

Jerry Brown slams climate skeptics as 'troglodytes' at Vatican conference

By Nick Gass, Politico, Tuesday, July 21, 2015

Deniers of climate change are spending “billions on trying to keep from office people such as yourselves and elect troglodytes and other deniers of the obvious science,” the Democratic governor said, according to the AP.

Brown, whose state has set the most stringent regulations on greenhouse gas emissions in North America, blasted climate deniers for their “fierce opposition and blind inertia” and their attempts to “falsify the scientific record” to persuade scientists, politicians and the American people that global warming does not exist.

The governor, who spent roughly four years in a Jesuit seminary in the late 1950s, reportedly told the mayors in attendance that they should be vigilant and active in opposing those who deny the existence of climate change caused by humans.

A declaration set to be signed by some five dozen mayors in attendance seen by the AP proclaims that “human-induced climate change is a scientific reality and its effective control is a moral imperative for humanity.”

It's not the first time Brown has hurled the “troglodyte” insult at political opponents.

In March, for example, he ripped the positions of Republican governors and attorneys general challenging President Barack Obama's immigration executive actions as “at best troglodyte, and at worst, un-Christian.”

Speaking at a climate change conference in Toronto earlier this month, Brown said that “[w]e have a lot of troglodytes south of the border.

<http://www.politico.com/story/2015/07/jerry-brown-slams-climate-change-skeptics-troglodytes-120399.html>

* ***Do you want \$2 Gasoline at the pump?***

* ***Do you want clean air and water?***

Ethanol waiver and elimination of E-85 flex fuel credit can cut our ozone & CO2 transportation pollution over 50%

Let's improve performance of CA Climate change law AB 32 (Pavley) in 2015 for future generations

Gov. Brown Says World Has Reached ‘Tipping Point’ On Global Warming At Vatican Climate Summit

CBS/AP / July 21, 2015 7:49 AM

SAN FRANCISCO (CBS/AP) — At a climate summit at the Vatican, Gov. Jerry Brown said the world may have reached a tipping point on global warming and that humanity must reverse course or face extinction.

Brown addressed mayors and other government officials from around the world, issuing criticism of Republican politicians and business interests skeptical of climate change.

“We have very powerful opposition that, in at least my country, spends billions on trying to keep from office people such as yourselves and elect troglodytes and other deniers of the obvious science,” Brown told the conference according to the Los Angeles Times.

Brown is at the Vatican amid stepped up efforts to bring support for policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The summit was called by Pope Francis following the recent release of his encyclical on climate change.

Brown has made climate change a central theme of his governorship, promoting a plan to set a carbon reduction benchmark in North America. The plan would increase statewide renewable electricity use to 50 percent and have drivers use half as much gasoline, among other changes.

© Copyright 2015 The Associated Press. All Rights Reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed.

<http://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2015/07/21/gov-brown-says-world-has-reached-tipping-point-on-global-warming-at-vatican-climate-summit/>

***Ethanol waiver and elimination of E-85 flex fuel credit can
cut our ozone & CO2 transportation pollution over 50%***

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

California, Hawaii Lead Way on Climate Change Targets

By Rich Ehsen, Lexis Nexis, July 17, 2015

Prodded by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and led by California and Hawaii, states are tackling climate change and promoting renewable energy. But the fossil fuel industry and skeptical Republicans are pushing back.

Hawaii last month became the first state to establish a goal of relying 100 percent on renewable energy, setting 2045 as the year to reach this ambitious target. Meanwhile, legislation moved forward in California that would significantly expand its pioneering efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and combat climate change. The Golden State has an economy larger than all but six nations in the world, and almost anything it does has the potential of having global impact.

"The eyes of the world are on California," asserts State Senate President Pro Tem Kevin de Leon (D). He is the author of a bill [SB 350] that would require the state to generate 50 percent of electricity from renewable sources such as solar and wind power, halve the amount of petroleum used by vehicles and double energy efficiency of buildings by 2030. The bill is part of an environmental package making its way through California's Democratic-controlled legislature over Republican opposition. Gov. Jerry Brown (D), outspoken on climate change, is likely to sign these measures if they reach his desk.

Six other states – Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey and Washington – have mandated reductions in fossil fuels to meet climate-change goals. Twenty-

nine states have laws designed to increase renewable energy usage. Vermont's is notable: it requires that 55 percent of a utility's electricity come from renewables, including large-scale hydro power, by 2017. The target increases to 75 percent by 2032.

Presently, fossil fuels supply 85 percent of the nation's energy. In several states momentum toward greater use of renewables has been stopped or slowed by the opposition of power companies and the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) a corporate-funded policy group that provides like-minded legislators with "model bills" favoring fossil fuels.

Last February the Republican-controlled legislature in West Virginia repealed a mandate requiring that 25 percent of its energy be obtained from renewable or alternative sources such as natural gas by 2025. Last month Kansas made its previous mandate for 20 percent use of renewables by 2020 a voluntary goal. In 2014 Ohio froze its renewable energy targets while Florida cut its energy-efficiency goals by more than 90 percent.

But all states may become involved in the climate change battle when a pending EPA regulation is issued, said Glen Andersen, director of energy programs for the National Conference of State Legislatures. The regulation, known as the Clean Power Plan, is President Obama's proposal to assign each state a level to which it must reduce carbon emissions from electric power plants, a culprit in global warming. The plan could become a burden for states that rely on coal-fired power plants. Twenty-six states obtain most of

their energy from coal, with the highest users being Texas, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Kentucky and West Virginia.

The Clean Power Plan is the major element of Obama's effort to make a difference on climate change through executive action. Republican congressional leaders charge he is exceeding his constitutional authority and infringing on legislative powers. In February, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Kentucky) sent letters to all state governors urging them to refuse to carry out the EPA rule when it is implemented in August. While most states have ignored McConnell, five Republican governors have said they may honor his request. They are presidential aspirants Scott Walker of Wisconsin and Bobby Jindal of Louisiana plus three governors from heavy coal-using states: Greg Abbott of Texas, Mike Pence of Indiana and Mary Fallin of Oklahoma. Meanwhile, the Republican-controlled House of Representatives has passed a bill that would allow each state to decide if it wants to abide by the regulation. It faces an Obama veto if it clears the Senate.

Obama maintains that he has broad authority to act under the Clean Air Act, a comprehensive federal law regulating air emissions and authorizing the EPA to establish national standards to protect public health. Put forward in 1963 by President Lyndon Johnson, it passed by bipartisan vote. In 1970, Congress approved President Richard Nixon's proposal creating the EPA. The Clean Air Act was strengthened and the EPA given most of the powers it possesses today. Congress approved the changes

with only a single dissenting vote.

That was then. In today's politicized environment, global warming is a partisan issue. Dealing with climate change is a priority for Obama and many Democratic governors and legislators, especially on the coasts. Republican attitudes range from ambivalence to hostility; many question the scientific consensus that global warming is a growing peril. Gallup's annual Environment Survey highlights the partisan division. It shows that 52 percent of voters who lean Democratic consider global warming and climate change a major problem; only 13 percent of Republican-leaning voters agree. A Pew Research survey found that nearly two-thirds of voters believe the planet is getting warmer, but neither the Pew nor the Gallup respondents assigned much urgency to corrective action. These findings suggest that Congress has little to fear in the way of voter retaliation for its resistance to climate-change legislation.

The impasse between a chief executive who favors action on climate change and a resistant Congress could continue beyond the Obama presidency. Helped by favorable 2011 redistrictings, Republicans appear to be in position to control the House of Representatives into the next decade. In this context, state actions matter. When the federal government – including President Obama – was opposed to same-sex marriage, state actions made such unions legal and paved the way for the historic ruling last month by the Supreme Court declaring marriage equality a constitutional right.

Even small states can set an example, and Hawaii's establishment of a 100 percent renewable energy goal could have "aspirational" value for other states, said Vicki Arroyo, executive director of the Georgetown Climate

Center. For Hawaii itself, developing renewable energy is practical economics. The oil-dependent Aloha State has solar, wind, wave and geothermal resources but lacks fossil fuels. In signing the bill, Gov. David Ige (D) said Hawaii spends about \$5 billion annually on foreign oil. "Making the transition to renewable, indigenous resources for power generation will allow us to keep more of that money at home, thereby improving our economy, environment and energy security," he said.

But it is the pending California legislation that could have the greatest impact on other states – and perhaps other countries as well. California has long been a trend-setter on environmental issues. In 1974, legislation authored by a conservative Republican assemblyman and supported by Gov. Ronald Reagan gave the California Air Resources Board power to prohibit sale or registration of vehicles that failed to meet the state's strict standards on emissions control. The U.S. auto industry, which had opposed the bill, capitulated and made all its cars meet the California standards.

Later, California became a national pacesetter on greenhouse gas emissions, a role it's now expanding. In April, Gov. Brown issued an executive order calling for reduction of pollutants in California to 40

percent below 1990 levels by 2040 and to 80 percent below these levels by 2050, matching the standards of the European Community.

How important are such actions? Fred Krupp, president of the Environmental Defense Fund, said at the Aspen Ideas Festival, that state measures and Obama's Clean Power Plan initiative had broken a stalemate with China, which suffers ominously from air pollution. Last November Obama reached an agreement with Chinese President Xi Jinping in which the United States promised to cut carbon emissions by one-fourth through 2025 and China pledged to reach peak emissions by 2035.

These are at best starting points, but they could be useful. Air pollution does not respect state boundaries, and climate change is a global phenomenon. As important as California's actions are, says Sen. de Leon, they will not make a significant dent in global warming unless other states, the federal government, and the international community also take action.

Vicki Arroyo believes a tipping point could be near. She points out that polls show younger people are more concerned about global warming than their elders – and more convinced that something can be done. Public opinion changed rapidly in defiance of conventional wisdom on issues ranging from same-sex marriage to removal of the Confederate flag, Arroyo observes. Many national leaders and Pope Francis have warned of looming climate catastrophes unless something is done about global warming. Is climate change an issue whose time has come

<http://www.lexisnexis.com/communities/state-net/b/capitol-journal/archive/2015/07/17/california-hawaii-lead-way-on-climate-change-targets.aspx>

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Battling climate change, agency draws controversy

By *Kate Galbraith, CALmatters, Desert Sun, July 18, 2015*

California Air Resources Board Chairman Mary Nichols meets with Marine Corps Brigadier General Edward D. Banta (seated at Nichols' immediate left) on Nov. 3, 2014 in Sacramento. (Photo: Carl Costas / CALmatters)

On the outskirts of Los Angeles, inside a nondescript laboratory building, a man in a yellow T-shirt and helmet sits on a stationary motorcycle, looking intently ahead. The bike's back wheel is spinning, and a long orange tube connects to its exhaust pipe. A fan roars, mimicking wind.

Nearby, on a computer screen, colorful lines show the concentration of pollutants emitted from the motorcycle, such as nitrogen oxides and carbon dioxide. This is an emissions test, and the rider must calibrate his acceleration and deceleration precisely, even as he goes nowhere.

"It's like 55 things you've got to do to get this test right," said Tom Valencia, a branch chief for California's Air Resources Board, the state agency that runs the lab, as the next test, on a Chevy Impala, got underway.

The ARB, one of the most influential—and controversial—pollution regulatory agencies in the nation, conducts more than 1,500 tests each year at the lab. To environmentalists, the air board offers a bulwark against pollution, setting an example for the nation and the world on how to clean the air and fight climate change. To detractors, it is an out-of-

control agency run by unelected bureaucrats who are throttling the state economy.

"It's come to the point that they tell you what to do, and you salute, and you hope that your members don't fire you," said Jay McKeeman, a vice-president at the California Independent Oil Marketers Association.

Besides its longstanding mission to scrub California's air of damaging pollutants, the ARB in recent years has taken charge of the state's efforts to combat climate change, including the controversial cap-and-trade system that limits greenhouse gas emissions across most of the economy.

"It's not hyperbole when I say there is probably not a more important agency, not just in this country but around the world, than CARB and what they're doing on pollution control and climate change," said William Becker, executive director of the National Association of Clean Air Agencies in Washington.

The air board's roots go back nearly half a century, to a time when thick smog smothered Southern California. Air pollution was a "menace," in the words of Governor Pat Brown, the current governor's father. A Dutch-born biochemist at Caltech, Arie Jan Haagen-Smit, took up the challenge.

After studying plants' reactions to different compounds and collecting flasks of dirty air, he ultimately traced the smog to a

reaction involving vehicle exhaust and sunlight, as well as emissions from industrial plants. Oil companies and automakers fought his conclusions, but in 1968, Gov. Ronald Reagan appointed the "stubborn Dutchman" chair of the brand-new Air Resources Board. Haagen-Smit, a lifelong smoker, died of lung cancer in 1977.

His name is on the Los Angeles-area lab, which now plans to test so many vehicles, including heavy-duty trucks and cars using new technologies, officials want to move it to a bigger space. The tests cover everything from tailpipe emissions to vapors given off during refueling. The air board certifies new vehicles sold in California, an unusual role for a state-level agency.

Adrienne Alvord, the California and Western states director for the Union of Concerned Scientists, said that the air board's policies are paying off.

"They have not been afraid to stand up to oil companies and auto companies, which are obviously very well-heeled interests, in the interest of achieving clean air for the public good," she said.

Air quality has greatly improved since the ARB began its work, though ozone and fine-particle pollution still plague parts of the state. But the war on smog helps explain why the agency became so powerful. When Congress passed the Clean Air Act decades ago, it allowed California to set its own standards, more stringent than

the federal government's, for pollution from cars.

Mary Nichols, 70, is at the helm of the ARB. She is a veteran regulator and environmentalist and served as the air board's chairman more than three decades ago, when Jerry Brown was governor the first time. In 2007, Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger appointed her chair again. The agency, which is part of the California Environmental Protection Agency, is approaching 1,400 employees and has a budget of more than \$730 million, larger than most states' environmental agencies.

"Certainly when I first started at the Air Resources Board in 1975, we didn't see energy efficiency or fuel use as being part of our mandate," Nichols said in a recent interview. "It simply wasn't something we paid a lot of attention to."

But since Assembly Bill 32, California's landmark climate-

change law, passed in 2006, "thinking about climate change has become a part of everything we do," she said.

For Nichols, that has meant a steady stream of international visitors and trips. She spoke at an international climate-change summit in Peru last December, and has also visited China for the launch of an emissions-trading system there.

"I think the thing that's probably surprised me the most is the international role that we play today," she said.

As Brown and lawmakers strengthen their climate goals, the ARB remains a lightning-rod. Around a decade ago, the Legislature debated whether the air board or an interagency group should take charge of climate programs such as cap-and-trade. The ARB won, and now industry groups shudder at the idea of the agency expanding its role and crafting

new programs.

"The level of authority granted to ARB ... is quite dramatic," said Michael Shaw, a vice-president with the California Manufacturers & Technology Association, in testimony in July over a bill that would require the ARB to carry out a plan for cutting petroleum use in half by 2030. "Taking it further, we think, is a tremendous error."

That's not how Nichols sees it. If lawmakers craft new climate and pollution goals, she said, the ARB will engage in a long process of consultation on how to achieve the new standards, as happened with earlier climate programs.

"The science behind global warming requires that more stringent targets be met," she said. "And California's goal of being a leader in this field, which we believe benefits our economy overall, requires that we stay ahead of the pack."

CALmatters is a non-profit journalism venture dedicated to explaining California policies and politics.

<http://www.desertsun.com/story/news/environment/2015/07/18/arb-agency-draws-controversy/30333181/>

*** *Do you want \$2 Gasoline at the pump?***

*** *Do you want clean air and water?***

Ethanol waiver and elimination of E-85 flex fuel credit can cut our ozone & CO2 transportation pollution over 50%

Let's improve performance of CA Climate change laws AB 32 & SB 32 (Pavley) in 2015 for future generations

Is it time for an Attorney General, EPA conversation?

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Sky-High California Gas Prices Have a Green Additive

Allysia Finley, Wall Street Journal, July 17, 2015 7:08 p.m. ET

For most American families, the ritual summertime road trip is a lot cheaper this year thanks to plunging gas prices, propelled in part by the U.S. shale-oil boom. The average gas price nationally has dropped by nearly 25% to \$2.76 a gallon over the past 12 months.

California is another story. While gasoline in the Golden State is averaging \$3.88 a gallon, the average price in the Los Angeles market shot up 65 cents this week to \$4.30 a gallon, about 20 cents higher than a year ago. Gas prices surpassed \$5 per gallon at some stations, hitting \$5.49 in downtown L.A., according to GasBuddy.com.

As usual, purported consumer activists are blaming collusion among putatively monopolistic oil companies. The real culprit is anti-carbon regulation promoted by a cartel of green activists and liberal politicians that is aimed at raising energy costs to discourage consumption. Sticker shock at the pump, like water rationing and high electric rates, is the price Californians must pay for their environmental virtue.

For most of the 1980s and '90s, Californians paid roughly the national average, according to U.S. Energy Information Administration data. Since 1999—the year Democrat Gray Davis assumed the governorship following 16 years of Republican leadership—California gas prices have sizably surpassed the national average and most of the lower 48 states, principally due to more stringent fuel regulations. California gas taxes are also about 12 cents higher than the national average.

In 1999, Mr. Davis's Air Resources Board banned the fuel additive MTBE—a smog-reducing oxygenate that in low quantities has been detected in groundwater. It also

adopted cleaner “reformulated” fuel standards that raised production costs. A tiramisu of other environmental mandates have been layered into the state's fuel standards.

The results? By 2006 Californians were paying 23 cents more than the national average for regular gas. The disparity increased to 40 cents in 2014 and now sits at \$1.11.

Next to crude, electricity ranks as refiners' largest production cost. Electric rates like gas prices have soared in California thanks to the state's mandate that requires that renewables make up 33% of the state's electricity by 2020. Gov. Jerry Brown and Democratic legislators have proposed raising the mandate to 50% by 2030.

Over the past three years, electric rates in California rose by 2.18 cents per kilowatt-hour—about four times the rate nationally—as more solar and wind power has come online. Meanwhile, nuclear plants, which generate cheaper electricity, have been decommissioned, and hydropower has flagged because of the drought.

The state's 2006 global-warming law, AB32, also established a cap-and-trade program that requires large industrial companies operating in the state to cut their carbon emissions or buy permits. Cap-and-trade auctions commenced in 2012, but this year refiners have to buy permits.

Based on an Air Resources Board analysis, the Western States Petroleum Association last year extrapolated that cap and trade would add 16 cents to 76 cents a gallon to the retail price of gas. Other economists projected a 10-cent bump. Sure enough, gas prices skyrocketed this year, though it's tough to disentangle the impact of cap

and trade from other ill-conceived environmental policies.

State and federal environmental mandates have forced several smaller, inefficient refineries in California to shut down over the past two decades. Only 14 refineries in California produce the state's pristine-burning fuel, and most operate at nearly full capacity to stay cost-effective. Few refiners outside the state blend California's reformulated fuel.

In most of the country, a problem at one refinery won't significantly affect retail gas prices. But in California, when one refinery shuts down, others can't pick up the slack. And it can take weeks to import refined fuel by tanker. In the meantime, customers are stuck paying higher prices.

Hence this year's price swoon. Following an explosion at an Exxon Mobil XOM -0.36 % refinery in Torrance, and a labor stoppage at a Tesoro plant in Martinez this winter, gasoline prices rose nearly a dollar.

Eventually, imported oil helped cover the supply-demand gap. But recently a Tesoro refinery in Carson reduced its output to perform annual maintenance, which has again stretched supply in the Southern California market.

In May Democratic state legislators held hearings to "investigate" the gas price spike. San Francisco hedge-fund grandee Tom Steyer has demanded subpoenas of oil-industry executives.

"As everyone knows, the oil companies have been charging Californians up to \$1 billion per month more for gasoline than if we paid the national average," the billionaire environmentalist asserted. "It's time to put an end to the Big Oil giveaway." His remedy? An oil-extraction tax.

Here's a better idea: Mr. Steyer and his liberal friends in Sacramento should take the stand to explain why they're gouging consumers to indulge their rich green appetites.

Ms. Finley is an editorial writer at the Journal.

<http://www.wsj.com/articles/sky-high-california-gas-prices-have-a-green-additive-1437174504>

*** *Do you want \$2 Gasoline at the pump?***

*** *Do you want clean air and water?***

Ethanol waiver and elimination of E-85 flex fuel credit can cut our ozone & CO2 transportation pollution over 50%

Let's improve performance of CA Climate change laws AB 32 & SB 32 (Pavley) in 2015 for future generations

Is it time for an Attorney General, EPA conversation?

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Why are California's roads so bad?

By Jay Obernolte, Las Angeles Times, Friday, July 17, 2015

California motorists pay some of the highest gasoline taxes in the nation. On average, states impose a combination of taxes and fees that amount to about 30 cents a gallon, whereas California's gas tax is an astonishing 42 cents a gallon. On top of that, according to a report released last fall by the Legislative Analyst's Office, cap-and-trade regulations will probably lead to an additional 13- to 20-cent-a-gallon increase by 2020. Drivers may not notice the added burden these taxes impose when gas prices are low, but at the moment they are skyrocketing: at nearly \$5 a gallon in the Los Angeles-Long Beach region.

Given that Californians pay about 40% more in taxes and fees than the national average, it is only reasonable to expect that the quality of roads we get in return should be significantly better than in other parts of the country.

Unfortunately, anyone who has driven in our state recently knows that this is simply not the case. According to the Reason Foundation's 21st Annual Highway Report, California is home to one of the worst highway systems in the nation. The report ranks our state second to last in both the condition of urban interstates and in maintenance expenditures per mile.

How can it be that we pay so much for so little? The answer lies in how the government spends the taxes we pay. -

In contrast, all five of the top-ranked states for highway system performance (Wyoming, Nebraska, South Dakota, South Carolina and Kansas) have state gasoline taxes at or below the national average. If

these states can manage to fund road construction and maintenance without imposing exorbitant taxes on their residents, then so can we.

How can it be that we pay so much for so little? The answer lies in how the government spends the taxes we pay. As it turns out, not all of the revenue from gas taxes and vehicle fees is invested in our highways; instead, portions of it are diverted to other uses.

For instance, 100% of the sales tax on diesel fuel is currently diverted to public transit projects. If we spent this money on our road infrastructure instead, we'd have an additional \$620 million each year for repairs. Cap-and-trade revenue, currently allocated with the intention of reducing greenhouse gases, is a more appropriate source of funding for mass transit.

A similar situation exists with the nearly \$1 billion that is collected annually from the vehicle weight fee program. During the recession, the Legislature approved AB 105, which directed revenue from truck weight fees to support the general fund. Now that our economy has improved, budget gimmicks like this are no longer needed.

A healthy transportation infrastructure is crucial, especially in a state as large and populous as California. If the state spent driving-related revenue as originally intended, we could avoid tax increases while reinvesting billions of dollars in our roads. Fees and taxes paid by drivers should go toward funding improvements for drivers.

Jay Obernolte (R-Hesperia) represents the 33rd District in the Assembly, which covers the northern half of San Bernardino County.

<http://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-0717-obernolte-gas-tax-20150717-story.html>

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Gov. Brown Talks To KCAL9 About Bill That Would Mandate Reduction In Gas Usage By Dave Bryan, KCAL9 news, Los Angeles CBS, July 16, 2015

LOS ANGELES (CBSLA.com) — As Gov. Jerry Brown prepares to travel to Rome next week for an international climate conference, the debate over a bill aimed at reducing gas usage in California is heating up.

Brown fully supports SB-350, which would mandate a 50-percent cutback in California's gas usage in the next 15 years, arguing that it's a prime factor in global warming.

"We've got a serious problem here," he told KCAL9 Political Reporter Dave Bryan via satellite. "Burning oil and gas and coal and diesel is a big part of the problem. We've got to find new bio-fuels. We have to be more efficient. We've got a lot to do. And by the way, if we do nothing, the cost is unimaginable."

"We think this is reckless legislation and one that people certainly need to be aware of because it'll impact every single motorist in the state of California," Tupper Hull of the Western States Petroleum Association said via Skype.

Critics charge the bill provides no specific plan to achieve the massive cutback in gas usage.

That would be left up to the California Air Resources Board, which those critics, like the oil industry say, would have no limits on what it could mandate.

The impact on Californians, they argue, could be devastating.

"What are they supposed to do to get to work? To get their kids to school?" asked Hull. "What is supposed to replace all of this gasoline and diesel that's gonna be taken out of the system?"

"Well, of course, the people who are gonna sell 50 percent less petroleum are not only gonna have questions, they're gonna have a fierce, unrelenting opposition. So, let's be clear about that," said Brown.

Cutting gas consumption in half, though, may be especially difficult in the Los Angeles area, where sitting in traffic jams is a long hated ritual and the rapid transit system is still decades away from being a truly comprehensive regional people mover, like New York or Chicago have.

While the oil industry have been leading the charge and

criticizing the bill, Assemblyman Roger Hernandez, a Democrat from West Covina, was quoted in The Los Angeles Times as questioning whether an appointed board should be making the rules for cutting gas consumption, charging the bill would give them a blank check of unregulated and unlimited power over the lives of Californians.

In an interview, Brown asked in response: who do you want regulating the consumption? The oil companies?

"You saw what they did and what? Did gasoline go up 80 cents in the last week? Who's regulating that? Well, the companies were. So, you can have a company regulate or you can have an agency of government," Brown said, adding: "You need an authority within government to set the conditions of survivability."

The bill appears to be well on its way to passage having already cleared the state Senate and some Assembly committees, but the debate over how to cut in half California's dependency on gas by 2030 is possibly just beginning.

<http://losangeles.cbslocal.com/2015/07/16/gov-brown-talks-to-cbs2-about-bill-that-would-mandate-reduction-in-gas-usage/>

Ethanol waiver and elimination of E-85 flex fuel credit can cut our ozone & CO2 transportation pollution over 50%

Let's improve performance of CA Climate change laws AB 32 and SB 32 (Pavley) in 2015 for future generations

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Sharon Runner Introduces Measure to Halt High Speed Rail Funding

By Sharon Runner / CA Senate / Wednesday, July 15, 2015

Senator Sharon Runner (R-Antelope Valley) announced today that she is authoring legislation to prohibit Cap and Trade funds from being used for High Speed Rail. Introduced in the First Extraordinary Session on Transportation Infrastructure, Senate Bill 1X 6 would instead require Cap and Trade dollars be used to fund existing transportation projects.

"I do not support the Cap and Trade tax, but drivers are already paying it at the pump to the tune of \$1.9 billion a year,"

said Runner. "California should not spend another dollar on the high speed rail boondoggle; if taxpayers are being forced to pay, the money should be used for existing transportation purposes."

Currently, 25 percent of annual Cap and Trade proceeds are used to pay for the failed High Speed Rail project. SB 1X 6 would redirect these funds to the California Transportation Commission to be used for necessary, high priority transportation projects such as fixing our roads and highways.

It would also return the \$400 million in Cap and Trade taxes borrowed by the General Fund.

"Instead of High Speed Rail, we should be spending Cap and Trade dollars to restore our badly neglected transportation infrastructure," said Runner. "We need to work on improving our existing transportation system. Fixing and updating our roads to meet current demands would benefit California's families and reduce greenhouse gasses right away."

<http://district21.cssrc.us/content/sharon-runner-introduces-measure-halt-high-speed-rail-funding>

** Do you want \$2 Gasoline at the pump?*

** Do you want clean air and water?*

Ethanol waiver and elimination of E-85 flex fuel credit can cut our ozone & CO2 transportation pollution over 50%

Let's improve performance of CA Climate change laws AB 32 & SB 32 (Pavley) in 2015 for future generations

Is it time for an Attorney General, EPA conversation?

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Dem governors call for strong ozone rule

By Devin Henry, THE HILL, Monday, June 22, 2015

Regulators should write a stringent new surface-level ozone rule that follows "sound science and settled law," five Democratic governors said in a letter to Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Gina McCarthy.

The governors — Jerry Brown (Calif.), Maggie Hassan (N.H.), Jay Inslee (Wash.), Dannel Malloy (Conn.) and Peter Shumlin (Vt.) — praised the 45-year-old Clean Air Act for improving public health, but they said EPA's current ozone rule isn't strong enough to do that in the future.

"The 2008 primary ozone standard is inadequate to protect public health," the governors wrote in a Friday letter. "We urge you to finalize the proposed ozone standards

in a timely manner that reflects sound science and settled law."

The EPA is finalizing a rule to tighten its ozone standard from 75 parts per billion to 65 or 70 parts per billion.

The agency has said the new standards will protect public health, especially among children, the elderly and those with respiratory issues. But opponents of the rule, especially Republicans and manufacturers, say the standards will be expensive to implement and could lead to job losses.

In their letter, the governors tried to rebut that argument, saying Clean Air Act regulations have "saved hundreds of thousands of lives and generated trillions of

dollars in economic benefits to our nation."

"Compliance with national ambient air quality standards has consistently proven less costly and more beneficial than either its critics or supporters predicted," they wrote. "The health and environmental benefits associated with cleaner air continue to outweigh the costs of achieving those standards."

Republicans have launched a legislative assault on the rule, introducing bills to block the EPA by taking the regulatory power out of its hands, forcing it to consider cost when writing pollution rules and delaying new regulations until counties can comply with the current ones.

http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/245712-dem-governors-call-for-strong-ozone-rule#disqus_thread

*** *Do you want \$2 Gasoline at the pump?***

*** *Do you want clean air and water?***

Ethanol waiver and elimination of E-85 flex fuel credit can cut our ozone & CO2 transportation pollution over 50%

Let's improve performance of CA Climate change law AB 32 (Pavley) in 2015 for future generations

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Clinton pushes Obama on renewable fuel standard, demands more ethanol

By Paul Bedard, Washington Examiner, May 28, 2015

Finally beginning to fill in policy gaps, Hillary Rodham Clinton said Thursday that she would double down on President Obama's war on global warming, expand the use of ethanol in gasoline and condemned the GOP for embracing "fuels of the past."

"As president, I'll champion what works, ensure that Americans have the tools they need to lead the world in clean energy, and stand up to those who block our way and want to keep us trapped in an energy economy of the past," she said in a guest column for the Cedar Rapids, Iowa Gazette.

Her agenda leaves builds on Obama's green plans. Clinton said she would:

-- Help biofuels companies with making fuel from grasses and agricultural waste.

-- Expand the government's support of rural renewable energy outlets.

-- Broaden the Renewable Fuel Standard from 10 percent ethanol in gasoline to 15 percent, a huge boost to farmers but a

potential threat to current internal combustion engines.

Clinton's push for expanding the RFS puts pressure on her former boss who has been sitting on plans to continue building the amount of ethanol in gas. The Environmental Protection Agency could release its plan Friday or Monday.

"We have to get the RFS back on track in a way that provides investors with the certainty they need, protects consumers, improves access to E15, E85, and biodiesel blends, and effectively drives the development of cellulosic and other advanced biofuels," Clinton wrote.

She also described some in the GOP presidential field as slaves to coal and gas.

"There are still some here in America — even candidates for president — who want to keep the deck stacked for the fuels of the past," she mocked, adding, "They support wasteful subsidies for oil and gas, block investments in new clean technologies, and even deny the science of climate change."

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/clinton-pushes-obama-on-renewable-fuel-standard-demands-more-ethanol/article/2565198>

*** *Do you want \$2 Gasoline at the pump?***

*** *Do you want clean air and water?***

Ethanol waiver and elimination of E-85 flex fuel credit can cut our ozone & CO2 transportation pollution over 50%

Let's improve performance of CA Climate change law AB 32 (Pavley) in 2015 for future generations

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters



Clean Air Performance Professionals

April 26, 2015
Assemblyman Frank Bigelow
State Capitol, Suite #6027
Sacramento, CA 94249-0005
(916) 319-2005
(916) 319-2105 fax

RE: Audit of Lake Tahoe service station ground water

Dear Assemblyman,

Can California audit Lake Tahoe Service Station fuel tank leak compliance?

California water supply is in short supply and fuel leaks has a history of impacting local business at the Lake Tahoe World Class resort.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Charlie Peters', is written over the typed name below.

Charlie Peters
Clean Air Performance Professionals
Fax: 510-537-9675

Our Attorney General has given attention to southern California water protection but Northern California AB 32 climate change pollution may be getting the short stick

Cc: interested parties

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Hillary's Big Iowa Flip-Flop

By Robert Bryce, Reuters, The Daily Beast, April 14, 2015

Why Clinton is the biggest hypocrite in the race when it comes to ethanol, an expensive, environmentally destructive fuel that benefits Iowa's powerful corn lobby.

Now that Hillary Clinton has launched her second bid for the White House, we will see even more scrutiny of her on everything from her time at State to the Clinton Foundation's funders. But the issue that best exposes Clinton's enormous ambition — and her readiness to sacrifice the interests of consumers to that ambition — is her flip-flop on the corn ethanol tax.

No other active, high-profile American politician has been as duplicitous on a basic pocketbook issue as Clinton has been on this one. The corn ethanol tax, which was imposed by Congress last decade and is formally known as the Renewable Fuel Standard, now costs American motorists \$10 billion per year in additional fuel costs. That works out to about \$47 per year for every licensed driver in the country.

During her early years in the US Senate, Clinton was a staunch opponent of the corn ethanol tax. In 2002, she and three of her senate colleagues -- New York Democratic Sen. Charles Schumer and California Democrats Sens. Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer — used that very word, "tax" to describe then-pending legislation that was to require the blending of two billion gallons of corn ethanol per year into domestic gasoline supplies. Their March 21, 2002 letter said the pending measure would add "an astonishing new anti-consumer government mandate — that every US refiner must use an ever-increasing volume of ethanol."

They said consumers would be "forced" to use ethanol and that the legislation was "the equivalent of a new gasoline tax." In all, during her stint in the Senate, Clinton voted against ethanol 17 times.

But when she set her sites on the White House and realized she had to kowtow — just as Barack Obama was doing — to Big Corn in Iowa, she flipped like a hotcake. In early 2007, during a visit

to Des Moines, Clinton said that the US needs to work on "limiting our dependence on foreign oil. And we have a perfect example right here in Iowa about how it can work with all of the ethanol that's being produced here."

The sole reason for her flip-flop: her desire to win the Iowa caucuses, which is the first crucially important contest in the race for president. More ethanol production means more money for Iowa farmers and ethanol producers, but it's a loser for most everyone else in the country. It's also a negative for the environment and for people who like to eat. John DeCicco, a research professor at the University of Michigan's Energy Institute, recently published a report which found that "there's no climate benefit" from using biofuels. Meanwhile, researchers looking at the Gulf of Mexico are expecting another huge "dead zone" (also known as a hypoxia zone) this year, thanks in large part to fertilizer-laden runoff from corn farms in the Midwest.

Furthermore, increased use of ethanol and other biofuels means less land is available to grow food. Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change stated flatly that "there is high confidence that pressure on land use for biofuels will further increase food prices." [Emphasis in original document.]

But environmental concerns and consumers' interests are taking a distant back seat to Clinton's lust for political power. And that desire explains why she's back in Iowa this week, where she will be campaigning in the town of Monticello, population 3,811. While the residents of Monticello and Jones Country may like the attention they get from Hillary and other prospective presidents, there's simply no question that by insisting on having its primary first, Iowa has been able to coerce presidential candidates into supporting the corn ethanol tax.

In November 2007, during a speech in Newton, Iowa, she said that if elected president, she would "dramatically increase biofuels production." Clinton's plan was to increase production of fuels like corn ethanol, cellulosic

Brown: California leading on climate-change work with China

By Associated Press / UT SanDiego / March 4, 2015

SAN FRANCISCO (AP) — Gov. Jerry Brown touted California's cooperation with China on climate change Wednesday, pointing to more than a dozen accords on sharing training and knowledge for cleaner energy.

While partisan disputes in Washington have limited federal progress to slow greenhouse-gas emissions and climate change, California has "helped foster the political climate that gets stuff done," Brown said in San Francisco.

"it's a little bold" to speak "as though we were a separate nation," Brown said of California's initiatives with China. "But we are a separate nation."

Brown, who is pushing a goal of 50-percent renewable energy for his own state, has also sought to build clean-energy cooperation and business ties with China and other countries. He and Chinese officials signed a pact in 2013 on reducing carbon emissions.

China also has been cited as a possible source of private investment for one of Brown's priority projects, the proposed \$68 billion high-speed rail project. The governor traveled with Chinese rail officials on his trade mission there in 2013 and met privately with potential Chinese high-speed rail investors.

Brown spoke for the release of a privately funded report outlining collaboration on research and training between Chinese officials and state officials, academics and environmentalists in California.

<http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2015/mar/04/brown-california-leading-on-climate-change-work/>

Dr. Stan's California water & fuel supply opinion

<http://mediaarchives.gsradio.net/radioliberty/121213d.mp3>

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

DeWine sues BP over \$33 million from Ohio's fuel-tank clean-up fund

Toledo Blade, March 3, 2015

Ohio Attorney General Mike DeWine is suing BP, alleging that it improperly obtained \$33 million from a state fund to clean up leaks from underground fuel tanks.

The lawsuit, filed yesterday in Franklin County Common Pleas Court, says the energy company received money from the Petroleum Financial Assurance Fund at the same time it was receiving insurance money for the same leaks. DeWine's office described that as "double-dipping."

"Our lawsuit alleges that BP knowingly and intentionally took more than \$33 million that it was not eligible to accept," DeWine said in a statement. "BP has to follow the same rules as other businesses and can't engage in misconduct without consequence."

The complaint says BP concealed the existence of hundreds of insurance policies. It cites 2,651 claims filed by the company with the state, which led to \$33.4 million in payments. And that doesn't include an additional 905 claims worth \$22.3 million that the state is still reviewing.

BP spokesman Jason Black had this statement:

"BP acted at all times in good faith and believes its dealings with the Ohio state underground storage tank fund have been proper. BP plans to defend itself against the allegations in the complaint."

The cleanup fund has paid out \$221 million, according to the panel that oversees it. BP and companies that it later acquired have received more money from the fund than any other company dating to the fund's inception in 1989.

<http://www.toledoblade.com/news/2015/03/03/DeWine-sues-BP-over-33-million-from-Ohio-s-fuel-tank-clean-up-fund.html#>

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Ethanol industry lobbies up

By Timothy Cama / THE HILL / Tuesday, March 3, 2015

Pro-ethanol group Fuels America has signed with a pair of high-profile lobbyists from both parties as part of its effort to defend the federal ethanol blending mandate.

Documents filed with Congress in late February say that prolific Democratic fundraiser Heather Podesta of Heather Podesta + Partners and former Republican Speaker Denny Hastert of Dickstein Shapiro started representing the ethanol coalition's interests on Capitol Hill in mid-January.

"Our strong, bipartisan advocacy team will help us continue to make the case that the renewable fuel standard is helping lower gasoline prices, protect the environment, and create jobs here at home with American-made renewable fuel," Fuels America spokesman Aaron Wells said of the new contracts.

The big-gun lobbying contracts arrive at a key moment for the renewable fuel standard (RFS), which requires that gasoline and diesel refiners blend ethanol and biodiesel into their traditional fuels.

The same week that the group filed the lobbying papers, Sens. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) and Pat Toomey (R-Pa.) introduced a bill aimed at eliminating the corn ethanol mandate.

Dozens of members of Congress from both parties support either repealing or significantly changing the mandate. The Feinstein-Toomey bill has wide support among lawmakers, as does an anti-mandate bill from Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.).

The mandate also faces hurdles in the executive branch, where the Environmental Protection Agency has delayed issuing its 2014 blending volumes for 16 months.

Ethanol is under additional attacks from the oil industry, restaurants, auto advocates and some environmental groups.

Congress enacted the mandate in 2007 with the goal of reducing oil imports and greenhouse gas emissions. Opponents say it has done neither.

The ethanol industry, however, set a production record last year when it made 14.3 billion gallons, according to the Renewable Fuels Association.

Podesta and Hastert's firms both said that the RFS would be their main focuses in the Fuels America contracts.

Fuels America, whose members represent various points in the ethanol production process, has dramatically increased its lobbying presence since it launched in 2012.

The group spent \$820,000 lobbying last year, nearly double the \$480,000 it spent in 2013, its first full year of operation, according to data compiled by the Center for Responsive Politics.

The group spent even more on advertising and promotion, with \$1.8 million in expenses in 2013, according to reports filed with the IRS.

By comparison, the American Petroleum Institute — which wants the RFS completely eliminated because of the costs to fuel refiners — spent \$9.09 million lobbying last year and \$67.9 million on advertising and promotion in 2013, the most recent year for which data are available.

Fuels America has a history of using high-profile lobbyists. It brought on former Democratic Rep. Bill Delahunt (Mass.) and his Delahunt Group last year, spending \$210,000.

Since it was established in 2012, Fuels America has had an ongoing contract with the Glover Park Group, with which it has spent \$1.2 million.

<http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/234393-ethanol-industry-lobbies-up>

Dr. Stan's California water & fuel supply opinion
<http://mediaarchives.gsradio.net/radioliberty/121213d.mp3>

Cheap Gasoline

Climate One at the Commonwealth Club, February 27th, 2015

Gas prices are plunging, and Americans can get back on the road again. What are the economic, geopolitical and environmental consequences of cheap oil?

Jason Bordoff, Founding Director, Center on Global Energy Policy, Columbia University; Former Special Advisor to President Obama, National Security Council Staff

Kate Gordon, Senior VP and Director, Energy & Climate Program, Next Generation

Bill Reilly, Former Board Member, ConocoPhillips; Senior Advisor, TPG Capital

Transcript

(snip)

We're talking about cheap oil and gasoline at Climate One. Let's have our audience questions. Welcome.

Male Participant (Charlie Peters): I have a question that has been an awful fun part of this debate over time which is the issue of the use of corn to make products that were promoted to be a significant improvement in global warming, in carbon taxes. So my question is, there's an appearance that there's a divide there between possibly British Petroleum and Shell and DuPont wanting to go to butanol. And then the question becomes is it impacting our water supply being a carcinogen. Is that something that should be of concern? We never check our water supply anywhere ever

Greg Dalton: Thank you --

Male Participant (Charlie Peters): So a response to that would be great.

Greg Dalton: So who'd like to -- Bill Reilly, you were on the board of DuPont, but the question, I think, is that people advocated for corn as a climate solution, corn turned out to

not be so good. Cellulosic ethanol has been disappointing. Your thoughts.

Bill Reilly: Well, if you make the ethanol out of switch grass or something of the sort, I think that you possibly do something very positive with respect to liquid fuels, and I would support that. I would not worry so much about contaminating the water supply with ethanol. I mean, we're talking about replacing some portion of the gasoline and we've been managing that with some success for, I think, some time. So I don't think that would be the major problem.

The major problem, I think, with the ethanol area is the enormous subsidies that have gone into it and for corn production and certainly my recollection from having administered the Clean Air Act is that the advantages of ethanol as an additive are for wintertime NOx [nitrogen oxides] control. So it's been touted as doing something far more significant than that and reducing our dependency on foreign imports and the rest. Those arguments, I think, have lost a great deal of their appeal.

Greg Dalton: Corn has been overhyped. ...

<http://www.climate-one.org/audio/cheap-gasoline>

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

t

BP follows Shell to back climate change resolution

By Gail Moss, IPE, International Publishers, 6 February 2015

The BP board of directors will be advising shareholders to support a resolution on climate change filed by more than 50 institutional investors at its annual general meeting (AGM) on 16 April.

The move comes only days after the board of Royal Dutch Shell said it was backing a similar resolution at its own AGM in May.

The special resolution – ‘Strategic resilience for 2035 and beyond’ – amplified by a supporting statement, calls for routine annual reporting from 2016 to include further information about certain activities related to climate change, including ongoing operational emissions management, asset portfolio resilience to the International Energy Agency’s scenarios, and public policy positions relating to climate change.

It has been filed by Aiming for A, a coalition of more than 50 institutional investors with portfolios totalling £160bn (€214bn), led by CCLA Investment Management, the specialist church and charity fund manager.

Its name is taken from the highest performance rating (A) of CDP (formerly the Carbon Disclosure Project), an NGO that rates the performance of global companies on climate change.

BP and Shell have the biggest carbon footprints of all the companies listed on the London Stock Exchange.

Edward Mason, head of responsible investment for the Church Commissioners, who are

members of the coalition, said: “The positive way in which BP and Shell have responded to our shareholder resolutions is completely unprecedented. This represents a step change in engagement between institutional shareholders and the oil and gas industry on the strategic challenge that climate change poses to the industry.”

Mason added: “The next step is for investors to back the boards of both companies and to vote for the disclosures that we have requested and that the companies have said they will provide. We look forward to seeing the new in-depth reporting from both companies later this year and to continued engagement.”

BP has not published a formal statement but said it had met the CCLA and other proposers of the resolution.

David Nicholas, spokesman at BP, told IPE: “The board has considered its response and told the proposers we will recommend the shareholders support it at the AGM.”

“The proposal is non-confrontational and gives us the opportunity to demonstrate our current actions and build on our existing disclosures in this area.”

Nicholas added that the decision had not been influenced by Shell’s own decision to back a similar resolution.

Details of BP’s response will be sent out to all shareholders with the notice of meeting in early March.

<http://www.ipe.com/news/esg/bp-follows-shell-to-back-climate-change-resolution/10006577.fullarticle>

Dr. Stan’s California water supply opinion

<http://mediaarchives.gsradio.net/radioliberty/121213d.mp3>

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters



Clean Air Performance Professionals

Saturday, November 22, 2014

Voluntary GMO corn fuel may reduce CO2 & Fuel cost to \$2 per gallon.

50% butanol mandate may raise fuel to \$10 per gallon.

Monopoly patent mandate may lower BP-DuPont stock value and profit while a move to voluntary may improve employee and customer relationship with improved profit. Win Win outcome.

MTBE is in our water and a pain to oil profit. Is it time to check California water for fuel ethanol? Time for food air & fuel price mitigation? Time for a AG conversation for consideration of a California fuel ethanol waiver?

UN supports voluntary GMO fuel, a waiver.

Go OOIDA, Clean Air Performance Professionals supports your fuel performance and price conversation, Fed EPA ethanol mandate stinks.

A random 'Smog Check' inspection & repair 'secret shopper' audit, ethanol cap and elimination of dual fuel CAFE credit can cut California "Wallet Flushing" car tax over 50% in 2015. (Prevent 2000 tons per day of sulfur, PM, HC, O3, NOx, CO & CO2.) Improved performance of AB32 by \$billions

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters



Clean Air Performance Professionals

Sunday, August 31, 2014

I'm confused, that a graph of ethanol used in our gas and the price we pay for fuel sure paints an interesting picture.

An op-ed from May 1, 2002 warned the legislation that is requiring ethanol might create an additional 10% increase in price.

An internet search indicated California fuel ethanol use was very minor and with a pump price of about \$1.37 per gallon of regular CA CARB fuel.

Fed EPA told CARB's board Chair to use 5.6% and the fuel price went up.

More time passed and the Arnold crew went for 10% and the price goes up.

We now are at 10% and considering 15% and the price has gone from about \$1.37 to \$3.50.

The California Government regulators say we use about 14 billion gallons of fuel per year.

So if the price has changed over \$2.-- in a decade the ethanol laced fuel price increase may be about \$40 Billion per year. Is it time for Governor Brown to request a waiver from EPA?

Does California use 1500 gallons of water to grow corn to produce 1 gallon of GMO corn fuel ethanol? Does California water providers check for ethanol in the supply water for public consumption? Should California request a waiver of the "Wallet Flushing" ethanol mandate so fuel ethanol ozone is in federal EPA compliance?

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

<http://www.wwntradio.com/news/news.php/displayType/article/15053/2013/12/sessions-vitter-demand-accounting-of-taxpayer-funds-wasted-on-epas-unnecessary-ozone-proposal>

December 18, 2013

CARB held the California Public hearing on ozone and Clean Air Performance Professionals (CAPP) used ethanol waiver as a ozone reduction method in our presentation to the fed EPA

CAPP's presentation also covered the confusing policy that gave a \$625,000 fine for baking bread that released ethanol that increased ozone was an example of EPA policy that mandated ethanol in the gas to reduce ozone. WHAT?

The conversation between the male lawyer of the panel with the honorable Gary Condit in early 2001 about bipartisan HR 52 to relieve California from federally mandated year-round gasoline oxygenate requirements while preserving the full benefits of California reformulated gasoline program was used as support for ozone reduction.

Is it time for California AG to have an ethanol waiver conversation with EPA?



Charlie Peters
510-537-1796

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Why Can't Wendy's and BP Get Along?

James Flaherty, Wall St. Cheat Sheet, June 22, 2013

As Congress considers scaling back or even abolishing U.S. government regulations mandating the use of renewable fuels, many in the petroleum industry are on cloud nine. That is, everyone except for British Petroleum (NYSE:BP).

Wait, what?

The reason BP isn't happy is because their joint venture with Dupont Co. (NYSE:DD), set to start producing a new alternative fuel by the end of the year, would have its market evaporated before they could enter it should Congress repeal the Renewable Fuels Standard, the law in question.

"They don't need to change the law," Paul Beckwith, the chief executive of the venture, Butamax Advanced Biofuels, of Wilmington, Delaware, said in an interview. The program "as it's currently configured is working, and there are good opportunities for increasing renewable levels beyond where they are today."

The RFS started in 2007 amid concerns of foreign oil dependence, according to Bloomberg. Congress set quotas for the use of alternative fuels, like ethanol and biodiesel. Under the law, refiners like Exxon Mobil (NYSE:XOM) must blend a certain amount of renewable fuels

into their gasoline.

The Environmental Protection Agency say the mandate helps production of American made fuels. They also assert that it helps corn farmers by increasing demand, and cuts emissions.

Critics say that the use of corn to make ethanol pushes up cost of food. The National Council of Chain Restaurants, whose members include Wendy's (NYSE:WEN) and White Castle, is angry because their commodity costs are spiking because of the increased demand for corn. After hiring an outside research firm to conduct a study, "It was very clear that the RFS was a cause of it," said Robert Green, the executive director of the Washington-based group.

Lobbyists from Exxon and Tesoro (NYSE:TSO) have a different complaint. They say that falling U.S. fuel demand means that requirements for ethanol could force its use in gas higher than the 10 percent allowed under government regulations.

The next two weeks will prove crucial for the RFS, as lobbyists from both sides take turns catching Washington's ear. Whichever side is more persuasive could save billions for their customers.

<http://wallstcheatsheet.com/stocks/why-cant-wendys-and-bp-get-along.html/>

(CAPP contact: Charlie Peters)

BP Defends Renewable-Fuel Rule Other Oil Companies Oppose

by Mark Drajem, Bloomberg, June 20, 2013

June 20 (Bloomberg) -- As Congress considers scaling back or abolishing U.S. rules that mandate the use of renewable fuels, it has the full-throated support of the petroleum industry -- with one major exception.

BP Plc, one of the world's biggest oil companies by revenue, is part of a joint venture with DuPont Co. that is set to start producing a new alternative fuel by the end of the year. In order to preserve a market for that fuel, the venture's officials are busy in Washington trying to convince lawmakers that the current system doesn't need an overhaul.

"They don't need to change the law," Paul Beckwith, the chief executive of the venture, Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC of Wilmington, Delaware, said in an interview. The program "as it's currently configured is working, and there are good opportunities for increasing renewable levels beyond where they are today."

The Renewable Fuel Standard, or RFS, dates in its current form to 2007, when concerns about dependence on overseas oil and a desire to curb the use of fossil fuels induced Congress to set quotas for the use of alternatives to gasoline or diesel, such as corn-based ethanol and biodiesel.

Under the law, refiners such as Exxon Mobil Corp. must blend a certain amount of renewable fuels into their gasoline each year, with their contribution determined by their share of the fuel market. The Environmental Protection Agency and renewable-fuel producers say the mandate spurs production of American-made fuels, helps corn farmers and cuts carbon emissions by replacing gasoline.

Lobbying Costs

The efforts of BP and Wilmington, Delaware-based DuPont, which together spent \$13.8 million on lobbying in 2012, show the fissures in the business community over the future of the rules, and the difficult path any overhaul must tread. A panel of the House Energy and Commerce Committee is set to hold a hearing on the program next week, as Republicans such as Representative Bob Goodlatte of Virginia push to scrap it.

In the Senate today, Republicans John Barrasso of Wyoming and Pat Toomey of Pennsylvania joined with Democrat Mark Pryor in proposing their own version of legislation to repeal the program.

"The Renewable Fuel Standard is fundamentally broken and beyond repair," Barrasso said in a statement. "Instead of delivering meaningful environmental benefits, it's driven up food and fuel costs for American families."

Separate Issues

Critics, ranging from motorcyclists to chicken farmers, focus on two separate issues. Food retailers and food charities complain that use of corn to make ethanol is pushing up the cost of food.

Local chain restaurant owners pestered their advocacy group, the National Council of Chain Restaurants, to find out why their commodity costs were spiking, according to Robert Green, the executive director of the Washington-based group. After hiring an outside research firm to conduct a study, "it was very clear that the RFS was a cause of it," he said in an interview. The group, whose members include White Castle and Wendy's Co., today started a campaign in Washington it calls the Feed Food Fairness to repeal the RFS.

Blendwall Danger

Lobbyists representing refiners such as Exxon, based in Irving, Texas, and Tesoro Corp. of Waltham, Massachusetts, raise a different objection to the mandates. They say falling U.S. fuel demand means that requirements for ethanol may force its use higher than the 10 percent that the government says is safe for all engines, exceeding what the industry calls "the blendwall."

"With each passing day or month we're going to see more movement" for repeal, Charles Drevna, president of the American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, which represents refiners such as Exxon and Tesoro, said in an interview.

Now the small collection of renewable-fuel producers are pushing back against those efforts, arguing that they will soon be making the kinds of next-generation fuels necessary to fill the growing government quotas while avoiding the damage to engines that worries the refiners.

Butamax Plant

Butamax plans to convert an existing ethanol plant to make biobutanol, a related fuel also made from corn that has lower greenhouse-gas emissions and doesn't present the same kind of refining issues as ethanol, according to the company.

"It completely overcomes the issues with the blendwall," Beckwith said before meeting this month with congressional staff members to discuss the issue.

The London-based BP, which in the U.S. has the capacity to refine 725,000 barrels of crude oil a day, is taking a slightly different position than the industry trade groups in

advocating for regulatory mending by EPA, not a legislated end.

"BP supports the goals of the RFS program to stimulate the development and deployment of biofuels technologies, and we believe that technologies like Butamax's will be an important part of our liquid transportation fuel mix," Matt Hartwig, a company spokesman, said. Still, "safely moving past the ethanol blendwall will require time and investment."

Iowa Corn

Butamax is not alone in pushing to preserve the program. Iowa's corn growers have flooded Washington to make their case, and to take aim at what they say are unfair subsidies that the oil industry gets.

Separately, ethanol producer Poet LLC of Sioux Falls, South Dakota, and Royal DSM NV, a Heerlen, Netherlands-based biotechnology company, are pushing ahead on a plant that will use crop residue such as corn cobs and husks to produce 20 million gallons of cellulosic biofuel a year. It plans to start full commercial production in early 2014.

The foes "continue to work hard to spread myths and misinformation about the RFS in an effort to return to a gasoline monopoly on transportation fuel, maintain their record profits, and serve their interests here and in the Middle East, Hugh Welsh, DSM's president for North America, said in an e-mail.

"The RFS is doing great things, and will continue to do so for the next 15 years," he said. "When presented with the facts and the results, our elected officials recognize this."

To contact the reporter on this story: Mark Drajem in Washington at mdrajem@bloomberg.net

To contact the editor responsible for this story: Jon Morgan at jmorgan97@bloomberg.net

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2013-06-20/bp-defends-renewable-fuel-rule-other-oil-companies-oppose>

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

State Sues BP, Arco Over Alleged Environmental Violations At Stations

San Francisco CBS Local, February 4, 2013 9:11 PM

OAKLAND (CBS SF) - California Attorney General Kamala Harris and district attorneys from seven counties across the state filed suit Monday alleging that BP and Arco have engaged in environmental violations at more than 780 gas stations in the state.

The lawsuit, filed in Alameda County Superior Court, alleges that BP West Coast Products, BP Products North America, Inc., and Atlantic Richfield Company have violated state laws governing hazardous materials and hazardous waste by failing to properly inspect and maintain underground tanks used to store gasoline for retail sale at gas stations in California.

Arco is a subsidiary of BP, which is headquartered in London.

Alameda County District Attorney Nancy O'Malley and prosecutors from Glenn, Merced, Nevada, Placer, San Bernardino, Stanislaus and Yuba counties joined Harris in filing the suit.

The suit claims that since October 2006 the BP companies and ARCO have improperly monitored, inspected and maintained underground storage tanks used to store gasoline for retail sale.

It alleges that the oil companies tampered with or disabled leak detection devices, and failed to test

secondary containment systems, conduct monthly inspections, train employees in proper protocol, and maintain operational alarm systems, among other violations.

The suit says inspectors from the Alameda County Department of Environmental Health obtained documents that showed that BP officials instructed their service stations in Alameda County to maintain gasoline leak detection sensors at a height contrary to California law.

The suit alleges that this resulted in leak detection sensors at multiple ARCO stations in the county to be positioned so they were unable to detect a fuel leak at the earliest possible opportunity.

Alameda County Deputy District Attorney Ken Misfud said prosecutors believe BP and Arco officials wanted less stringent leak detention standards to avoid having to shut down gas stations, as leaks can force stations to be closed for an entire day or longer and the companies consequently lose revenue.

The lawsuit also claims that the oil companies improperly handled and disposed of hazardous wastes and materials associated with the underground storage tanks at retail gas stations throughout the state.

The suit says a statewide investigation found violations of hazardous materials and hazardous waste laws and regulations at gas stations in 37 counties across the state, including 28 gas stations in Alameda County.

Misfud said the suit is seeking an injunction ordering BP and Arco to comply with state law as well as unspecified fines and legal costs.

Misfud said the fines theoretically could be large because state law allows prosecutors to seek a fine of between \$500 and \$5,000 for each violation for every day there's a violation.

The attorney general's office filed a similar lawsuit against Phillips 66 and ConocoPhillips in January 2012.

O'Malley said in a statement, "The laws that regulate proper handling and storage of hazardous materials are not trivial. They exist to protect the precious and finite public resource that is a clean and safe environment."

O'Malley said, "When a fuel leak occurs it can contaminate the soil and groundwater for decades. We will not tolerate the dangerous and irresponsible practice of cutting corners on environmental

regulations."

Harris said in a statement, "Safe storage of gasoline is not only common sense, it is essential to protecting the integrity of California's groundwater resources. California's hazardous waste laws safeguard public health and this lawsuit ensures proper maintenance of the tanks that store fuel beneath California's communities."

BP said in a statement, "The majority of these alleged incidents are procedural violations concerning documentation. A small number of the alleged violations relate to the monitoring of tanks. None of the alleged violations posed any harm to human health or the environment."

BP said the attorney general's office "has been pursuing underground storage tank litigation with the refining industry for several years now" and BP, like other companies before it, has been in negotiations with the attorney general's office to try to settle the alleged violations.

The oil company said, "BP takes compliance seriously and has a comprehensive program to maintain compliance. As soon as BP learned about the alleged violations, BP took appropriate action to address the issues."

(Copyright 2013 by CBS San Francisco and Bay City News Service. All Rights Reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.)

<http://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2013/02/04/state-sues-bp-arco-over-alleged-environmental-violations-at-gas-stations/>

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

California sues oil company for environmental violations

By East Bay News, KGO-TV, February 04, 2013

ALAMEDA, Calif. -- State Attorney General Kamala Harris is going after Arco and its parent company BP. In a lawsuit filed Monday, the state attorney general and seven counties are accusing the oil company of violating regulations designed to protect the environment.

The Arco gas station at Park Street and Encinal Avenue in Alameda, one of 7,000 Arco stations named in the suit, was deemed to be among the worst environmental violators in Alameda County.

Alameda County Deputy District Attorney Ken Misfud explains, "One of the most important regulations is to require certain sensors be inside certain areas of the underground storage compartment to make sure that if there is a fuel leak it's detected." He said.

The underground storage tanks at the Alameda station had sensors but instead of being placed next to the ground they were an inch above the ground so that the sensors would not go off unless the leak was severe.

"BP was actually instructing their service stations here in Alameda County that they can be raised up to an inch," Misfud said.

"That would allow for a leak that wouldn't be detected for quite some time," he said.

Misfud says that sensor violation was the most egregious. Most of the other violations named in the suit have to do with maintaining equipment, proper monitoring, and training.

In a statement to ABC7 News, BP said the bulk of the allegations were procedural violations concerning documentation.

The statement read, "A small number of the alleged violations relate to the monitoring of tanks. None of the alleged violations posed any harm to human health or the environment."

BP suggests the attorney general is going after oil companies for money. The attorney general recently settled a similar case against Chevron for \$24 million. There is another factor at play; Arco is selling off its stations. The station in Alameda was sold a little over a year ago, and the company is unloading more of them.

The deputy district attorney speculates that Arco's reason to sell is economic. The stations are liabilities for environmental problems like leaking underground storage tanks.

http://abclocal.go.com/story?section=news/local/east_bay&id=8980676

Does California use 1500 gallons of water to grow corn to produce 1 gallon of GMO corn fuel ethanol? Does California water providers check for ethanol in the supply water for public consumption? Should California request a waiver of the "Wallet Flushing" ethanol mandate so fuel ethanol ozone is in federal EPA compliance?

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

EPA refuses to waive ethanol mandate

By Ben Geman, The Hill, 11/16/12

The Environmental Protection Agency is rejecting requests from states and meat industry groups to waive regulations that require the blending of ethanol into gasoline.

EPA rejected petitions from nearly a dozen states, including Texas, Virginia, and Maryland, for waivers of the federal Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS).

"[T]he agency has not found evidence to support a finding of severe 'economic harm' that would warrant granting a waiver of the Renewable Fuels Standard," EPA said Friday.

Opponents of the RFS say drought-driven spikes in corn prices and reduced harvests should prompt the agency to relax the requirements, which require refiners to blend billions of gallons of ethanol into gasoline.

Livestock, poultry and food industry groups dismayed at the amount of corn used for ethanol have joined states in calling for EPA to back off the ethanol mandate. EPA also faced congressional pressure to ease the requirements.

But EPA tossed aside their arguments.

"We recognize that this year's drought has created hardship in some sectors of the economy, particularly for livestock producers," said Gina McCarthy, EPA's top air regulator, in a statement. "But our extensive analysis makes clear that Congressional requirements for a waiver have not been met and that waiving the RFS will have little, if any, impact," she said.

The ethanol industry applauded EPA's decision.

Renewable Fuels Association President Bob Dinneen lauded EPA for "basing its decision on thoughtful analysis of the facts and not emotion or panic," and said the fuel standard

is working as designed.

"The flexibility that is built into the RFS allows the marketplace to ration demand, not the government. Indeed, the ethanol industry has responded to the market by reducing output by approximately 12%. Other users of corn have responded to a lesser degree," he said in a statement.

EPA is requiring 13.2 billion gallons of ethanol to be blended into gasoline in 2012, rising to 13.8 billion next year.

The decision drew quick attacks from food groups and environmentalists.

"This year's catastrophic drought seriously reduced corn yields and has led to a situation where the RFS' unsustainable mandates force ethanol fuel to commandeer a shrunken pool of available corn for food and livestock feed," said Rob Green, executive director of the National Council of Chain Restaurants.

Said Michal Rosenoer, biofuels policy campaigner at Friends of the Earth: "If the worst U.S. drought in more than 50 years and skyrocketing food prices are not enough to make EPA act, it falls to Congress to provide relief from our senseless federal support for corn ethanol."

But EPA largely disagreed with claims that waiving the ethanol mandate would affect prices.

"EPA's analysis shows that it is highly unlikely that waiving the RFS volume requirements will have a significant impact on ethanol production or use in the relevant time frame that a waiver could apply (the 2012-2013 corn marketing season) and therefore little or no impact on corn, food, or fuel prices," EPA said in a summary of its decision.

The ethanol mandate was first created in a 2005 energy law and expanded in 2007 legislation.

<http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/268453-epa-rejects-bids-to-waive-ethanol-mandate>

Does California use 1500 gallons of water to grow corn to produce 1 gallon of GMO corn fuel ethanol? Does California water providers check for ethanol in the supply water for public consumption? Should California request a waiver of the "Wallet Flushing" ethanol mandate so fuel ethanol ozone is in federal EPA compliance?

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

For Release: June 16, 2010, Contact: David Almasi at (202) 543-4110 x11 or (703) 568-4727 or dalmasi@nationalcenter.org, or Judy Kent at (703) 759-7476 or jkent@nationalcenter.org

Obama Pushes BP-Inspired Cap-and-Trade Bill in Speech to Nation; The National Center for Public Policy Research Calls on the Senate to Reject the "BP Bill"

Both BP CEO Hayward and Obama Support Big Government Efforts to Discourage Fossil Fuels

Washington, D.C. – Responding to President Obama's speech on the oil disaster in the Gulf of Mexico, The National Center for Public Policy Research is calling attention to BP's role in pushing Obama's cap-and-trade energy policy.

BP was a founding member of the United States Climate Action Partnership – a lobbying coalition that played a key role in passing the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade bill that passed the House of Representatives last year and the company also played a role in negotiating the terms of the Kerry-Lieberman bill recently introduced in the Senate.

"It's ironic that Obama is touting legislation inspired by BP. While Obama criticized the oil industry's influence over its regulators he failed to mention the role BP was playing in influencing the president's cherished cap-and-trade legislation," said Tom Borelli, Ph.D., Director of the National Center's Free Enterprise Project.

"Maybe in addition to the tragedy in the Gulf, Obama and BP CEO Tony Hayward will discuss cap-and-trade legislative strategy when they meet," added Tom Borelli.

According to The Hill, "Hayward indicated he was encouraged by the effort by Sens. John Kerry (D-Mass.), Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) and Joseph Lieberman (I-Conn.) to write compromise climate legislation." Other media outlets reported on BP's effort to improve the elements of the bill.

Senator Kerry also mentioned BP as one of the companies that supports his cap-and-trade bill.

"Given BP's incompetence and its awful record

with environmental and safety matters, it's outrageous elected officials allow the company to influence legislation. Maybe if BP spent less time and money in lobbying and more on safety we would not be suffering from this environmental disaster," said Deneen Borelli, fellow with Project 21.

"The public should demand that the 'BP Bill' be soundly rejected by the Senate. It's outrageous that elected officials are bashing BP in public while they seek their advice in private," said Deneen Borelli.

Deneen Borelli also commented on Obama downplaying the cost of cap-and-trade to Americans. During the presidential campaign Obama said, "Under my plan of a cap-and-trade system electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket. Businesses would have to retrofit their operations. That will cost money. They will pass that cost onto consumers."

Last night Obama minimized the cost, saying, "Now, there are costs associated with this transition."

"It's shocking the degree to which Obama is misleading the American people about the cost of cap-and-trade. Obama's priorities are with his progressive ideology and not with the interests of 'we the people'," Deneen Borelli said.

The National Center For Public Policy Research is a conservative, free-market non-profit think-tank established in 1982. It is supported by the voluntary gifts of over 100,000 individual recent supporters, and receives less than one percent of its revenue from corporate sources.

-30-

501 Capitol Court, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002, Ph (202) 543-4110, Fax (202) 543-5975

info@nationalcenter.org

www.nationalcenter.org

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters