

**Senator Roger Madigan, Chairman
Transportation**
Room 286 Main Capitol Building
Senate Box 203023
Harrisburg, PA 17120-3023



**Senator Mary Jo White, Chairman
Environmental Resources & Energy**
Room 169 Main Capitol Building
Senate Box 203021
Harrisburg, PA 17120-3021

Senate of Pennsylvania

To: All Members of the House of Representatives

From: Senator Mary Jo White, Chairman
Senate Environmental Resources & Energy Committee
Senator Roger Madigan, Chairman
Senate Transportation Committee

Date: October 23, 2006

Re: Senate Bill 1025 (PA Clean Vehicle Emission Program)

Your office recently received correspondence from Secretary of Environmental Protection (DEP) Kathleen McGinty and Legislative Secretary Steve Crawford opposing Senate Bill 1025. We introduced this legislation to establish the Clean Vehicle Emission Program in statute and maintain the federal vehicle emission standards in Pennsylvania.

Unfortunately, the Rendell Administration continues to spread misinformation to mislead legislators and the public about this important subject. This bill does not kill the Clean Cars Program, and any assertion to that is just plain false.

We again stress the following points:

- The Ridge Administration did not adopt and endorse the California vehicle emission standard in 1998. In fact, DEP expressed its intent to utilize the federal Tier II standard. Any statements to the contrary are indisputably false.
- Pennsylvania currently utilizes the federal Tier II standards, crafted by the Clinton-Gore Administration. Approximately 40 other states also use the federal standards.
- **SB 1025 Does NOT prohibit the sale of CA emissions vehicles in Pennsylvania.** Anyone who wants to purchase a vehicle meeting California emission standards will be able to and in the case of many vehicle models there is no difference.
- Under federal law, states must choose either the California vehicle emission standard, or the federal standards. There is no “customizing” of the vehicle emission standards.
- DEP has repeatedly submitted air quality improvement strategies to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) which state that the Commonwealth will bring almost all counties into attainment utilizing the federal vehicle emission standards.

- EPA has cautioned states to not overstate the benefits of the California standards, advising that there may be only a 1-2% added benefit.
- Letting California set our emission standards would in fact prohibit the sale of numerous vehicle models, **including many diesel models**. Furthermore, the Commonwealth would be susceptible to further vehicle choice limitations depending on what California chooses to do in the future to address its own unique air quality needs.
- Cars designed to meet the California standards cost more to manufacture, slowing down fleet turnover. For example, estimates to meet the pending California carbon dioxide standard range from \$1,000 - \$3,000 per vehicle. Design modifications include:
 - Redesigning V-6 engines to in-line 5 cylinder engines
 - Installing low rolling resistant tires (to reduce friction/grip with road surface)
 - Developing new automated-manual transmissions
 - Reconfiguring the alternator and electric power systems

If there were no difference in manufacturing costs, logic dictates that manufacturers would simply make one model that can be certified in all 50 states.

- The Rendell Administration's support for ensuring that DEP does not adopt more stringent emission limitations on stationary sources is noteworthy. However, DEP's own submissions to EPA indicating the Commonwealth can achieve and maintain its air quality attainment obligations using the federal standards contradicts this argument. If the Rendell Administration is so concerned, some may question why it is seeking to increase energy costs by hundreds of millions of dollars and threaten coal mining jobs by initiating a state-specific mercury rulemaking above and beyond the 86% reduction required by the federal government.
- Our air is cleaner today than at any point in over a century. The federal standards now in place will produce cars 95% cleaner than those on the road just six years ago.

We did not make this assertion – former President Bill Clinton did.

This is not a debate about a clean car vs. a dirty car. The reality is that it is a debate about two very clean cars, one that reasonably allows people to maintain vehicle choice and one that restricts that choice and has the potential to set back the natural progression to cleaner vehicles for Pennsylvania.