



Associated Oregon Loggers, Inc.

P.O. Box 12339 • Salem, Oregon 97309-0339 • (503) 364-1330 • Fax: (503) 364-0836

Associated Oregon Loggers, Inc. Opposes HB 3310 and SB 824

Both HB 3310 and SB 824 would direct the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) to adopt rules, standards and programs for the regulation of diesel emission adopted by the California Air Resources Board. These standards have been a disaster in California (see attached article) and would be equally disastrous in Oregon if these bills become law. SB 824 would also establish a "Clean Diesel Engine Fund" which would be funded with a deposit of one percent of the value of public improvement project contracts that require diesel engines and a "registration fee" for all diesel engines exceeding 25 horsepower and used for "non-road" purposes. **All diesel engines manufactured prior to 2007 would have to be replaced or "retro-fitted" with new and expensive emission control equipment.**

SB 824 alleges that Oregon is ranked 6th in the country for diesel soot emissions. This 2004 study was done using 1999 data. But what it shows is that the three worst concentrations of emissions are in Portland, Eugene and Medford. It has been a long time since much logging was done in any of these three metropolitan areas.

It is impossible to overstate the economic damage these bills would inflict on the logging industry. Please consider the following concerns:

- Logging is a very fuel-intensive industry. Almost everything we do consumes diesel fuel from harvesting trees, yarding them to a landing, processing them into proper lengths, loading them onto a truck and transporting them to a mill. Retrofitting all of this equipment would bankrupt most logging businesses.
- The logging industry is comprised, almost exclusively, of small family owned businesses. In most cases, the value of their equipment represents the value of the company. If these bills pass, most logging firms would be rendered worthless, immediately. Replacing the equipment and/or retro-fitting existing equipment is not practical or economically feasible.
- Our members live and work in rural Oregon. The study used to justify these bills clearly demonstrates that the problem, if one truly exists, is in a very small number of large metropolitan cities. Our industry does not contribute to air pollution in these areas. It makes no sense to penalize those businesses that do not contribute to the problem.
- The transition to equipment with higher emission standards is going to take care of itself over a period of time. New engines are equipped to meet the higher standards envisioned in these two bills. Eventually, they will replace existing equipment. But this transition should be driven by economics and the realization of the full useful life of existing equipment. It should not be a legal mandate with an unrealistic timeframe.

We urge the legislature to reject these two bills and avoid economic disaster in our industry.



Robert Bowman (<http://www.forbes.com/sites/robertbowman/>) Contributor
I cover logistics, international trade and supply-chain management.
 Opinions expressed by Forbes Contributors are their own.

FOLLOW

LOGISTICS & TRANSPORTATION (LOGISTICS-TRANSPORTATION) 9/24/2013 @ 11:15PM | 10,475 views

California Truckers Say They're Choking on State's Emission Rules

Comment Now Follow Comments

(<http://www.flickr.com/photos/37467370@N08/7564939874>)
 (Note: This story was updated on 9/27/13. See additional comments from CARB below.)

Truck operators in California are complaining that several new rules issued by the state's [Air Resources Board](http://www.arb.ca.gov/homepage.htm) (CARB) are either too costly or impossible to comply with, given current engine and fuel technology.

In at least one case, industry charges, a diesel soot filter mandated by CARB caused a major [fire](#)

(<http://www.dieselnet.com/news/2011/10cleaire.php>) in [Washington](#) (<http://www.forbes.com/washington/>) state, leading to the destruction of nearly 4,000 acres of forest and grassland.

CARB is phasing in a [requirement](#) (<http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/onrdiesel/documents/multirule.pdf>) that all trucks manufactured between 2000 and 2004, with gross weight of more than 26,000 pounds, be fitted with diesel particulate filters (DPFs). The devices trap soot, ash and toxic metals, cutting down on noxious emissions. [Vehicles](http://www.forbes.com/vehicles/) (<http://www.forbes.com/vehicles/>) that fail to comply with the rule will be banned from operating in California, with violators subject to fines ranging from \$1,000 to \$10,000 a day.

ally BANK. FDIC Member

1.29% ANNUAL PERCENTAGE YIELD

Ally IRA Raise Your Rate 2-Year CD

ROLL OVER YOUR IRA TO ALLY

Get the option to raise your rate once if our rate goes up on this CD

learn more

Truckers claim that the filters don't integrate well with older vehicle models. They have been known to shut down engines and result in increased equipment downtime, said Michael Shaw, spokesman for the California Trucking Association (<http://http://caltrux.org/>) (CTA).

The filters need to be periodically regenerated, or cleaned out. The 2011 fire in Washington was set off by sparks escaping from a CARB-approved filter that had gone into an uncontrolled regeneration cycle, Shaw said.

CARB immediately had the suspect filter removed from the market. Erik White, chief of the agency's Mobile (<http://www.forbes.com/mobile/>) Source Operations Division, said the particular model contained a metal substrate that can melt under high temperatures. Most diesel filters consist of heat-resistant ceramics.

"We felt that the right course of action was to cease any future sales of that device," said White. But CARB insists that all other filters on the market are safe, and essential to reducing diesel emissions from older trucks.

In cases where a filter causes engine shutdown, the reason is nearly always the failure of truck operators to follow the manufacturer's maintenance procedures, said White. "When we follow up, and they incorporate those changes into their practices, we don't see repeat problems," he said.

Shaw said the filter retrofits "are not going to be a long-term viable option." What CARB really wants is for truckers to scrap their older models and buy newer, cleaner-burning vehicles. In the meantime, operators are faced with a cost of \$15,000 or more for each filter installed on an existing unit. Many older trucks aren't worth more than that. CTA estimates industry's total cost of compliance at \$1 billion a year.

The CARB rules come with several financing mechanisms to help truck owner-operators pay for the retrofits, including both outright grants and loan guarantees. Passage of state Proposition 1B

(<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/ibond.htm>) in 2008 made available money for the purchase of cleaner trucks. Another measure earmarked \$10 million in loan guarantees, and White said CARB is recommending that the state invest an additional \$8 million to extend funding through the end of the year.

"We will see an extension of the program," said Shaw, "but more needs to be done."

The trucking industry is also upset over CARB's Low Carbon Fuel Standard (<http://www.arb.ca.gov/fuels/lcfs/lcfs.htm>) (LCFS) program, which mandates the increased use of low-carbon transportation fuels. Shaw said the standard "far exceeds the technological capability of engines we have in the fleet today. Currently, even the most modern engines cannot deal with more than a level

of 20-percent biodiesel (<http://www.fueleconomy.gov/feg/biodiesel.shtml>).”
What's more, he said, the use of biodiesel fuel at CARB-mandated levels would violate manufacturer warranties.

CARB replied that it isn't specifying which alternative fuels need to be used. And it refutes industry claims that there aren't enough of them around to meet the LCFS. “These assertions tend to overlook the existence of low-carbon-intensity natural gas and electricity as fuel sources,” the agency said in a statement. In addition, CARB said, industry is dramatically under-estimating the amount of biodiesel that can be produced, while ignoring the growth of low-carbon sources such as corn oil and waste oil.

“In short,” said CARB, “these negative predictions generally assume there will be no technological development and investment in alternative fuels, which is an assumption already being proved wrong.”

Yet another source of friction between CARB and truckers is the agency's mandate for the installation of trailer skirts (<http://www.truckinginfo.com/channel/fuel-smarts/article/story/2012/10/time-running-out-for-carb-compliance-on-trailer-aerodynamics.aspx?prestitial=1>), to cut down on aerodynamic drag. The plastic or metal panels are placed between the wheels of the tractor and trailer. In addition, the agency is requiring the adoption of low-rolling-resistance tires (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Low_rolling_resistance_tire) to reduce road friction.

The problem, in industry's view, lies in CARB's assessment of the benefits of that equipment. Shaw claimed the agency is basing its calculations on trucks driving at 62.5 miles per hour — seven and a half miles faster than the legal speed limit — 80 percent of the time. In reality, he said, carriers travel at 55 MPH about 40 percent of the time.

Continue
(<http://www.forbes.com/sites/robertbowman/2013/09/24/california-truckers-say-theyre-choking-on-states-emission-rules/2/>)

Page 1 / 2

Comment Now Follow Comments