

BP sold Texas oil refinery after making hundreds of people sick, victims claim

FT, April 16, 2013 18:43

After releasing toxic chemicals that left hundreds sick, BP sold its Texas City, Texas oil refinery for \$2.4 billion. Now the oil and gas company is facing a \$1 billion lawsuit for "violating the rights and endangering the health" of 474 plaintiffs.

The victims in the case claim that BP's oil refinery released highly toxic chemicals for 15 consecutive days in November 2011 and inflicted permanent environmental and health damages upon the local community. BP allegedly knew about the potential harm these chemicals could do, but "failed to take proper action to stop or control the release," the lawsuit states.

Additionally, years of unsafe practices at the refinery have polluted the city, most notably the series of explosions and fires that killed 15 workers and injured 1,000 in March 2005. And after polluting Texas City from 1998 until earlier this year, BP sold its refinery, reaping lucrative profits while abandoning the now-contaminated region.

"BP made a tremendous amount of money while doing business in Texas City, sold the refinery at a large profit and then left Texas City and the people of Galveston County holding the bag for its mess," reads the complaint, filed by lead plaintiff Samuel Charles

Boyd Jr. "To be sure, the mess is enormous - so large that Texas City and Galveston County may very well never recover from the harm done to the area environment."

The lawsuit also alleges that because of BP's violations of air pollution laws and guidelines, Galveston County now has the worst air quality in the US - a side-effect of the crude refinery that residents must now bear the consequences of.

BP sold its Texas City oil refinery to Marathon

<http://rt.com/usa/oil-texas-refinery-bp-961/#> =

Petroleum Corporation for \$2.4 billion on Feb. 1, the company announced on its website.

But although the lawsuit cites numerous instances in which BP's refinery polluted the environment, killed workers or sickened residents, the complaint focuses on the impact of the 15-day period that released toxic chemicals into the air.

"From November 10, 2011 through possibly early December 2011, BP reportedly released Sulfur Dioxide, Methyl Carapaptan, Dimethyl Disulfide and other toxic chemicals into the atmosphere," the complaint reads. "Despite that the leak had been reported, BP denied the dangerousness of the leak, or that any harm could be caused from it."

While some refinery employees sought medical treatment, air monitors picked up on increased levels of toxins and residents described smelling an unpleasant odor, BP repeatedly denied that the chemicals were in any way harmful. The 474 plaintiffs named in the lawsuit now seek compensation for their repeated exposure to the dangerous chemicals produced by the refinery.

"Plaintiffs seek remedy for the repeated exposures that have occurred as a result of the release of chemicals from the refinery, and also to send a message to BP, its officers and its Board of Directors - that the wanton poisoning of an entire community is not an acceptable business practice," the complaint reads. "In this effort, plaintiffs seek punitive damages against BP in excess of \$1 billion."

Meanwhile, BP is already defending itself in a trial over the environmental impacts of the 2010 Deepwater Horizon oil spill, which is considered the largest accidental marine oil spill in history. With the latest lawsuit against BP, the oil and gas company could be facing even greater penalties for its calamitous effect on the environment.

Will BP GMO fuel affect the water & or the beef?

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

California clean air chief to automakers: We can work together

Alisa Priddle, Detroit Free Press, April 16, 2013, 12:13 PM

California doesn't have to be the bogey man of the auto industry.

That was the gist of comments by Mary Nichols, chair of the California Air Resources Board, to thousands of engineers gathered at Cobo Center for the Society of Automotive Engineers annual World Congress.

California has long challenged the auto industry with tougher air quality and fuel economy regulations than the federal government.

That has often put organizations like CARB at odds with automakers.

But Nichols said collaboration of numerous agencies and auto companies in recent years to set new corporate average fuel economy standards has fostered more collegial relationships she hopes will continue.

"If we can collaborate, we can be successful together," Nichols said. "If we don't, the consequences can be something we don't want to talk about."

The industry may need further collaboration and partnerships to get more electric vehicles on the road.

Asked about the current struggles of electric carmaker Fisker, Nichols said it was a bold effort that did not work.

"The biggest players are going to be those with the most resources.. that can do the research and development and the marketing ... that are the ones most likely to succeed," she said.

Interesting partnerships are starting to develop between certain start-ups and more established

companies, she said.

California's cap-and-trade initiative allows companies to buy and sell of credits tied to carbon emissions. This is helping startups like Tesla which has credits because it only makes electric cars.

"They have something of value to sell to other companies," Nichols said.

CARB is implementing programs designed to meet a goal of getting 1.5 million zero-emission vehicles California's roads by 2025.

One in seven new vehicles sold in California by 2025 will be a plug-in hybrid, battery electric vehicle or fuel cell, Nichols said.

Even though 40% of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles are being sold in California, Nichols said the state was less than halfway to its goal.

Consumers have been reluctant to buy more expensive plug-ins and electric vehicles, but the variety of models and sales continue to increase.

Sales of zero emission vehicles have increased fivefold in the last 14 months, Nichols said, adding charging stations are sprouting up in her neighborhood.

California is setting emissions and economy standards for heavy-duty vehicles, pushing for biofuels and hydrogen stations, and more public charging stations.

"We do this in California, not to drive you crazy, but to address our unique air quality problem," she said. Nichols called the three-day SAE World Congress a "gathering of rock stars," and reminded her audience that California's rules put engineers to work.

Contact Alisa Priddle: 313-222-5394 or apriddle@freepress.com

<http://www.freep.com/article/20130416/BUSINESS01/304160112/automakers-california-fisker-tesla-hybrids>

California AB 8 Perea and SB 11 Pavley are urgency bills to tax the motorist \$billions to build Hydrogen stations to fill car tanks to 10,000 psi of Hydrogen, absolute insanity--VOTE NO.

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Obama administration renews aviation biofuel program

Author: Ayesha Rascoe, Thomson Reuters, April 16, 2013

The Obama administration on Monday renewed an interagency agreement that backs the development of biofuels for the aviation industry and reiterated its support for embattled federal renewable fuel targets.

U.S. Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack and Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood signed a pact extending a program that has worked with the private sector and rural communities to create an alternative to fossil fuels for aviation.

"We want to re-affirm the importance of this particular industry in this administration," Vilsack told reporters at an industry conference in Washington.

The "Farm to Fly" program aims to support annual production of 1 billion gallons of aviation biofuels by 2018.

The program will focus on evaluating various sources of renewable alternatives to jet fuel, while also developing state and local partnerships with private companies.

Federal support for biofuels has come under increased scrutiny amid complaints from livestock producers and refiners that the federal biofuels mandate has contributed to higher food prices and could threaten gasoline supplies.

Last week, lawmakers in the House of Representatives introduced legislation that would eliminate the corn-based ethanol portion of the mandate, which requires increasing amounts of renewable fuels to be blended into U.S. gasoline and diesel supplies.

The Obama administration's support for the

mandate could block attempts to curtail the targets, though, especially as most lawmakers from major grain-producing states oppose any limits on the mandate.

Vilsack encouraged the biofuel industry representatives to remain "vigilant" in support of the mandate.

"There are industries and folks who are deeply concerned about the progress that is being made, who want to show that progress down," Vilsack said. "Now, is not the time to step back, now is the time to continue moving forward."

Vilsack told reporters that the mandate was lowering, not raising, gasoline prices for consumers and creating jobs in rural communities.

Oil refiners, who want the mandate rescinded, say the targets are approaching a point where compliance would require the industry blend more ethanol into gasoline than can physically be done at the 10 percent per gallon level.

This problem is referred to as the "blend wall".

Supporters of ethanol argue the "blend wall" could be easily overcome if refiners drop their opposition to allowing gasoline with 15 percent ethanol content, or E15.

The Environmental Protection Agency has approved use of E15 in cars built since 2001, which now account for about two-thirds of U.S. passenger vehicles on the road, but gasoline station operators and oil refiners have voiced concerns that higher blends could hurt vehicle engines.

(Reporting by Ayesha Rascoe; Editing by Ros Krasny and Leslie Gevirtz)

<http://planetark.org/wen/68407>

Do you have GMO fuel in your home water supply? Does ethanol affect the beef?

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Ethanol gasoline becoming a corny issue for Florida consumers

By Frank Cerabino, Palm Beach Post, April 15, 2013

When you gas up your car, you've probably noticed that sign on the pump disclosing that as much as 10 percent of the gasoline you're buying is really ethanol.

That's because of something called the Renewable Fuel Standard, a 2005 federal clean-energy program that mandates the introduction of biofuels, mostly corn, into gasoline.

Sounds good, right? Weaning our dependence on foreign oil with domestically grown corn. Decreasing greenhouse gases with cleaner automotive fuel.

But I got my first inkling that all was not well when my lawnmower started acting up. McGee Lawn Mower Service in Boca Raton was swamped with other homeowners with the same problem.

"I'll fix a lawnmower and it will be working perfectly, then three months later it's back here," said the owner, Johnny Gavino. "The ethanol deteriorates the fuel line and the primer, and it's bad for the carburetor. You've got to run the engine dry every time you use it."

It turns out my car mechanic didn't have nice things to say about the ethanol going into my car's gas tank, either.

"My experience is that it prematurely wears out the fuel injectors and the seals," said Andrew Sarantidis at New Age Automotive in West Palm Beach. "It's

alcohol. The engines are designed for petroleum products, not alcohol."

And because ethanol has two-thirds the energy content of gasoline, it also reduces a car's fuel efficiency by about 3 to 10 percent, according to estimates in Road & Track magazine.

The ethanol program is a bonanza for corn agribusiness in America, which had benefited from \$81.7 billion in government subsidies from 1995 to 2011, and now benefits from a program that converts 37 percent of the nation's corn crop to fuel.

The effect of this artificial demand has made the corn used to feed livestock, the primary use of corn, to be more expensive. And that has pushed up the price of food.

But at least environmental groups love ethanol's clean energy benefits, right? Well, maybe not.

A 2011 study done by Friends of the Earth found that when you take into account the greenhouse gases in the conversion of corn to ethanol, traditional gasoline is cleaner.

"Despite EPA projections that corn ethanol will have less of a greenhouse gas footprint in the future based on its modeling, the facilities that are producing corn ethanol today are producing more greenhouse gas emissions than gasoline," the study concluded. "In fact, on average, the corn ethanol we produce today

contributes 36 percent more greenhouse gas emissions than gasoline.”

Since 2011, the Florida Legislature required that all gasoline sold on the wholesale market in Florida be an ethanol blend. But the state didn't prevent gasoline retailers from selling ethanol-free gas.

So it's possible to buy gas without ethanol in Florida. But it's not easy to find. The website pure-gas.org lists 385 gas stations in Florida that sell gas without ethanol. There are only five listed in Palm Beach County, and they only sell the 90-octane variety of ethanol-free gas.

One of those stations is at 874 N. Dixie Highway in Lantana.

“People would like to buy non-ethanol gas, but because of the price, they don't do it,” station owner Maksud Chowdhury said.

The non-ethanol gas at his station was selling for \$4.75 a gallon Monday, while the ethanol-containing regular gas sold for \$3.63. So it's usually just landscapers and boat owners who buy the ethanol-free gas,

he said.

The Stop 'N Shop, at 1001 W. Blue Heron Blvd., in Riviera Beach is pushing its non-ethanol gas with a \$4.35-a-gallon price and free ice. But there aren't many takers, said station manager Freddy Acevedo.

“I have about three people who use it in their cars,” he said.

The Florida Legislature is now considering whether to repeal the Florida Renewable Fuel Standard Act. It isn't the first time, but this session the repeal has already passed the House. And Gov. Rick Scott wants the repeal, because the demand for corn has cost Florida's cattle ranchers in high feed costs.

If successful, it would be a bizarre bit of timing.

The state's move away from ethanol would coincide with the completion of Florida's first ethanol-production plant, the INEOS New Planet BioBenergy Plant in Vero Beach, a project made possible by millions of dollars in state and federal grants and loan guarantees.

<http://www.palmbeachpost.com/news/news/state-regional/cerabino-ethanol-gasoline-becoming-a-corny-issue-f/nXM2p/>

“The state's move away from ethanol would coincide with the completion of Florida's first ethanol-production plant, the INEOS New Planet BioBenergy Plant in Vero Beach, a project made possible by millions of dollars in state and federal grants and loan guarantees.”

Will Mary Nichols and Governor Brown support the UN, Bill Clinton, Gary Condit, Al Gore, Pete Wilson, Gray Davis, Dianne Feinstein and the World Bank ethanol waiver?

Can CO2, ozone and pm be reduced with a GMO fuel waiver and improved PZEV performance?

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Reducing Emissions of Soot, Methane can Decrease Sea-Level Rise

By Staff Reporter, Nature World News, April 15, 2013

Cutting-down emissions of pollutants such as methane, soot, refrigerants, and gases can help in reducing sea-level rise by 2100, according to a new study.

Researchers said that reducing emissions of these short-lived pollutants could slow-down the annual rise in sea-levels by as much as 25 to 50 percent.

"To avoid potentially dangerous sea level rise, we could cut emissions of short-lived pollutants even if we cannot immediately cut carbon dioxide emissions. This new research shows that society can significantly reduce the threat to coastal cities if it moves quickly on a handful of pollutants," said Aixue Hu of the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), the first author of the study.

Like Us on Facebook

Previous research has shown that reducing levels of soot and methane in the atmosphere is a better strategy to adopt against climate change.

Sea levels are rising at a rate of 3 millimeters (0.12 inches) per year and could rise between 18 and 200 centimeters (between 7 inches and 6 feet) by the end of this century. As most of the world's major cities are located near the sea, rising sea-levels could be disastrous for many people.

In the present study, the research team from Scripps Institution for Oceanography, NCAR,

and Climate Central looked at reducing the impact of certain pollutants like methane and soot that are known to trap heat. These pollutants stay in the atmosphere for less time, but influence climate change more quickly than carbon dioxide.

"It is still not too late, by stabilizing carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere and reducing emissions of shorter-lived pollutants, to lower the rate of warming and reduce sea level rise by 30 percent. The large role of the shorter-lived pollutants is encouraging since technologies are available to drastically cut their emissions," said Veerabhadran Ramanathan of Scripps, lead author of the study, according to a news release.

The data for the study came from the NCAR-based Community Climate System Model as well as another model that simulates climate, carbon and geochemistry. Researchers also estimated the change in levels of the greenhouse gases under various social and economic scenarios.

The study showed that reducing these four pollutants by 2015 could sharply slow down sea level rise by 50 percent by the year 2050.

"It must be remembered that carbon dioxide is still the most important factor in sea level rise over the long term. But we can make a real difference in the next several decades by reducing other emissions," said Warren Washington, a co-author and an NCAR scientist.

The study is published in the journal Nature Climate Change.

<http://www.natureworldnews.com/articles/1369/20130415/reducing-emissions-soot-methane-decrease-sea-level-rise.htm>

*Can CO2, ozone and pm be reduced with a GMO fuel waiver and improved PZEV performance?
Will Mary Nichols and Governor Brown support the UN, Bill Clinton, Gary Condit, Al Gore, Pete Wilson, Gray Davis, Dianne Feinstein and the World Bank ethanol waiver?*

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Non Ethanol Gas Debated

WJHG-TV - 7, Friday 3:33 PM, April 12, 2013

Stations offering non-ethanol are few and far between, 100% gas at four of its twelve pumps. The cost: 30 cents a gallon more than regular.

A motorist says he was told it was better for his car, but he couldn't tell us why saying "Trying something different. This is my first time seeing it."

The state House wants to stop requiring the sale of ethanol blended gas.

"It is not a product that is dependable," said Rep. Charlie Stone.

"If it's not good for your body, it's not good for the engines," said Rep. Keith Perry.

Lawmakers have been whittling away at ethanol since it was first required in 2010. Ethanol enthusiasts say it will cost the state jobs because it sends the wrong message.

"It will send a message to the people that we don't care about fuel independency. Energy independency. All we care about is depending on oil companies," said Rep. Debbie Mayfield.

Lawmakers changed the law last year to allow retailers to sell both.

State records show that there are already about 350 stations across the state that is selling non ethanol gas.

We found Bobby New putting ethanol blended gas in his 1988 pickup. When asked do you have any trouble putting this blended gas in your truck, he said "No."

Even If the ethanol free bill does become law, federal requirements will supersede the state's, which means ethanol blended gas will still be plentiful.

The change is being fueled by North Florida lawmakers and boating interests. The State Senate is slated to take the legislation up next week.

<http://www.wjhg.com/news/headlines/Non-Ethanol-Gas-Debated-202753851.html>

BP GMO fuel in your home TAP water?

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

The fuel that could be the end of Ethanol

Ethanol could be on its way out this decade thanks to a discovery that makes butanol more cost-effective.

By Jennifer Abbasi, FORTUNE, April 12, 2013

FORTUNE In 2007 we reported on biobutanol, a biofuel with the potential to solve many of the problems associated with ethanol. Since then, industry players like BP have been seeking ways to make a cost-efficient transition to the "advanced biofuel," and now a scientific breakthrough might finally make that possible.

Butanol trumps ethanol in several ways: Adding ethanol to gasoline reduces fuel mileage, but butanol packs almost as much energy as gas, meaning fewer fill-ups. Butanol also doesn't damage car engines like ethanol, so more of it can be blended into gas. And because butanol doesn't separate from gasoline in the presence of water, it can be blended right at the refinery, while ethanol has to be shipped separately from gas and blended closer to the filling station.

But with 200 plants already up and running in the U.S., ethanol is firmly entrenched. Modifying those plants to produce butanol from corn instead of ethanol costs roughly \$15 million for each facility. Converting ethanol into butanol could be cheaper, theoretically, but the industry has been looking for a chemical catalyst capable of doing it efficiently. Until now, the conversion process produced too little butanol and too many unwanted products that had to be separated out. The process

was "certainly too expensive to be competitive as a fuel molecule," says Duncan Wass, a professor of chemistry at the University of Bristol in the U.K.

MORE: 8 PCs that want to bring sexy back

At the annual American Chemical Society meeting in New Orleans, Wass presented research -- funded by BP (BP) -- on a family of new catalysts that produced 95% butanol in the lab. "They hold the prospect of being able to convert ethanol to butanol in high yield, high selectivity and at large-scale," Wass says.

It will still be some time before we'll start seeing butanol produced with Wass's catalysts at the pump -- it takes several years just to design, build, and test new fuels at scale in a pilot plant. Wass estimates it will be six years to commercialization if the next steps go off without a hitch.

But at that point, won't we just be trading one food-based fuel for another, taking corn out of the mouths of babes? Says Wass, "The beauty of these catalysts is that they can use all sources of ethanol biologically derived from any crop." Corn stalks, wood, leaves, and switch grass are all being studied as sources of non-food biofuel.

<http://tech.fortune.cnn.com/2013/04/12/the-fuel-that-could-be-the-end-of-ethanol/>

BP GMO fuel in your home TAP water?

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Aston Martin Hybrid Hydrogen Rapide S to compete in 24 Hours of Nürburgring

By Stephen Edelstein, Digital Trends, April 12, 2013

An Aston Martin Rapide S will race in this year's 24 Hours of Nürburgring. That isn't too surprising, given that the Rapide S packs a 6.0-liter V12 and is based on Aston's racy DB9.

What is surprising is that this Rapide S will also be partially powered by hydrogen.

Actually, the Hybrid Hydrogen Rapide S, as Aston is calling it, can run on hydrogen, gasoline, or a combination of the two. Under the hood is the same V12 that powers the stock Rapide S, but with twin turbochargers.

Feeding those 12 cylinders is a constantly variable fuel mixture. Aston's goal is to complete at least one lap of the Nürburgring on pure hydrogen, but gasoline will probably be doing most of the work.

The hydrogen will be stored in four carbon fiber tanks. Two will be placed next to the driver, and two will be in the trunk. Aston Martin says the Hybrid Hydrogen Rapide S will be "the first hydrogen-powered car to compete in an international event as well as the first zero CO2 emissions sports car to complete a race pace lap at the Nürburgring 24-hour race."

Aston hasn't released any performance statistics for the Hybrid Hydrogen Rapide S. The standard Rapide S has 550 horsepower and 457 pound-feet of torque. It will do 0 to 60 mph in 4.7 seconds and reach a top speed

of 190 mph.

As a maker of very traditional V12-powered sports cars, Aston Martin doesn't seem like the kind of carmaker that would dabble in green tech. However, with emissions and fuel economy regulations getting stricter, the Hybrid Hydrogen Rapide S makes a lot of sense.

So far, the laughably cynical Toyota iQ-based Cygnet has been Aston's only response to emissions regulations. Eventually, it will have to follow the lead of Ferrari, McLaren, and Porsche, and think of something else.

Those three have bet their chips on battery-electric hybrids, but what if Aston decided to develop a hydrogen production car instead?

Fuel availability would obviously be an issue, but if enough early adopters (or people rich enough to buy their own hydrogen) signed on, who knows what could happen.

Aston could even adopt the Hybrid Hydrogen Rapide S' switchable fuel system for production, potentially lessening range anxiety.

Either way, the resulting car would be exactly an Aston Martin in every way that matters, but with an engine that burns hydrogen instead of gasoline. Talk about the best of both worlds.

<http://www.digitaltrends.com/cars/its-a-gas-aston-martin-hybrid-hydrogen-rapide-s-to-compete-in-24-hours-of-nurburgring/>

California AB 8 and SB 11 Pavley are urgency bills to tax the motorist \$billions to build Hydrogen stations to fill car tanks to 10,000 psi of Hydrogen, absolute insanity--VOTE NO.

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Diverse Coalition Calls for Ethanol Policy Reform

by Marlo Lewis, Global Warming, April 12, 2013

On Wednesday, Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.) introduced H.R. 1461, a bill to repeal the renewable fuel standard (RFS) program, and H.R. 1462, "The RFS Reform Act," a bill to eliminate the corn ethanol component of the RFS program, cap the amount of ethanol that can be blended into conventional gasoline at 10%, and require the EPA to set cellulosic ethanol blending targets at commercial production levels.

A diverse coalition of agriculture, business, environment, hunger, taxpayer, and free-market groups joined Rep. Goodlatte and co-sponsors at a press conference announcing the introduction of H.R. 1462. Spokesperson for 15 of the groups each provided a paragraph explaining their particular reasons for supporting RFS reform in a joint letter. Here's what I wrote on behalf of the Competitive Enterprise Institute:

If ethanol is such a great deal, why do we need a law to make us buy it? Although ethanol is cheaper than gasoline by volume, ethanol has about one-third less energy than gasoline and does not make up the difference in price. Consequently, the higher the ethanol blend, the worse mileage your car gets, and the more you have to spend for fuel. For example, at today's prices, the average motorist would have to spend an extra \$400 to \$650 a year to switch from gasoline to E85 (the highest commercial ethanol blend). Congress should stop forcing Americans to make a "fuel choice" that increases our pain at the pump.

<http://www.globalwarming.org/2013/04/12/diverse-coalition-calls-for-ethanol-policy-reform/>

Can CO₂, ozone and pm be reduced with a GMO fuel waiver? Will Mary Nichols and Governor Brown support the UN, Bill Clinton, Al Gore, Pete Wilson, Gray Davis, and World Bank position?

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Bill due to remove corn ethanol from RFS

By Nick Snow, OGJ Washington Editor, April 11, 2013

Bipartisan legislation will be introduced to remove corn-based ethanol from the federal Renewable Fuels Standard in 2014, a group of US House members announced on Apr. 10.

Goodlatte said prospects for passage of the bill are good because bipartisan support is growing, along with the number of organizations that support it. More than 40 groups back the legislation, he said.

"The RFS Reform Act will eliminate corn-based ethanol requirements, cap the amount of ethanol that can be blended into conventional gasoline at 10%, and require the [US Environmental Protection Agency] to set cellulosic biofuels levels at production levels," said Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.), the bill's primary sponsor.

Four more House members spoke in favor of the bill at an Apr. 10 press conference near the US Capitol. The American Petroleum Institute and American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers welcomed the proposal.

"Renewable fuels play an important role in our energy policy but should compete fairly in the marketplace," he continued. "This legislation will bring the fundamental reform this unworkable federal policy needs now."

"Ethanol and other renewable fuels have an important role to play in our transportation fuel mix and will continue to be used after Congress repeals the mandate," API Pres. Jack N. Gerard said. "But we cannot allow a mandate for ethanol that exceeds what is safe and that could put upward pressure on fuel prices."

The bill would be in addition to legislation Goodlatte plans to introduce which would eliminate the RFS entirely, he noted.

AFPM Pres. Charles T. Drevna said the RFS elimination bill "recognizes that betting on the RFS to work is like betting against reality: Eventually, you lose."

Declaring the RFS "is not working," Rep. Jim Costa (D-Calif.) said, "We can't afford to keep putting food in our fuel tanks. It's no longer just about agriculture or energy. It's about putting food on our families' tables."

Drevna said, "The RFS was founded upon baseless assumptions and now, 8 years later, the reality is that there is no fix for this broken program, which is why AFPM fully supports the elimination legislation."

Bill's prospects

Contact Nick Snow at nicks@pennwell.com.

<http://www.ogj.com/articles/2013/04/bill-due-to-remove-corn-ethanol-from-rfs.html>

Can CO2, ozone and pm be reduced with a GMO fuel waiver? Will Mary Nichols and Governor Brown support the UN, Bill Clinton, Al Gore, Pete Wilson, Gray Davis and World Bank position?

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Emissions checkpoints came to Lamont, state collects data while informing drivers Bureau of Automotive Repair testing emissions



Joe Henke | Email Me, Video, 04/11/2013

LAMONT, Calif. - When the California Highway Patrol tells you to pull over, you might become worried. But for drivers in Lamont today - there was no need to be alarmed by the roadside checkpoint near Main St. and Panorama Rd.

"This is a non-enforcement stop. We don't effect their Department of Motor Vehicles registration or their driver's license in any way," said John Opjorden.

CHP was working with Opjorden and his crew from the California Bureau of Automotive Repair today for a roadside emission survey. On Wednesday the same crew was working in Bakersfield.

BAR has four crews that travel throughout California going zip code to zip code for these tests.

CHP directs cars to pull over and then BAR enters license plate numbers into a state computer. If the vehicle is randomly selected by the computer to be tested the driver can then either opt in or out.

These voluntary 10 minute inspections simulate road conditions as emission data is collected, which helps the state evaluate the emissions reduction program while drivers get a printed handout of some maintenance issues they might want to have checked out.

After the test - Opjorden goes over the emissions and maintenance printout with the drivers.

Drivers are also informed of available funds through consumer affairs for vehicle retirement, repair assistance and smog checks.

Through the Department of Consumer Affairs, which oversees the Bureau of Automotive Repair - drivers might be eligible for that funding.

If your vehicle qualifies for vehicle retirement you might receive \$1,000 to \$1,500. If you fail a smog check and need repairs, you might be able to receive \$500.

For more information on that process, visit <http://www.autorepair.ca.gov> or call 1-800-952-5210.

Copyright 2013 Scripps Media, Inc. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

<http://www.turnto23.com/news/local-news/special-checkpoints-being-set-up-throughout-bakersfield>

Can CO2, ozone and pm be reduced with a secret shopper audit by Senate Rules, CARB, Sierra Research or the Referee? Will Mary Nichols and Governor Brown support improved PZEV performance?

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

↓ ↓

California AB 8 and SB 11 Pavley are urgency bills to tax the motorist \$billions to build Hydrogen stations to fill car tanks to 10,000 psi of Hydrogen, absolute insanity--VOTE NO.

Sarah Palin Attacks American Car Companies, Calls Them 'Losers'

By Michael Allen, Sun, April 07, 2013

Former half-term Alaska Governor Sarah Palin, who often attacks Democrats for hurting small businesses, slammed American automakers Tesla Motors and Fisker Automotive for being "losers" on her Facebook page.

Palin attacked Fisker Automotive for laying off 75 percent of its employees last Friday, reports the Los Angeles Times.

Palin also accused the Obama administration of supposedly attempting "to pick 'winners and losers' in the free market," but did not mention that for decades the federal government has made loans to businesses.

She showed additional contempt for hybrid electric cars by slamming General Motors' Volt, which tripled its sales in 2012, per CNN.com.

"This losing tax-subsidized venture joins other past losers like the Obama-subsidized Volt that

gets 40 miles per battery charge, or like the Obama-subsidized Tesla that turns into a 'brick' when the battery completely discharges and then costs \$40,000 to repair," Palin angrily wrote on Facebook.

"This is really just the latest manifestation of the administration's crony capitalism as their green energy buddies benefit from this atrocious waste of taxpayer money. Americans really need to get outraged by these wasteful ventures. As we've seen time and time again, We the People are always stuck subsidizing the left's 'losers.'"

Fisker Automotive and Tesla Motors both received a \$465 million loan from the Department of Energy.

Palin did not mention that "loser" Tesla Motors is going to repay its loan five years earlier than required because of the success of its electric Model S Sedan, as noted Bloomberg.com.

<http://www.opposingviews.com/i/money/jobs-and-careers/sarah-palin-attacks-american-car-companies-calls-them-losers?>

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Obama Apologizes for Praising Attorney General's Looks

By *MICHAEL D. SHEAR, New York Times, April 5, 2013*

WASHINGTON — President Obama late Thursday night called Kamala Harris, the California attorney general, and apologized to her for

telling a group of wealthy donors that she is the “best-looking attorney general in the country.”



There was a quick reaction on social media sites, with some people accusing Mr. Obama of being sexist

and others defending his comment as harmless.

But the president's aides apparently knew the potential for political damage. Soon after Air Force One returned Mr. Obama from his West Coast fund-raising trip, he called Ms. Harris and apologized, according to Jay Carney, the White House press secretary.

"You know, they are old friends and good friends," Mr. Carney said, "and he did not want in any way to diminish the attorney general's professional accomplishments and her capabilities."

Mr. Carney repeatedly remarked on Ms. Harris's abilities, calling her "a remarkably effective leader as attorney general" and "an excellent attorney general" who has "done great work." The president, Mr. Carney said, "fully recognizes the challenge women continue to face in the workplace and that they should not be judged based on appearance."

A spokesman for Ms. Harris, Gil Duran, said in a statement on Friday: "The attorney general and the president have been friends for many years. They had a great conversation yesterday, and she strongly supports him."

While Ms. Harris did not seem offended, others were on her behalf. Robin Abcarian wrote on the Web site of The Los Angeles Times that the comment was "more wolfish than sexist," and "may be a little problem he needs to work on."

Joan Walsh wrote on Salon that "my stomach turned over" when she heard about the comment. "Those of us who've fought to make sure that women are seen as more than ornamental — and that includes the president — should know better than to rely on flattering the looks of someone as formidable as Harris," she said.

Ms. Harris, 48, was elected to the statewide office in 2010 after serving two terms as district attorney of San Francisco. She is the first woman to hold the post and the first with African-American and South Asian heritage. Her name has come up as a possible candidate for governor, or even for the United States Supreme Court if a seat is vacated during Mr. Obama's second term. She has been an ally of the president's, speaking at the Democratic National Convention that renominated him last year.

A version of this article appeared in print on April 6, 2013, on page A10 of the New York edition with the headline: Obama Apologizes for Praising Attorney General's Looks.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/06/us/politics/obama-apologizes-for-praising-female-officials-looks.html?>

Will GMO fuel affect the water & or the beef?

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Air board cuts own power as part of deal with oil industry

Anne C. Mulkern and Debra Kahn, Greenwire, February 14, 2013

One of California's most powerful environmental agencies has agreed to undermine its own authority in a political deal cut with the oil industry.

The California Air Resources Board helped insert language into Assembly and Senate bills that would bar the agency from enforcing one of its rules.

If the legislation passes, CARB for a decade will be unable to implement its Clean Fuels Outlet, a measure aimed at providing fill-up stations for green vehicles. In exchange, oil companies are supporting provisions that advance cleaner cars and trucks and provide state funding for hydrogen vehicle refueling locations.

Backers of the arrangement say it helps the state. Many green groups support it, even while lamenting that CARB squashed its own rule.

"It's rare that the regulated, the regulators and the environmental and public health community can all agree on something," state Sen. Fran Pavley (D), sponsor of the Senate bill, said in an email. "That's why I believe this bill will attract broad bipartisan support."

But others warned the deal sets a precedent that imperils a suite of state climate and clean energy policies.

In 2010, the oil industry funded an attempt to kill the state's climate law, A.B. 32. The bid failed, but petroleum interests now are trying to weaken that mandate and other green rules, said Kathryn Phillips, executive director of Sierra Club California.

"I see them going after individual regulations bit by bit," Phillips said, adding that it's "like being nibbled to death by ducks."

"This will not be the first or last time the oil industry will go to the Legislature," she added.

The language blocking CARB's authority came at the behest of oil trade group Western States Petroleum Association, according to those familiar with the legislative negotiations. WSPA member companies include BP PLC, ConocoPhillips Co., Exxon Mobil Corp. and Royal Dutch Shell PLC.

WSPA wouldn't agree to an interview about the pact. In a statement from its president, Catherine Reheis-Boyd, the trade group said it supported the legislation, S.B. 11 and A.B. 8.

The bills "assist in the development of hydrogen fueling infrastructure, in lieu of regulatory action," Reheis-Boyd said. "This approach to the development of the state's hydrogen fueling infrastructure will provide the necessary signal to the hydrogen vehicle and fuel market that California is committed to the development of this technology."

The deal comes as the oil industry challenges other California environmental rules. An appeals court decision is pending in a case where American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers charged that the state's low-carbon fuel standard discriminates against out-of-state fuels. That regulation seeks to increase the market share of gasoline and diesel alternatives.

The California Chamber of Commerce, meanwhile, has filed a lawsuit contesting the state's authority to auction off emission permits as part of its carbon cap-and-trade system. Chevron and Shell executives have seats on the CalChamber's board of directors.

Heading off legal challenge?

The Clean Fuels Outlet has existed for two decades but has mostly idled. CARB in January 2012 amended it to push for expansion of hydrogen vehicle stations. Oil refiners and importers would have to help fund

hydrogen fueling stations once any region had at least 10,000 related cars.

CARB missed the deadline to file that update with the state's Office of Administrative Law, which makes regulations final. But the air board has resuscitated the measure, and it could go back into effect if the legislation fails.

Oil companies dislike the regulation, and many believed the industry would sue to overturn it.

"A legal challenge was pretty imminent," said Nidia Bautista, policy director at the Coalition for Clean Air, a statewide nonprofit advocacy group. "Certainly any legal challenge in regards to that would have potentially delayed implementation" of the Clean Fuels Outlet.

Environmental groups did not want the Clean Fuels Outlet stalled.

"It's important to have fueling stations available in the next few years," said Simon Mui, director of California vehicles and fuels at the Natural Resources Defense Council. Businesses building those cars need the assurance the market will grow, he said.

"This was [CARB's] attempt to get some certainty out of what was obviously a politically and legally charged attack by the oil industry," Mui said.

Oil companies "might well have sued," CARB spokesman Dave Clegern said. But, he added, the board agreed to the bill language "because we want to move forward as expeditiously as possible" on the hydrogen stations.

The state's desire to shrink climate pollution to 1990 levels by 2020 requires a swift transition to low-carbon fuels, he said.

The legislation provides \$20 million annually in funding for hydrogen stations through 2016 and up to \$20 million in subsequent years until there are at least 100 publicly available stations.

"What we're trying to accomplish is to make sure we can reach the goals of A.B. 32," Clegern said. "The greenhouse gas emission reductions are what we are after, and we believe this will give it to us and the state of California, and that's our only priority on this particular case."

Pavley, the Senate bill's sponsor, said in an email there was consensus "that the Clean Fuels Outlet regulatory approach is not the best fit for the policy objective we're trying to achieve -- commercializing zero emission vehicles to meet near and long term air pollution requirements."

But others said if the regulation didn't work, it should have been fixed outside the Legislature.

"The Legislature does legislation to set policy. CARB implements policy through their regulations. There's a bit of a dividing line there," said Adrienne Alvord, California and Western states director at the Union of Concerned Scientists. This move "invites micromanaging of the regulatory process through the Legislature. We think that's a bad precedent."

Deal first struck last year

The agreement between CARB and WSPA originated in legislation that failed last year, S.B. 1455 from then-Sen. Christine Kehoe (D).

The bill originally aimed to increase the portion of alternative fuels used in the state. But it became obvious that bill would die on the Senate floor, said John Boesel, president and CEO of Calstart, a nonprofit that seeks to expand the green transportation industry. It was a sponsor of Kehoe's legislation.

Kehoe asked for a meeting, Boesel said, with the major players in the

debate: Calstart, the California Natural Gas Vehicle Coalition, CARB and WSPA. The goal was to see what could be salvaged.

In those talks, Calstart said it wanted to see extended the Carl Moyer and A.B. 118 clean vehicle incentive programs, which are due to expire in 2015-16. Those measures issue grants for truck engine retrofits, electric vehicle charging stations and other technologies that reduce air pollution. The awards are funded by fees the state levies on vehicle registrations and tire purchases.

"The oil industry said we're open to discussing that, but we don't really like this one regulation here that would mandate that we build and operate these hydrogen stations," Boesel said.

WSPA asked for relief from the regulation in exchange for supporting a measure that extended the incentive programs. The legislation also included state funding for hydrogen stations.

Calstart, Boesel said, "didn't necessarily want to see Clean Fuels Outlet substituted" but believed there was a "net-net" positive outcome if the bill passed and there was "greater certainty hydrogen stations will get built."

"The oil industry has been battling CARB for decades, and they have often sought to go through the Legislature to achieve their objectives," Boesel said. "This is a rare instance where CARB was willing to negotiate a deal that they felt would work for them and was also acceptable to the oil industry."

Because S.B. 1455 would have assessed fees on residents, under state law it needed a two-thirds majority in both chambers. It passed the Assembly but failed in the Senate by two votes.

Pavley, along with fellow S.B. 11 sponsor Sen. Michael Rubio (D) and A.B. 8 sponsors Henry Perea (D) and Nancy Skinner (D), picked up the bulk

of S.B. 1455 as their current measures. The current bills also need two-thirds majority for passage.

Precedent-setting?

Those for and against the measure disagreed about whether it's risky. Clegern with CARB said the bill doesn't signal the air board's deference to legislators.

"There is no precedent that they're not doing it without our input," he said of lawmakers. "We are not ceding any regulatory authority. This is simply a practical collaborative effort with stakeholders and legislators."

Bautista with the Coalition for Clean Air said the oil industry has pressed the Legislature hard before and would do so in the future, regardless of whether it had achieved this deal.

"They'll keep trying whatever they can try on all kinds of fronts," Bautista said. "I don't think this effort in particular supports or stops" it.

But two environmental groups saw the bargain as problematic.

"We just don't agree that it's the Legislature's role to change a legally standing regulation," said Alvord with the Union of Concerned Scientists. The Clean Fuels Outlet, she said, was a "legally vetted, scoped, passed regulation by CARB. The legislation basically tells CARB it can't enforce its own regulation."

Union of Concerned Scientists hasn't taken a position on the bills because it supports extension of the incentive programs.

Phillips with Sierra Club California said it could hurt public confidence in the rulemaking process.

"It suggests to the general public that the amount of time they put into something is sort of easily and willfully going to be gutted by CARB if the right deal comes along with a regulated entity," she said.

Read My Lips, Henry Perea: No New Car Taxes

By Arthur Christopher Schaper, Elk Grove Patch, 2/Jan/13

Assemblyman Henry Perea (D-Fresno) wants to renew Assembly Bill 8 for passage, a piece of legislation which narrowly failed the last time Sacramento politicians considered it. Now Perea is attempting to push the same bill again, one which contains little good, but a lot of bad: another tax increase on California voters. Normally, the number "8" signals new beginnings, but in this case, Assembly Bill 8 is just the same old "Sacramento Shuffle" of bringing forth a bill that looks good on the outside, but on the inside hides a nasty set of higher taxes waiting to be sprung upon us.

This report follows from a column just published by Jon Coupal, the president of Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, who has just "outed" the Central Valley lawmaker's legislation, which is mixed with little good and mostly bad.

The good parts:

AB 8 would remove some of the most outlandish and counterproductive regulations on the diesel trucking industry.

The Diesel trucks that move our goods from "ship to shop" are critical to our state's economy. Would it not be more effective if Assemblyman Perea enacted legislation that would end California's captious "Cap and Trade" program? Electricity rates are going up all over the state, and the same legislation has fueled the massive movement of businesses out of the state.

Now the bad parts (as if the previous

element was any good at all):

The bill would increase or extend \$2.3 billion of fees on car owners until 2023. These include smog abatement fees, air quality management district fees, vehicle and boat registration fees and new tire fees. Cumulatively, the impact to citizen taxpayers will be at least \$20 per vehicle annually.

The legislature already held a gun to voter that if they did not get more money, then Sacramento would have to enact steeper cuts. Thus were the voters coerced into passing Proposition 30, which raised income taxes on the "wealthiest among us" and a sales tax, too. Already Sacramento legislators are turving these monies toward shoring up the lagging and damning pension obligations weighing on this state. Sacramento politicians have no right nor business asking, or rather demanding, more money from the drivers of automobiles or the drivers of the state's economy. I already pay more money just to change my tires, including environmental disposal fees. Assemblyman Perea should start driving me to work if he wants to make the privilege of driving a car so expensive.

As if Perea has so easily forgotten, State Senator Ted Lieu (D-Torrance) already backed away from tripling the state's car tax, most likely because his own wife took him to task for suggesting the outlandish increase. In order to get more perspective on how crippling this tax already is, consider the following. My father owns a large pick-up truck, big and black and bulky. He also pays a hefty car tax: \$500 per year. With Lieu's projected increase,

he would have had to pay \$1,500. He receives an adequate pension after putting in twenty-six admirable years for the Torrance Water Department. He played by the rules. He paid all his taxes. He does not deserve to be punished with paying more taxes just because Sacramento lawmakers refuse to balance their books.

My father, like a growing number of Californians, is leaving the state because of the high taxes and outrageous regulations. His new home: Oregon, where he will pay a paltry \$85 car tax, which will cover him for two years. Does Perea really believe that raising taxes will raise revenues? In reality, raising taxes is leading residents to raise their stakes and move out.

Assemblyman Perea and his Democratic colleagues are responsible for this rising exodus of California residents. Don't they care enough about their jobs that they want someone to stay residing in the state of California? Even liberal-progressives who insist on expanding the government ought to realize that more government means fewer residents means less to manage.

I wonder if Assemblyman even drives a car. Perhaps he should give up his state-

<http://www.asmdc.org/members/a31/>

Sacramento Office: (916) 319-2031

Fresno Office: (559) 445-5532

http://elkgrove.patch.com/blog_posts/read-my-lips-henry-perea-no-new-car-taxes# =

California AB 8 Perea and SB 11 Pavley are urgency bills to tax the motorist \$billions to build Hydrogen stations to fill car tanks to 10,000 psi of Hydrogen, absolute insanity--VOTE NO.

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

bought wheels before he starts rolling over us with more taxes. He probably does own a car, a vehicle which taxpayers are already paying for. A number of legislators were even exposed for getting expensive detail jobs on state-owned cars before purchasing them.

Nothing less than fiscal prudence and limiting government spending must be in order in our state capital. No one should assume that Governor Brown has solved this state's budget woes, nor should any lawmaker take away from his sometime good news that the state legislature can now return to its spend-thrift ways. If legislators in ultra-liberal Massachusetts have already discussed raising the voting threshold for raising taxes while cutting other levies, then California legislators are all the more without excuse for their tandem train-wreck of tax measures, including the no longer hidden Assembly Bill 8.

Whether you are a homemaker or a homeowner, do not let Assemblyman Perea feel at home raising your taxes. Call Assemblyman Perea and tell him in no uncertain terms:

Read My Lips, Henry Perea: No New Car Taxes!

Iowa livestock producer claims operation lost due to GMO corn

Brett Wessler, Staff Writer, AgProfessional, December 4, 2012

An Iowa man raising cattle and hogs told the Food Nation Radio Network he was forced to quit farming when GMO corn made his animals sterile.

In an interview with Michael Serio, Iowa farmer Jerry Rosman said he lost his family farm due the corn he was feeding his livestock.

Rosman said he used hybrids in the past and started to use GMO corn in feed in 1997 without any trouble, but things changed in 2000 when he switched to a different company's genetics with a new genetically modified trait.

Starting in 2000, most of Rosman's animal were unable to reproduce with a low sperm count in males and females showing false pregnancies. The pigs that were reproducing had smaller litters. By adjusting the type of corn used, Rosman concluded the corn with the genetically modified trait he started using in 2000 was causing the problem. Continued losses and his shrinking herd forced him to close his farm two years later.

A 2006 publication from the International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-Biotech Applications (ISAAA)

For more information regarding genetically modified corn, read John Maday's article: Scientists call for retraction of GM corn paper.

<http://www.agprofessional.com/news/181872191.html?cmid=118295025&submitted=y#a118295025>

reports at least 65 million metric tons of GM corn grains are used in livestock diets annually and extensive testing and a long approval process accompany every GM crop introduction.

The resource explains safety concerns on the use of GM crops as feed ingredients involve three questions:

- * Are GM crops safe as feeds for livestock?
- * Is animal performance affected by GM crops?
- * Could transgenic materials be transferred to and accumulate in milk, meat, and eggs?

"Feeding trials have been conducted to examine the safety and efficacy of GM feeds for farm livestock. Based on these studies, there is no evidence of significantly altered nutritional composition, deleterious effects, or the occurrence of transgenic DNA or protein in animal products derived from animals fed with GM feed ingredients."

Additionally, a study by University of Nebraska researchers found no difference between cattle grazing genetically enhanced corn hybrids and their non-genetically enhanced parent hybrid.

Water groups oppose ethanol as MTBE replacement

National Trade Publications, Secure.gvmg, April 17, 2002

WASHINGTON — Replacing methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE) with the fuel additive ethanol could result in further water contamination and higher gas prices, three water organizations told Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle this week.

The Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA), Sacramento; American Water Works Association (AWWA), Denver; and the Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies (AMWA), Washington, said in a letter to Daschle, D-SD, that they support ending the use of MTBE.

MTBE is a fuel oxygenator that purportedly helps clean emissions from vehicles, but is found to be a groundwater pollutant and health risk. Ethanol is often talked about as its replacement.

But "replacing MTBE with ethanol runs the serious risk of repeating costly environmental mistakes," the letter said, without evidence that it benefits clean air and without evidence there are no health risks associated with it.

"Putting ethanol on gasoline, at any levels, would almost certainly result in higher prices at the pump and new instances of possible water contamination," the letter stated.

ACWA, AWWA and AMWA also oppose language in the Energy Policy Act of 2002's ethanol provision that features the creation of a "renewable fuels safe

harbor," that the groups claim gives liability protection to ethanol marketers.

The groups cited a 1999 study by the University of California that concluded the state could meet its clean air goals without oxygenated fuel.

Copies of the groups' letter were sent to US senators Dianne Feinstein, D-CA, and Barbara Boxer, D-CA, who also oppose the use of MTBE.

In October 2000, Feinstein introduced five bills to deal with MTBE, and on 11 April, Boxer said in a statement on her website that she would offer an amendment to hold ethanol producers responsible for any future damage to the environment or any threat to public health.

Boxer said she would also introduce a second amendment to encourage the use of ethanol produced from agricultural biomass, such as rice straw and sugarcane residue, as an alternative to corn-based ethanol. That approach, she said, would help prevent supply disruptions that can translate into unfair gas prices for consumers.

California once intended to stop using MTBE next year, but last month, concerned about possible increased gas prices at the pump caused by ethanol, Gov. Gray Davis postponed the MTBE ban, giving refineries up to an additional 12 months for the transition from MTBE to ethanol.

https://secure.gvmg.com/watertechonline/newsprint.asp?print=1&mode=4&N_ID=30919

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

EPA: Lodi bakery cited for ethanol emissions

The Sacramento Bee, The Associated Press, June 28, 2012

LODI, Calif. -- The Environmental Protection Agency says a San Joaquin Valley bakery was emitting more than just good odors during the bread baking process.

Cottage Bakery in Lodi has been cited for allegedly releasing ozone-producing ethanol as well. The EPA says the commercial bakery failed to obtain permits for new ovens and install air pollution controls.

The bakery must pay a \$625,000 penalty as part of a settlement filed in federal court this week. The settlement still requires the court's approval.

Cottage Bakery's parent company, Ralcorp Frozen Bakery Products, Inc., says the violations occurred before it acquired the bakery, and it has since invested more than \$1.4 million to ensure the bakery is in compliance with environmental regulations.

<http://www.sacbee.com/2012/06/28/4596854/epa-lodi-bakery-cited-for-ethanol.html>

NO on CA / AB 523 & SB 1396 unless the ethanol mandate is changed to voluntary.

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters



Clean Air Performance Professionals

Sunday, October 15, 2006

VOTE **NO** on Prop. **87**

The \$0.51 per gal. corporate welfare to the oil refiners for adding 5.6% ethanol to California gas is about \$500,000,000.00 per year

The ethanol may add over \$1.00 per gal. to the gas profit in California.

That may be about \$100 billion in oil profit from California motorists.

The science is interesting but so is the money.

A \$4 billion Prop. 87 oil tax may add \$40 billion in oil profit.


Charlie Peters

Clean Air Performance Professionals

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters



Barack Hussein Obama, Jr.

Lawyer, U.S. President, U.S. Representative

August 04, 1961 (Age: 50)

Punahou Academy, Occidental College, Columbia University,
Harvard Law School
Honolulu, Hawaii

Former Illinois Senator Barack Obama is the 44th and current president of the United States. Inaugurated on January 27, 2009, he is the first African-American to serve as U.S. president.

202.456.1111 / 2461 fax

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

An Ethanol Spring

There's bipartisan progress to change an impossible mandate.

Wall Street Journal, April 16, 2013, 7:21 p.m. ET

When Churchill said Americans do the right thing after exhausting all the other options, he was unacquainted with modern Washington. But every now and again that maxim turns out to be true, and so it may be this year with ethanol.

A growing right-left bicoastal coalition is loosening the ethanol lobby's thrall over U.S. politics, and now it may succeed in introducing some rationality to the renewable fuels mandate that passed amid the George W. Bush energy panic in 2007.

Back then everyone assumed domestic gasoline demand would rise to almost 150 billion gallons in 2012 and 155 billion this year. The irony is that 2007 marked the peak of U.S. demand. Last year the country used merely 89% of that projection, and 2013 will probably come in at 80%, or 124 billion gallons. The decline is due mainly to slow economic growth and better fuel economy.

But the 2007 mandate still requires that certain volumes of ethanol be blended into the gas supply each year, with the amount rising over time, which means that more gallons of ethanol are chasing fewer gallons of gas. These quotas will soon force the

ethanol to gas ratio to blow past 10%.

Exceeding this per gallon limit harms consumers, who are forced to buy more of product that is less energy efficient yet is also more expensive. Every one-cent increase at the pump steals about \$1 billion from the larger economy that consumers would have otherwise saved or spent on something else. Ethanol mixtures above 10% are also unsafe, damaging engines and exhaust systems in older cars and trucks, as well as everything from boats to wood chippers and well pumps.

The Ethanol Promotion Agency—er, the Environmental Protection Agency—could have modified this year's ethanol quotas to reflect market conditions, but it didn't. That decision defies a D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals ruling this January vacating part of the 2012 mandate, so reformers in Congress are now moving to intervene.

This month Democrats Jim Costa of California and Peter Welch of Vermont and Republicans Bob Goodlatte of Virginia and Steve Womack of Arkansas introduced a bill that would eliminate the specific volume mandates and simply cap ethanol at 10% a

gallon. The mandate would then float with gas consumption—still a genuflection to the farm belt but far better than the status quo.

Their proposal would also declare that ethanol is ethanol, regardless of type, erasing the EPA's artificial mandate distinctions for corn ethanol, cellulosic ethanol, biodiesel and more. Most of these fuels are not commercially available and may never exist.

Over in the Senate, Energy and Natural Resources Chairman Ron Wyden—an ethanol supporter—conceded last week at a Georgetown conference that "I'm not convinced that the current requirements are achievable" and said his panel would spend "a lot of time" rethinking renewable fuels.

Other reasons for optimism? We count ourselves students of Bob Dinneen, the Renewable Fuels Association lobby president whose rhetorical stridency tends to be inversely proportional to his political prospects. Mr. Dinneen has recently accused ethanol opponents of "living in a fantasy parallel universe" and attacked the House bill as "backwards, silly, circular logic." He's worried it could pass.

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324485004578426862270946762.html>

Will BP GMO fuel affect the water & or the beef?

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters