CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

STATE CAPITOL SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

January 21, 2008

Mary Nichols, Chair Air Resources Board California Air Resources Board 1001 "I" Street P.O. Box 2815 Sacramento, CA 95812

Re: Proposition 1B

Dear Ms. Nichols:

ORIGINAL: Copies:

Board Clerk

Executive Officer

Chair

Pally Zwarts Rob Oglesby

We were recently advised of a preliminary report which included the allocation of the Proposition 1B funding for the "Goods Movement Emission Reduction Program". While we understand that this is merely a "draft," we are deeply concerned over the proposed 25% allocation to an area that is impacted by 45% of the goods movement-related diesel truck emissions generated in the four corridors identified as being eligible for Prop.1B funding. We feel it is prudent to allocate the most funds in areas with the biggest challenges, and where emissions from diesel trucks and locomotives do the most damage. We believe that an objective, needs-based analysis justifies that at least 37% of the Proposition 1B Air Quality funding should be allocated to the Central Valley. The increased allocation to the Valley is based upon the following factors:

- Inclusion of the required emissions reductions to bring the Valley into attainment of the 8-hour ozone standard by 2017 in the "SIP Needs" factor.
- Utilization of the official emissions inventory for "Goods movement emission" factor.
- Utilizing a per capita pollution exposure weighting in the "Population" factor.

As you are aware, the San Joaquin Valley faces significant air quality challenges. Over the past year, the Air Resources Board (ARB), the San Joaquin Valley Air District Board, and the Governor have all expressed a desire to accelerate the attainment of clean air standards in the San Joaquin Valley. The ARB established a task force to seek opportunities to achieve additional emissions reductions to bring the San Joaquin Valley

into attainment sooner than can be reached through the identified regulatory strategies. However, the current ARB proposal of 25% seems to be out of synch with these goals and would not allow sufficient funding for this accelerated attainment.

Sadly, competing for state dollars is not a new concept for the San Joaquin Valley on many fronts. We have consistently been strong advocates for our underserved Valley and we can not emphasize enough that the problems which exist in the Central Valley are every bit as important as those in Southern California and deserve a greater share of the allocation than proposed.

We appreciate the opportunity to voice our concerns on behalf of the people of Central California.

Sincerely,

Roy Ashburn

18th Senate District

enate District

Greg Aghazarian 26th Assembly District

om Berryhill 25th Assembly Distric

Cathleen Galgiani 17th Assembly District Dave Cogdill

14th Senate District

enate District

Juan Arambula

Assembly District

Doug LaMalfa

2nd Assembly District

Bill Maze
34th Assembly District

Nicole Parra 30th Assembly District

Mike Villines 29th Assembly District

Alan Nakanishi 10th Assembly District

Ted Gaines 4th Assembly District

Lois Wolk 8th Assembly District