

Developer appeals ruling on San Mateo hillside project

By Julia Scott, San Mateo County Times

In the Contra Costa Times & Tri-Valley Herald, Tues., Dec. 29, 2009

SAN MATEO — Developer Dennis Thomas wants a second chance to build a subdivision in the unincorporated Highlands-Baywood Park neighborhood, and he has appealed to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors.

Thomas, of San Mateo Real Estate Inc., lodged his appeal two weeks after the county Planning Commission unanimously rejected his proposal for a 25-unit subdivision on Baywood Park's famously steep Water Tank Hill. But there's a twist: Thomas will submit a new set of plans, altering several aspects of the proposal to make it more likely to earn approval.

Details are sketchy so far, because Thomas has only sent a short letter to county planning staff members outlining some of the changes. Thomas wouldn't say Monday whether he will propose more homes or fewer homes, only that the lots will be smaller and will avoid the steepest parts of the hillside.

"I'm appealing the project on the advice of the county that this is a procedural move they have recommended if I wish to preserve the work that's been accomplished to date," said Thomas, who has been working on this Ascension Heights project for eight years. "The Planning Commission and the public had problems with some areas of the development, and we're going to address those and see where it is appropriate to make changes."

A Planning Commission hearing Dec. 9 drew passionate testimony from 400 local residents who expressed concerns about hillside erosion and air pollution associated with hauling thousands of tons of dirt from the site while the hill is graded. Thomas' new commitment to avoiding the steepest slopes appears aimed at assuaging those concerns, as do statements in his letter alluding to shortening the truck haul routes and avoiding soil exportation on Saturdays so as to minimize disruption during the first construction phase.

Thomas also intends to avoid building a steep fire access road up the back of the hill as required by fire officials in the original design. And he wants to protect the sensitive summer lupine grass on the site by building around it.

It's unlikely that earning approval for the new design will be as simple as presenting it to the Board of Supervisors, which in any case would be more likely to remand such a project back to county staff to be analyzed, said project planner James Castañeda.

"This is not a typical situation, where you have an applicant file an appeal and then make changes to a project," said Castañeda, adding that a new environmental impact report may be required, which could take a year or more, and it would have to be followed by a public hearing process.

Castañeda said he isn't even sure who would hear such an appeal first, the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors.

"We need to see what he has," he said. "If it's a material change, it's practically a new project. That's something we'd need to confer on with county counsel."

Thomas did not say when the new plans would be submitted.

Locals are open to a subdivision that's safe, well-planned and fits in with the neighborhood, said Baywood Park Homeowner's Association President Jerry Ozanne.

"The community is very willing to work with (Thomas) on some reasonable design," Ozanne said. "What he had proposed before was extreme. ... We just want to make sure that the process is fully vetted, fully analyzed, and that we're involved in assessing the design now instead of after the fact."

Inspectors find 47 Spare the Air violators Friday

The number of offenders was more than double the Nov. 26 total.

By Denis Cuff

Contra Costa Times & Tri-Valley Herald, Tues., Dec. 29, 2009

Bay Area air pollution inspectors found 47 violators burning wood fires illegally during Christmas Day's Spare the Air alert — which was declared because cold, unhealthful air had been forecast.

The tally was more than double the 22 violators detected on Thanksgiving, when the Bay Area Air Quality Management District also called a Spare the Air alert.

Violators get written warnings for a first offense and \$400 fines for a second offense.

While critics have bashed the air district for intruding on a holiday burning tradition, a spokesman for the agency defended the Christmas crackdown Monday, saying it was done to protect public health from soot that can trigger asthma attacks, and aggravate other respiratory and heart problems.

"We know a lot of people like to burn on this holiday, but it's our duty to protect public health," said Ralph Borrmann, the spokesman.

Inspectors typically patrol areas where people complain about burning or have a track record of burning on Spare the Air Days.

On Friday, the air district received 216 calls from the public. The calls were either complaints about burning, or questions or comments about the smoke rule.

Exemptions from the bans are made for homes with no other permanent heating source than a wood-burning appliance.

Emissions Disclosure as a Business Virtue

By Leslie Kaufman, staff writer
N.Y. Times, Monday, Dec. 28, 2009

Cupping their hands near holes drilled for cable routing, workers at the Boeing Company's four-acre data processing site near Seattle noticed this year that air used to keep the computers cool was seeping through floor openings.

Mindful of the company's drive to slash electricity consumption by 25 percent, they tucked insulation into holes there and at five similar sites. The resulting savings are projected at \$55,000, or some 685,000 kilowatt hours of electricity a year.

Yet Boeing's goal is not just to save money. The hope is to keep pace with other companies that have joined in a vast global experiment in tracking the carbon dioxide emissions generated by industry.

Boeing and other enterprises are voluntarily doing what some might fiercely resist being forced to do: submitting detailed reports on how much they emit, largely through fossil fuel consumption, to a central clearinghouse.

The information flows to the Carbon Disclosure Project, a small nonprofit organization based in London that sifts through the numbers and generates snapshots, by industry sectors in different nations.

By giving enterprises a road map for measuring their emissions and pointing out how they compare with their peers, experts say, the voluntary project is persuading companies to change their energy practices well before many governments step in to regulate emissions.

Scientists estimate that industry and energy providers produce nearly 45 percent of the heat-trapping emissions that contribute to global warming. While some governments are convinced that reining in such pollution is crucial to protecting the atmosphere, a binding global pact is not on the immediate horizon, as negotiations in Copenhagen showed this month.

Until broad regulation is at hand, many investors and company executives say, voluntary reporting programs like the Carbon Disclosure Project may be the best way to leverage market forces for change.

They say the project sends a message that a company that moves to curb emissions now is girded for the future and therefore worthy of investment.

"With the regulatory framework changing, how companies handle carbon is a core risk factor," said Jack Ehnes, chief executive of Calstrs, the California teachers' pension fund. "Smart companies will take C.D.P. information and realign their strategies."

Mary Armstrong, Boeing's vice president for environment, health and safety, traces her company's energy focus back to 2007, when she first saw the forms that companies fill out for the disclosure project.

"The questions take you through and say, 'Do you have environmental performance targets?' We didn't, but now we do," she said. The companies' individual responses are posted at the project's Web site.

In contrast to the United States, European Union countries already regulate carbon dioxide emissions from their most energy-intensive industries through a cap and trade program, and Japan polices energy consumption itself.

Paul Dickinson, the founder and chief executive of the Carbon Disclosure Project, is quick to acknowledge that his group is no substitute for muscular government regulation. But he argues that the voluntary project offers a frictionless path toward reining in emissions, even in relatively unregulated markets like China's and India's. Emissions are expected to soar in those fast-growing economies in coming years as new coal-fired plants go online.

Yet even as the Carbon Disclosure Project has established itself as the standard for emissions measurement methods, it has stirred some skepticism. Critics say that the emissions figures do not have to be verified through external audits, as financial figures from publicly traded companies must be.

And some argue that the project rewards companies that would have cut their carbon dioxide output anyway, and has no influence over polluting companies that refuse to take part.

Nonetheless, 2,500 of the world's largest companies completed at least part of the project's questionnaire last year, from the energy conglomerate Gazprom in Russia to Huaxin Cement in China.

In the United States, where almost only the companies in the Standard and Poor's 500s stock index were solicited by the disclosure project, some 330 filled out forms this year. Some companies do not answer all of the questions. But the most detailed reports specify not only how much energy a company consumes, and how, but also ticks off ways in which it might be vulnerable to climate change — flooded stores, for example.

Industry is a broad and varied category, of course, covering everything from cement and chemical makers, which emit an enormous amount of carbon dioxide, to data-driven businesses like financial services, which emit little by comparison.

The disclosure project has response rates of at least 60 percent for most industry sectors in the United States. But it has even higher rates for utilities, which are highly regulated, and materials companies, which include cement and chemical makers. It has received responses from energy titans like Chevron and chemical companies like DuPont.

To drum up more and better reporting, the project has enlisted major investors like Calstrs, the nation's second-largest pension program, and Bank of America Merrill Lynch to co-sign letters from the project encouraging companies to take part.

Mr. Dickinson said the project writes letters on behalf of 475 investor groups representing \$55 trillion in funds worldwide.

Some American companies have argued that reporting is cumbersome and could allow competitors to learn too much about their manufacturing processes. But proponents counter that the monitoring could give some of them a competitive advantage as early adopters.

In September, the Environmental Protection Agency announced it could require the nation's biggest power plants and industrial operations to report greenhouse gas emissions as early as 2011. The United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers have firmly opposed such regulation, saying that it would be legally and technically burdensome, drive up fuel costs by promoting renewable sources and send job overseas.

But nations that have already pressed ahead with regulations are prodding the United States to match their efforts. The European Union has been monitoring and limiting carbon dioxide emissions from its most energy-intensive sectors since 2005 through a cap and trade program.

Since 2003 Japan has required companies of any size to report energy consumption to the government and what they are doing to reduce use. Mr. Dickinson argues that disclosure could prove a means of currying investor favor in international markets as the global awareness of industry's role in climate change deepens.

"I have real confidence that the corporations of the world are going to outperform government in terms of dealing with climate change," he said. "In fact, they are already."

His vision for carbon transparency dates back to 1997, when he entered a master's program on responsible business practices at the University of Bath School of Management taught by Anita Roddick, the founder of The Body Shop.

After graduating, he solicited philanthropists, including Ted Turner, and went about developing reliable ways to measure output. Then he reached out to large investors to co-sign letters demanding that companies fill out the project's forms. Until 2002, the forms spoke only of "the perception" of climate change because global warming was still "too controversial," he said.

Some analysts now laud the program as an innovative way of encouraging investors to factor industry emissions into assessments of corporate performance.

Abyd Karmali, global head of carbon markets for Bank of America, likens the disclosure project to the advent of general accounting principles, which enable investors to compare financial performance and move dollars accordingly.

"It is very difficult to translate carbon-related risk into standardized disclosure, so it is a fantastic contribution," he said.

But others have their doubts. "There is disclosure, and then so what?" said Hewson Baltzell, the co-founder of Innovest, a financial research firm that gathered figures for the disclosure project the first several years.

"They've dipped their toe in the water on asking companies about performance, but not very far."

Mr. Dickinson counters that the project has added evaluations that rate companies by concrete steps taken to cut their emissions. It now also asks companies to calculate emissions of their suppliers, in the hope of leveraging the power that a giant like Wal-Mart might have over those that are otherwise unwilling to report.

Rob Bernard, chief environmental strategist for Microsoft, which is helping the project make its data more accessible to the public, says the impact of the reports is growing.

"With each year we are able to compare performance on greenhouse gas information with new levels of granularity," he said. "Now we just have to hope that more people read it and care."

[OC Register Editorial, Tues., Dec. 28, 2009:](#)

Shelving climate bill sensible for Senate

A cap-and-trade program to curb greenhouse gas emissions and financially penalize businesses emitting them faces new opposition among moderate Senate Democrats, apparently worried about voter backlash in next year's election. Cap-and-trade, along with sweeping changes in health care, are the Obama administration's two principle initiatives, but polls already show more Americans oppose (55 percent) than support (40 percent) the yet-to-be-approved health program, Rasmussen Reports said Monday.

Worries about further alienating voters who are struggling in a down economy prompted "at least a half dozen" moderate Democratic senators to urge the White House to give up its ambitious plan to force conversion from fossil-based fuels to alternative energy, the Web site Politico.com reported. Few, if any, Senate Republicans are expected to support the measure. Without moderate Democrats, it is highly unlikely cap-and-trade can pass the Senate, even though a version passed the House last summer.

In a mere half year, much has changed. There was Climategate, the controversy over leaked documents from the U.K.'s East Anglia University Climate Research Center that seem to show at the least that

climate scientists systematically blackballed dissenting views while manipulating and perhaps destroying data to make a case that global warming had occurred at an alarming rate.

Then there was the Copenhagen climate summit fiasco this month where 193 nations had hoped to agree on worldwide greenhouse gas emission curbs. But the summit fizzled when only a handful of major nations agreed merely to keep working independently to cut their own emissions but, even then, without enforcement guarantees. Developing nations, including China, now the world's largest greenhouse-gas emitter, refused to agree to any absolute reduction goals, but nevertheless insisted developed nations like the U.S. must pay them tens of billions annually to develop alternatives to fossil fuels, on which they, like the rest of the world, now rely.

More recently, a Russian think tank alleged temperature data from that nation used by the United Nation's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change was cherry-picked, grossly inflating readings for nearly half a century. Russians called for a complete reevaluation of the entire global temperature record, upon which the global warming theory is based.

Sen. Mary Landrieu, D-La., among other moderate Democrats, essentially told the White House and party leaders "it's time to jettison the centerpiece of their party's plan to curb global warming," Politico reported.

"Less than 10 days after claiming a breakthrough on climate change in Copenhagen, President Obama is facing a mutiny from senior Democrats who are imploring him to postpone or even abandon his cap-and-trade bill," agreed the U.K.'s TimesOnline.com

Moderate Democrats may fear voter backlash if they approve another sweeping government program, effectively imposing higher energy prices. They may fear voters more than the lobbying clout of environmental groups and huge utilities that back the cap-and-trade scheme, which would give the government power to artificially create a "market" for carbon emission allowances that companies could buy and sell, as they switch to alternative fuel sources.

Indiana Democratic Sen. Evan Bayh called passage of any economywide cap-and-trade plan "unlikely." His colleague, Sen. Ben Nelson, D-Neb., said: "I'd just as soon see that set aside until we work through the economy."

Meanwhile, some Democrats are scurrying for alternatives to cap-and-trade, such as taxing emissions, with proceeds passed on to consumers, or taxing only power plants.

Given growing public awareness of global warming's problematic scientific justification and the lingering economic downturn, the Senate should shelve plans to regulate ubiquitous CO2 emissions – at least until the scientific issues are resolved, and until the recession ends.

[Contra Costa Times & Tri-Valley Herald Guest Commentary, Tues., Dec. 29, 2009:](#)

My Word: Congress must give Port of Oakland authority to set standards to help truckers

By Christine Cordero and Rome Aloise

A THOUSAND truck drivers face unemployment in January when their rigs are banned from the Port of Oakland. The state is rightly enforcing new diesel truck emission standards, but these drivers can't afford the new trucks or upgrades needed to comply. The drivers are angry because they were misled about the availability of grants to pay the costs.

An economist hired by the Port of Oakland estimated it would cost \$200 million to transition to a clean port truck fleet to meet 2010 and 2014 standards. But there was only \$22 million in the grant fund. Eight hundred drivers received grants, but more than 1,200 applicants were turned down. Some drivers bought newer trucks, intending to retrofit them. Now they're stuck with debt on a truck that they won't even be able to drive next year.

Drivers have been staging protests at the port, City Hall and the state capitol. Some are demanding more funding. Others are asking for a deadline extension and there was talk of staging a work stoppage.

Understandably, the drivers are scared and frustrated. They're desperate. They wonder how they're going to support their families. Port drivers make poverty-level wages. Few have health benefits. Misclassified as independent contractors, they are ineligible for unemployment benefits. They have no safety net.

Make no mistake: These regulations are critical for improving air quality for residents, port drivers and other workers who are at great risk of contracting asthma, cancer and other diseases associated with diesel soot.

But it is a mistake to cast this problem as a conflict between the truck drivers struggling to protect their livelihoods versus government regulators protecting residents who want clean air for their kids to breathe.

Conspicuously absent in this debate is the role of the corporations that own and ship the goods. Companies like Walmart, Target and Home Depot reap huge profits from the services the port provides, yet no one is asking them to help pay to make the port a safe place for workers and the surrounding communities. Instead, taxpayers are being told that we have to subsidize these companies while they lobby with everything they've got to avoid paying their fair share.

The Port of Los Angeles recognized the dangers of the broken port trucking system and has enacted a comprehensive and sustainable Clean Truck Program, requiring port trucking companies to hire their drivers as employees and take responsibility for less polluting trucks. Instantly, 2,000 of the oldest, dirtiest rigs were taken off the road and nearly 6,000 clean-burning vehicles were put into service. The result was immediate significant air quality improvements.

But the American Trucking Association sued to stop this highly successful program. Fearing the high cost of legal defense when the Port of Oakland is financially strapped, the port decided to put real trucking reform on hold. Now we're stuck with toxic air to breathe.

That's why environmentalists, unions and community activists across the country are calling on Congress to update federal law to ensure that ports have the authority to set environmental, labor and community standards for port trucking. Once this happens, the industry must be required to pay for the new trucks needed to clean up the air and protect the public's health. It's time for the free ride to end.

Christine Cordero, an Oakland resident, is the Bridging Environmental Health & Justice Program Coordinator for the Center for Environmental Health. Rome Aloise is President of Teamsters Joint Council 7. They are both members of the Coalition for Clean & Safe Ports.

[Letters to the Fresno Bee, Tuesday, Dec. 29, 2009:](#)

New blood needed on air board

Your recent articles, opinions and letters to the editor dealing with the California Air Resources Board and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District prompt this letter.

What a bunch of nitwits these organizations are, feeding us the regulations they seem to feel is right, despite the obvious (at least to us with a brain) economic problems and our already over-burdened unemployment. These folks are not in the least bit interested in surrounding circumstances and listening to the public's input at their meetings — just like all politicians across this country today.

All elected officials and know-it-all appointees should be let loose from their positions as soon as possible — one and all. What we really need is entirely new blood with new educational and researched ideas, a great enthusiasm for their passion, the sincere desire to serve fervently, and the commitment to diligently earn their comfortable keep instead of wasting taxpayer dollars.

Muriel Zahler, Fresno

Warming not based on science

Alan Coles [letter Dec. 20] argues that global warming is real and takes issue with Gregory L. Bacchetti [letter Dec. 13] for not citing scientists to support his view.

I offer him a documented book "Climate of Extremes" published in May 2009 by Patrick J. Michaels, professor of climatology at the University of Virginia, and Robert C. Balling Jr., professor of climatology at Arizona State University.

They provide proof to reasonable people that man has little or no impact on the climate and that the notion the earth is suddenly warming is debunked by all the facts, and nothing but the facts. The sun makes a far more likely contribution to global warming, if it exists at all.

Al Gore and his hysteria parade is based on little or no science and his refusal to debate qualified authorities on the subject should give his followers great pause.

The work these two do in examining the science demonstrates that much of the prior scientific examinations has used cherry-picked information and that "peer review" has been prostituted to the point where everyone should be suspicious.

The recent findings that data was "gamed" should cause any reasonable person to demand a complete review top to bottom.

Jim Kochheiser, Fresno

Bump up the temp

I would ask Alan Coles [letter Dec. 20]] to name the scientists that prove man made global warming.

Environmental scientists are simply environmentalists who bought a white lab coat and can program a computer model that produces a desired result. These programs are so skewed to warming that they also say that even if we did what environmentalists want us to do, it would not slow the warming, so why do it.

There are two reasons I believe this is a hoax. First, global warming advocates won't submit to debate or questioning, if a legitimate question is asked the answer is always that only flat-earthers don't accept settled science. Real science is questioned and tested; global warming will not put itself in that position.

Second, global warming only leads to complete disaster. We're told that the worst case is 5 degrees in 40 to 50 years. That means fewer foggy days, less disastrous crashes, there would be less citrus losses due to frost, larger areas available to grow crops, and more crops per acre.

More people die from cold than heat — warmer temperatures would be a blessing. Why don't we try to bump it up 10 degrees?

William J. Scott, Clovis

[Letter to the Lodi News Sentinel, Monday, Dec. 28, 2009:](#)

Global warming is a hoax

I am so very disappointed in the Lodi News-Sentinel, along with all of the so-called mainstream media, for not covering the huge story regarding the recent revelations that global warming is nothing more than a hoax perpetrated by extremist groups and governments so as to control us and tax us into oblivion.

Why are you so quick to print stories that support the lie but never print anything that contradicts or promotes a dissenting opinion on global warming? Why have you not covered the story of the e-mails that were discovered at the University of East Anglia's Climate Research Unit, proving that the data is being doctored and made up to push the global warming agenda? Not one story have I seen.

Yet the front page (Dec. 8) has another story promoting the lie that carbon dioxide is bad for us humans. According to many so-called global warming experts back in the '80s and early '90s, many coastal cities were supposed to be under water by 2005 to 2010; yet the tide levels are no different today than they were 100 years ago.

Global warming scientists are manipulating and suppressing data to fabricate global warming hysteria. Carbon dioxide does not cause global warming! Data clearly shows that global temperatures are decreasing even as carbon dioxide levels are increasing.

I suggest you search out the global warming hoax and see for yourself that Al Gore is a liar as well as are so many who stand to benefit from grants, manufacturing subsidies and a multitude of other ways that the global warming nuts will take our money and ruin this great nation.

An expert in this field is Lord Monkton. You can google and read about him.

Phil Asman, Lodi

[Letter to the Lodi News-Sentinel, Sat., Dec. 26, 2009:](#)

Are we facing global warming or are we not?

Barbara Boxer, our junior U.S. senator while ranting on about those who exposed the distorting of data in the climate debate asked, "Whatever it is, the main issue is, are we facing global warming or are we not?" (thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefingroom/news/70249-boxer-hacked-climategate-emails-may-face-criminal-probe). As serious yet innocuous as her question might appear, the main issue should actually be: Are human beings responsible for global warming, and if so is there anything we can actually do about it?

No one would seriously reject the notion that all planets go through climatic changes over the course of time. In my 50-plus years of living I've experienced cooler summers and warmer winters than preceding seasons. And after awhile, things return to normal once again. But what is truly "normal" when discussing Earth? Creationists believe that the Earth is around 6,000 years old, others suggest it is 4.56 billion years old. Well, I'm more inclined toward the latter (which is not in contradiction to my Christian beliefs). Regardless, Earth is very old. A number of scientists and politicians insist that we now know all that we need to know about global warming and the history of the planet to lay blame on humans.

Of course this is a ridiculous conclusion. There are far too many unanswered questions than those we can actually accept as fact. Our 21st Century arrogance has even gone so far as to declare the global warming debate as "settled," that no further discussion is necessary. Clearly, the surfacing of these e-mails that more than suggest that our learned scientists fudged the data to fit their models should reopen whatever discourse is now necessary to better understand what is really going on here.

The inconvenient truth now is how much effort and expense has already been wasted in this futile attempt to control the planet's weather and what are we going to do about it? No decent person would argue against being responsible stewards for our global home; but to lie about the data that would have us waste trillions of dollars (Cap and Trade) for something that is now suspected to be false demands an investigation. I would think Senator Boxer would lead that campaign; yeah right!

Jerome R. Kinderman, Lodi

[Note: The following clips in Spanish discuss the improvement of air quality in Mexico City. For more information, contact Maricela Velásquez at \(559\) 230-5849.](#)

ECOLOGIA: Ciudad de México batirá récord de los últimos 25 años en su calidad de aire

Servicios de Impacto USA

Impacto USA, Tues., Dec. 29, 2009

México, 28 dic (EFE).- Ciudad de México, una de las metrópolis más contaminadas del mundo, batirá en 2009 su récord histórico de días con buena calidad de aire, informó hoy la Alcaldía capitalina.

Según datos del Sistema de Monitoreo Atmosférico de la ciudad, el récord de 2008 se igualó el pasado sábado 26 de diciembre con 181 días con niveles de ozono por debajo de los límites máximos recomendados por las normas mexicanas.

Los pronósticos de calidad del aire de las autoridades capitalinas señalan que "para la próxima semana se esperan más días con niveles de ozono por debajo del valor de la norma, por lo que este año se alcanzará un nuevo registro histórico con más del 50 por ciento de los días con estas características", destacó la Secretaría de Medio Ambiente del Distrito Federal (SMA) en un comunicado.

En los últimos 25 años los niveles de ozono en Ciudad de México han excedido "por mucho" los valores que las normas oficiales mexicanas recomiendan como seguros para la protección de la salud, destaca la nota.

Las condiciones de clima y ubicación de la urbe, en la que viven unos 19 millones de personas, "en combinación con la gran cantidad de contaminantes que diariamente se emiten a la atmósfera, favorecen una activa producción de ozono y partículas finas", explicó la Secretaría del Medio Ambiente local.

A finales de la década de los ochenta y principios de la de los noventa, el ozono excedía el valor máximo permitido en el país, de 0,110 partes por millón (ppm) promedio en una hora, en más del 90 por ciento de los días del año, "lo que implicaba un riesgo en términos de salud pública", agregó el organismo.

En los últimos años, la mayor parte de las acciones para mejorar la calidad del aire en la urbe se han centrado principalmente en la reducción del ozono, lo que ha permitido que desde 1994 las concentraciones de este contaminante muestren una tendencia descendente.

Mientras que en 2006 se reportaron 152 días con una calidad del aire favorable por ozono, en 2008 el número de días limpios aumentó a 181, con lo que se estableció un nuevo récord histórico, el cual será superado este año.

A juicio de la SMA, la reducción de la contaminación ha sido posible gracias a las estrategias de gestión ambiental adoptadas por las autoridades capitalinas, la "notable participación de la ciudadanía", y la colaboración del gobierno del vecino Estado de México y del Ejecutivo federal.

La dependencia exhortó a la población a que durante la temporada invernal no utilice el vehículo si no es necesario, mantenga limpias las calles y aceras, evite prender fogatas, quemar llantas, residuos o pastizales, se abstenga de usar juegos pirotécnicos, y dé aviso a las autoridades si se detecta un incendio forestal. EFE

Ciudad de México mejora en el 2009 la calidad del aire

By EFE

El Nuevo Herald, Tues., Dec. 29, 2009

Ciudad de México, una de las metrópolis más contaminadas del mundo, batirá en el 2009 su récord histórico de días con buena calidad de aire, informó el lunes la Alcaldía capitalina.

Según datos del Sistema de Monitoreo Atmosférico de la ciudad, el récord del 2008 se igualó el pasado sábado 26 de diciembre con 181 días con niveles de ozono por debajo de los límites máximos recomendados por las normas mexicanas.

Los pronósticos de calidad del aire de las autoridades capitalinas señalan que "para la próxima semana se esperan más días con niveles de ozono por debajo del valor de la norma, por lo que este año se alcanzará un nuevo registro histórico con más del 50 por ciento de los días con estas características", destacó la Secretaría de Medio Ambiente del Distrito Federal (SMA) en un comunicado.

En los últimos 25 años los niveles de ozono en Ciudad de México han excedido "por mucho" los valores que las normas oficiales mexicanas recomiendan como seguros para la protección de la salud, destaca la nota.

Las condiciones de clima y ubicación de la urbe, en la que viven unos 19 millones de personas, "en combinación con la gran cantidad de contaminantes que diariamente se emiten a la atmósfera, favorecen una activa producción de ozono y partículas finas", explicó la Secretaría del Medio Ambiente local.

A finales de la década de los ochenta y principios de la de los noventa, el ozono excedía el valor máximo permitido en el país, de 0.110 partes por millón (ppm) promedio en una hora, en más del 90 por ciento de los días del año, "lo que implicaba un riesgo en términos de salud pública", agregó el organismo.

En los últimos años, la mayor parte de las acciones para mejorar la calidad del aire en la urbe se han centrado principalmente en la reducción del ozono, lo que ha permitido que desde 1994 las concentraciones de este contaminante muestren una tendencia descendente.

Mientras que en el 2006 se reportaron 152 días con una calidad del aire favorable por ozono, en el 2008 el número de días limpios aumentó a 181, con lo que se estableció un nuevo récord histórico, el cual será superado este año.

La reducción de la contaminación ha sido posible gracias a las estrategias de gestión ambiental adoptadas por las autoridades capitalinas.