

New Way to Go Green: Auto Transport

By 1 Auto Transport

In the Sacramento Bee, Friday, March 4, 2011

LAKESWOOD, N.J., March 4, 2011 -- /PRNewswire/ -- The green revolution is a movement that is growing rapidly. An area that is lacking, however, and may be causing a large part of the greenhouse effect is that of the auto industry. Each year new models for hybrid cars are introduced, but many of these cars are concept cars. Even the ones that are ready to be sold have a hefty price tag that few people have the means to pay. A new and easy way to help is by using auto transport. 1 Auto Transport has now implemented revolutionary techniques to help reduce carbon emission.

The Department of Energy published an estimate of the amount of carbon dioxide one gallon of gasoline produces, the average mpg used by a car, the carbon dioxide emitted by one gallon of diesel, and the average mpg for one auto transport truck. The numbers are staggering. Within a year, one auto transport company saved 2,926,000 gallons of fuel and reduced the emission of greenhouse gases by 38,216,000 pounds. Studies show that if there was one auto transporter in each state, there would be national savings of almost 150 million gallons of fuel and 2 billion pounds of greenhouse gases.

1 Auto Transport has employed exclusive major reforms in an effort to make these numbers a reality. They constantly invest in the research and development of newer and more fuel-efficient flatbed trucks and trailers for enclosed auto transport. Their use of cutting-edge technology helps reduce the carbon emission caused by transit.

Another measure 1 Auto Transport has taken is to ensure that auto haulers are fully booked, and only make trips with a full load of cars, reducing the amount of trips needed. They also try to use terminals or pickup and drop-off locations that are close to main highways, in order to minimize the length of each trip. They work with numerous car dealers and manufacturers to ensure that new cars going to dealerships travel with a full load, instead of using the manufacturer's own car shipping trailer, and making the trip half empty.

1 Auto Transport offers customers low auto transport rates in an effort to make auto transport feasible for more people. They also work to bring awareness to the cause by urging consumers to consider auto transport for many situations. Mass transit with car shipping can be a convenient and eco-friendly option for college students, military transfers, snowbirds, and others. Aside for the green aspect, cheap auto transport may also be a more economical choice, saving customers the price of gas, hotels, food, etc. along their trip. They urge Americans to buy American cars, thereby reducing the carbon footprint left by cars coming from overseas.

Society still has a long way to go to reach a greener environment. 1 Auto Transport is making a start by getting more cars off the road.

Find out more at <http://www.1autotransport.com> or call Joe Kraus at 888-288-6081.

Industry Scrutinizes Bay Area Air District Plan To Hike Multiple Fees

Inside Cal/EPA, Feb. 25, 2011

Oil refinery representatives and other industry groups are expected to closely scrutinize a Bay Area air district proposal to raise a variety of regulatory fees tied to traditional air pollution programs. The district says it is hiking its fees in order to continue its long-term goal of increasing the amount of fee revenue to recover program costs.

Industry officials plan to examine the fee increases in part to determine if they may conflict with Proposition 26, which was enacted by voters last year, sources said. They also plan to establish whether the fees make a clear, required "nexus" between what the industry pays and the services the district provides, sources said.

Industry groups fear the across-the-board fee hikes could spark a new trend among air districts that are seeking more revenue during tough economic times, sources said.

With the passage of Proposition 26 last year, environmentalists, industry officials and regulators have heightened their analyses of whether environmental program fees are actually taxes. Prop. 26 requires that new or revised government fees under certain conditions be required to receive a two-thirds vote of the state Legislature or local government bodies or local voters to take effect.

The measure was supported by anti-tax groups such as the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association. Environmentalists strongly opposed the initiative.

The Bay Area air district is scheduled March 14 to host a public meeting to discuss with stakeholders its draft amendments to Regulation 3, which deals with fees on pollution sources.

Under the plan, fee hikes would take effect July 1. The hikes are aimed at helping the district recover through fees a greater share of the costs it incurs in implementing and enforcing its programs for stationary sources of emissions, the district says.

For example, the district is proposing to raise its hearing board fees by 14%, raise its fees on combustion of fuels by 10%, and raise by 14% fees on "gasoline transfer at gas dispensing facilities, bulk plants and terminals." Other fee increases include: 14% for semiconductor operations, 14% on dry cleaners, 14% on solid waste disposal sites, and 14% for major facility reviews. *A copy of the district proposal is available at InsideEPA.com. See page 2 for details.* The district also plans on 10%-14% fee increases for "miscellaneous sources," which include a broad range of operations such as cement and asphalt plants, refinery and chemical plant process units, and furnaces.

A district source said the agency is seeking the fee increases because fee revenue is down by a few percent from projections for the current fiscal year. The primary objective of the plan, however, is to continue toward a longer-term goal of increasing the degree to which fees recover program activity costs, the district source said. For the district's last fiscal year, fee revenue covered just 62% of regulatory program costs even though 100% is authorized by state law, the source noted.

The remaining fee revenue "gap" is filled by the district's second largest source of revenue: county property taxes. But this revenue source has flattened and may decrease, the district source said.

The district does not believe any of the fee increases conflict with Prop. 26, the source said. The fees fit the definition of "regulatory fees," which are used to recover costs of permitting, inspections, and related activities, the district source said.

An oil industry source said there is always a concern that other air districts may copy the Bay Area's action and also raise fees. The source acknowledged the district's assertion that state law may allow for 100% recovery of costs through fees, but added that there needs to be a direct nexus between the fee and regulation of the source paying the fee. It would also be unreasonable to request businesses to pay fees to a local district on programs administered by the state, which would make such fees duplicative, the source argued.

The industry will be analyzing all of the fee increases "in the context of both Prop. 26 and in the context of ensuring they are not duplicative of the fees we are being charged" under state programs run by the Air Resources Board, for example, the source said. "It is really important that all these types of fee increases be put to the Prop. 26 test to determine if there is a conflict or not."