.

"We were just going from one place to another, one moment to another, trying to gather your wits in an event that shook the nation," said Paul Liroy, an environmental health scientist affiliated with Rutgers University. **Don't go overboard**

EPA ready for farm permits

Application and instructions are posted on the agency's Web site; the deadline is May 14.

By Mark Grossi, The Fresno Bee, March 15, 2003

The federal government Friday took the next step in accounting for air pollution coming from diesel-powered pumps at large farms, which for decades have been exempt from pollution-tracking programs.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency posted a farm permit application on its Web site, along with a guide to help growers determine whether their operations produce enough pollution each year to require a permit.

By May 14, owners of large farms that qualify as "major sources" will have to file an application for a Title V permit, a controversial topic among San Joaquin Valley growers.

The EPA last year caused a stir by ordering large farms to get a major source permit as part of a lawsuit settlement. The permit allows officials to catalog emissions and track changes from large pollution sources.

Though the program seems like a paperwork exercise to many growers, farmer Paul Betancourt of Kerman said agriculture is willing to do its part. He is concerned that the federal government hasn't given farmers much time.

"Too bad they couldn't have had this available two months ago when there wasn't that much work on the farm," he said. "I just hope we can help farmers to jump through the bureaucratic hoops."

EPA officials explained they wanted to make the applications easier for farmers to fill out. "We have worked with a lot of people -- farm groups, agencies, environmentalists -- to streamline the application so it doesn't take a long time to fill it out," said Kerry Drake, EPA associate director of the air division in the agency's Pacific Southwest office. "We don't want it to be burdensome."

EPA officials said they would train people at farm organizations, such as county farm bureaus, to help farmers with the applications. The organizations are expected to hold meetings and workshops for their members.

The majority of the 27,000 farms in the Valley probably will not need a permit, EPA officials said. To qualify, a major source must produce more than 25 tons of pollutants per year in the Valley. Most farms are too small to reach that threshold.

Permit fees, which could cost hundreds or even thousands of dollars per year, won't be charged this year, Drake said. EPA is waiting to see whether the state will take over the permit program and establish its own fees, as it does with other permit programs.

The state for decades has exempted agriculture from such air permits, so the EPA was forced to start the program for farms. But the agency has told state officials to lift the exemption by Nov. 23 or face millions in extra fees for large or expanding businesses.

State and farm officials are working on legislation to deal with the exemption, and a legal fix might be in place by January.

The reporter can be reached at mgrossi@fresnobee.com or 441-6316.

Fresno meeting

When: 10 a.m. to 2 p.m., March 28

Where: 1990 E. Gettysburg Ave.

Modesto meeting

When: 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. April 14

Where: 4230 Kiernan Ave., Suite 130

Bakersfield meeting

When: 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. May 8

Where: 2700 M St., Suite 275

Each meeting will be carried via closed-circuit television to the other two sites.

To find the application online: www.epa.gov/region09/air/ca/title5app.html

For details, call (800) 810-9798. Phone messages will be returned within 24 hours. Questions also can be sent by e-mail to: farmpermits@epa.gov.

Crippen still shut down; talks hit a wall

City seeks to revoke land-use permits, close him permanently.

By Russell Clemings, The Fresno Bee, March 15, 2003

One week after his work site was shut down by an emergency city order, Archie Crippen remained out of business Friday, and the future of his southwest Fresno recycling yard remained uncertain.

Despite a week of negotiations, city officials have not lifted the "red tag" order they imposed March 7 on Archie Crippen Excavation, scene of a fire that burned from mid-January until mid-February in a 40-foot-tall pile of demolished waste.

The city also has notified Crippen that it intends to revoke his land-use permits, an action that could put him out of business permanently. Crippen's lawyer said an appeal of that action would be filed Monday.

The two sides remain at odds over one key question -- whether Crippen should be able to reopen his business, at least on a limited basis, despite the fire.

Crippen and his attorneys say that he should be allowed to operate his concrete- and asphalt-recycling business, as well as his public truck scale. But city officials say Crippen created a public nuisance and accepted materials that his permits did not allow. As a result, they want to revoke his permits.

"The main issue is whether the city will be able to shut him down permanently because of alleged violations of his permits," said Edwin A. Oeser, a Crippen attorney.

"The issue is whether Archie Crippen can continue to operate his rock-crushing operation ..., and we believe the answer is yes," Oeser said. He said Crippen denies the allegation that he created a nuisance and committed other violations of his permits.

Nick Yovino, city development director, said an appeal of Crippen's permit revocation was not unexpected and is likely to result in a hearing before the city Planning Commission, probably next month.

In the meantime, Yovino said, the business must remain closed until the city lifts its "red tag" shutdown order. That won't happen until Crippen provides the city with enough detailed plans addressing fire safety and related concerns. The city was reviewing the latest such submission from Crippen Friday.

"If we lift the red tag, he can operate," at least until the appeal is resolved, Yovino said.

Crippen did not respond to a request for a comment Friday. In an interview Wednesday, he said he might defy the city and reopen despite the red tag, a move that city officials said would prompt them to seek a court order enforcing the shutdown. But Friday, Crippen's attorneys said he had no immediate plans to reopen.

"I hope that we can work it out with the city, but it appears that the politics are such that they're going to try to shut him down," said Mark W. Coleman, another Crippen attorney.

Another unresolved issue is who will pay for fighting the Crippen fire, which cast a smoky shroud over parts of the Fresno metropolitan area as it smoldered in the pile of debris.

State Integrated Waste Management Board officials, who assisted in the firefighting effort, notified Crippen last week that he owes them at least \$580,000, and the bill eventually may reach from \$700,000 to \$750,000, an official said.

Meanwhile, state Sen. Dean Florez, D-Shafter, chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Air Quality in the Central Valley, sent a letter to Fresno Mayor Alan Autry on Friday with a list of questions for the city's task force on the Crippen fire.

Among the questions: Could the fire have been prevented? How long did it take firefighters to respond to the fire? To what extent do city officials bear responsibility for the fire? What is being done about lingering health concerns from the fire?

In the letter, Florez also said he would wait until the task force issues its report, which is scheduled for the end of this month, before deciding whether to hold a second hearing on the Crippen fire.

During an initial hearing Feb. 20, the committee took testimony from city, county and state officials, and local citizens.

Environmental case settled

By DANIELLE C. BELTON, Californian staff writer, March 15, 2003

The Kern County District Attorney's Office has settled an environmental case for \$1.15 million.

VSS Emultech has agreed to pay \$650,000, while Quality Carriers, a transportation company also named in the suit, agreed to pay \$500,000.

Settlement was based on a gas leak that took place on VSS Emultech's Bakersfield facility on March 21, 2001, that resulted in the hospitalization of two people and minor injuries for several others.

The settlement was reached Dec. 18 of last year.

Dan Starkey with the Kern County Environmental Health Department initially investigated the incident.

On March 21, a faulty tanker valve leaked hydrochloric acid gas from the asphalt-manufacturing facility.

Gas fumes made their way off-site to a lunch cart where employees of another company were out enjoying a break, according to Mike Chapman, chief environmental health specialist for the Environmental Health Department.

"Every time you have some sort of environmental violation the public is damaged," John T. Mitchell said.

Of the \$1.15 million, \$90,000 will be used to cover the cost of investigation and legal fees.

Another \$10,000 in restitution fees will go to the Western States Project, a federal government environmental regulatory agency that trains investigators and assisted in the investigation.

"We wanted to find some way of repaying the people, the victims," Mitchell said.

"In this case, we decided \$10,000 would go to Western States to train investigators."

[As for the remaining money, one-third will go to the county's general fund. Another third will go to the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District.](#)

The rest will go to the Environmental Health Department to help pay for future investigations.

"Right off the top we wanted to make sure investigating agencies get their costs back," Mitchell said. "We want to make sure that the people of Kern County don't have to pay for this."

Mitchell said most civil cases the D.A.'s office brings against businesses typically end in a settlement by the companies.

Typically, Mitchell said, the Environmental Health Department is able to handle most its violators without legal action, but they still end up passing along two to six cases per year to the D.A.'s office.

Other consumer and environmental cases come from various state and local agencies.

Mitchell said the office typically settles about 90 percent of these cases.

"Once the parties have come to some understanding as what the facts are, it's not uncommon for the parties to enter into a settlement," Mitchell said.

Chapman said it is rare for most environmental violations to result in the injury of people.

"We don't have too many cases where there's actually an exposure to the public," Chapman said. "Industry does a good job (of containing these incidents). This was a rare case."

Chapman said when there are injuries the most common ones involve farmworkers exposed to drifting sprays.

Both VSS Emultech and Quality Carriers are still operating.

Mitchell said it was the county's first civil suit for both of them and that Emultech has since replaced the faulty tank.

AIR POLLUTION VIOLATIONS

Bakersfield Californian, Sunday March 16, 2003

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District has issued the following citations against businesses suspected of violating pollution rules. For more information, call the district at 326-6900.

Arvin Sanitary Landfill in Bakersfield was cited Nov. 19 in Arvin for failing to perform a bi-weekly visible emission evaluation.

Coast Gas Inc./Enterprise Products Operating LP in Bakersfield was cited Nov. 19 for its railcar unloading operation. Tower six had a 30,000 ppm leak on railcar vapor-hose connection; tower eight had a 40,000 ppm leak on railcar liquid hose connection; tower eight also had a 32,000 ppm leak on railcar pressure relief valve.

Perin Kootstra of Bakersfield was cited Nov. 19 for an open burn of illegal material.

ChevronTexaco Inc. in McKittrick was cited Nov. 19 for flared gas due to a problem not associated with equipment breakdown or utility power failure.

Aera Energy LLC in Bakersfield was cited Nov. 20 for vapor recovery system in Belridge.

Tuboscope in Bakersfield was cited Nov. 20 for a coating other than protekto-coat 1152 being used for coating of sucker rods.

Aera Energy LLC in Bakersfield was cited Nov. 20 for a tank vented to atmosphere through pressure vacuum valve.

Mitch Brown Construction in Porterville was cited Nov. 21 for discharging quantities of an air contaminant that causes a public nuisance.

Bakersfield City Wastewater #2 in Bakersfield was cited Nov. 21 for an internal combustion digester-gas-fired cogeneration engine measuring NOx of 376 ppm averaged more than 15 minutes.

M&M Market in Bakersfield was cited Nov. 22 for operating with a suspended permit.

Kirschenmann Farms in Lamont was cited Nov. 22 for burning illegal debris.

Equilon Enterprises LLC in Bakersfield was cited Nov. 22 for exceeding fuel gas limit.

Steve Murray of Arvin was cited Nov. 22 for an agricultural burn conducted in a sump on a no-burn day and without a burn permit.

Terry Petris of Bakersfield was cited Nov. 22 for burning trash, palm leaves and wood at Petris Palms on Olive Drive.

Chevron USA Inc. in Bakersfield was cited Nov. 26 for operating a steam generator with excess emissions of SOx.

Charles Elizondo of Bakersfield was cited Nov. 26 for burning tumbleweeds on a no-burn day and without a valid permit.

Tut Brothers and Sons of Watsonville was cited Nov. 25 in Wheeler Ridge for a differential pressure gauge serving baghose compartment not functional as required by permit conditions.

Eva Mull of Bakersfield was cited Nov. 27 for her shed being demolished prior to asbestos being removed and without proper notification.

Halliburton Drilling Systems of Bakersfield was cited Nov. 27 for failing to maintain records as required.

Dirty air on agenda

The Bakersfield Californian

Sunday March 16, 2003, 11:03:15 PM

Air pollution from farms and urban growth will be among the subjects at a technical conference event in Bakersfield on March 25.

The Golden Empire Chapter of the Air & Waste Management Association has invited a number of federal and academic environmental experts to the conference to discuss dairy emissions and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's role in regulating valley air quality.

Other issues on the agenda include storm water discharge regulation, groundwater regulation and new federal smog rules affecting farmers. Kerry Drake, the EPA's regional air quality official, will be the lunch speaker. The conference concludes with a panel discussion, "Balancing Environmental Issues with Growth in the San Joaquin Valley," featuring experts from government and private agencies.

The conference kicks off at 7 p.m. Monday, March 24, with a dinner presentation by noted author Gerald Haslam, a Bakersfield native who recently published "The Great Central Valley: California's Heartland," a look at man's impact on the valley in words and pictures.

Conference sessions begins at 8 a.m. Tuesday, March 25 at the Holiday Inn Select on Truxtun Avenue in Bakersfield. Registration ranges from \$23 for the luncheon to \$175 for the entire conference.

For more information, call 326-6770, ext. 12.

[Editorial, Fresno Bee \(Published Saturday, March 15, 2003\)](#)

Traffic tax

British try charging driving fees to reduce London traffic congestion.

Anyone who has driven in central London can appreciate the problem: In a city whose streets predate the motor car by more than a millennium, traffic is in a near-constant state of gridlock. What to do? The mayor's answer: Charge people who drive into an eight-square-mile area of the central city about \$8 a day for the privilege. So far, it seems to have worked.

City traffic planners everywhere ought to watch closely to see if initial results in London stand up. On the first day under the new rule, the number of cars entering the city fell by nearly a third, and commutes in many cases took about half as long as thousands took the bus or tube (that's the subway).

On the other hand, the system is cumbersome: Some 700 cameras positioned around town monitor all cars entering during weekday work hours, compare license numbers with a database showing which car owners have paid the entry fee and, if it's not there, dun the owner about \$125. Critics complained that people who didn't know where to buy permits (by phone, Internet, at stores, garages) would be unfairly punished and argued that there ought to be a grace period for scofflaws.

Others complained that, to moderate-income suburbanites, \$40 a week is no modest sum. And for many there's the growing sense that Big Brother is watching; Britain already has more video monitoring cameras per square mile than any other country.

Still, the experiment has to be of interest to cities agonizing over what to do about urban congestion. A number of cities, including some in this country, have already started peak-time metering. Now more may be emboldened to act. Indeed, paying to drive into the city would probably work better in spread-out U.S. urban areas than the method adopted by many European cities, which have simply banned cars from central areas and provided shuttle buses.

There's an irony in London's experiment. Mayor Ken Livingstone, a Socialist, has staked his political future on making this market-oriented solution work. His likely Conservative Party opponent in the next election may be forgiven for having mixed feelings about a plan that, if it fails, could propel him into office but, if it succeeds, could leave him grumbling about having his principles stolen by a leftist. Once again, it's hard to beat British politics for mixing the substantive with the amusing.

[Modesto Bee Editorial, March 17, 2003](#)

Pollution controls also are needed on diesel engines

Every day, thousands of diesel-fueled trucks and cars move up and down the spine of the valley - double the number from two decades ago. They share those roads and highways with gasoline-powered vehicles, but there's one thing they don't share: the same set of regulations on their emissions.

The reasons: Diesel engines operate differently, and pollution controls that work on gas-powered engines won't necessarily help with diesels. Regulators have spent much more time and study on the problems caused by gas-powered vehicle emissions. And the kicker -- the trucking industry, the oil industry and the manufacturers of diesel engines have been a powerful consortium when it comes to fending off the attention of government regulators.

When a rudimentary inspection for trucks on California highways was started in 1991, the trucking industry tied it up in court. The program was suspended in 1993, and replaced in 1998 with a new program the industry helped create.

It doesn't help much. There are nearly 700,000 diesel vehicles on the state's roads; some 15,000 to 20,000 are inspected each year. And owner-operators of single diesel trucks are exempt from the program altogether.

Cars that skip or fail a Smog Check II test can't be registered. Uninspected diesels can.

Things are changing, but only very slowly. Too slowly, in fact. New standards for diesel engine emissions have been set, but won't take effect until 2007. New diesel technology promises

cleaner engines -- though improvements aren't nearly as dramatic as those achieved with gas-burning engines.

Diesels are popular because they're cheaper to run -- partly because they are barely regulated -- and they deliver more power for less fuel. But there's a huge social cost to using diesels: They produce about one-sixth of the valley's nitrogen oxides, a main component of smog, and huge amounts of particulates and soot.

It's going to be expensive to make improvements, but they must be made. And we've got to pick up the pace when it comes to diesel engine regulation. From now on, the bottom line on business as usual includes the human costs of air pollution.

[Letters to the Editor, Fresno Bee:](#)

Don't Go Overboard

By Richard Johansen
North Fork
(Published Monday, March 17, 2003, 5:25 AM)

After being pounded on a near-daily basis with endless stories, articles and editorials about the Valley's bad air, I've begun to wonder if the good folks at The Bee aren't becoming a wee bit hysterical over it. The March 10 piece on asthmatic cats confirms my suspicions.

Remember the old axiom: The easiest way to lose credibility is to overstate your case.

More bad air

By Bob Albertson
Clovis
(Published Monday, March 17, 2003, 5:25 AM)

We have 300,000 asthma patients in the Valley and the country's dirtiest air, so what do we do about it? The Clovis City Council OKs 10,000 more homes. That's 10,000 more furnaces, 10,000 more cars and 30,000 to 40,000 more people to use our limited water and resources, all in the name of the almighty dollar.

As a Republican I believe in property rights, but nowhere in the Constitution does it guarantee you can buy farmland and get it rezoned. Once again, follow the money trail.