

07 March 2023

Senate Committee on Energy and Environment

Re: Senate Bill 803

Dear Chair Senator Sollman, Vice-Chair Senator Findley, and members of the Committee;

Defenders of SB 803 and similar bills forcing non-fossil based diesel fuel use on the public insist it's a much cleaner fuel because it doesn't come from the ground, but from plants – mainly soybeans. However, to increase the use of plant based fossil fuel in the amounts required to satisfy current Renewable Fuel Standards means more arable land be put into use to produce the plants required. This particular aspect is seldom discussed when by supporters pushing for so-called 'clean' bio-diesel mandates.

Corn and soybean acreage, the main source, has reached record highs in recent years and this increase in monoculture comes at a cost. For one thing, indirectly raising food prices.

It is now becoming clear, taking a close look at EPA's assumptions and at emerging credible research, that food-based biofuels' environmental impact is as bad or often worse than the oil and gasoline it is meant to replace. For along with expansion of more arable land to satisfy the requirements of biofuel mandates comes a need for more use of pesticides and fertilizers, which may leach into groundwater, aquifers, streams and rivers, bringing wildlife habitat and bio-diversity destruction, e.g., the "dead zones" we hear about in the Gulf of Mexico caused from fertilizer run-off.

Soy and other sourced bio-diesel have two times the emissions of fossil fuels. Studies have suggested that the RFS as a whole "may be an ineffective policy for reducing global green house gas emissions."

How is this good for Oregonians? Somehow supporters of forcing upon us non-fossil based diesel fuel requirements oddly seem to think the long-term consequences of doing so won't affect Oregonians.

This effort to decarbonize the world has a long and colorful history (beginning in the 1960s) and it's unfortunate that history is seldom discussed or even mentioned. But, we are stuck with the current, dominant theories – which have little to nothing to do with protecting the Earth's environment and everything to do with who pays and who gets paid.

While the sponsors and supporters of SB 803 believe deep down in their hearts they are saving the planet. In reality they are impeding Oregon's progress – and prosperity, except perhaps for those dealing in carbon dioxide "equivalents."

I urge the Committee to table this bill. Oregon has, from the beginning, gotten way ahead of itself in it's efforts to "save the planet."

Sincerely,



Richard Wisner