

Submitter: Kyle Morgan
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Climate, Energy, and Environment
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB2738

The absence of scientific studies on this issue is glaring. Environmental regulations and health safety protocols require data-driven decision-making, especially when suggesting policy changes that can disrupt local economies and lifestyles. The decision to propose bills such as this should be based on thorough research and a clear understanding of the impact, particularly regarding air quality. However, no research has been presented to show that racing events using leaded gasoline contribute to hazardous air conditions that would justify this bill. This raises serious questions about the motives behind such proposals.

Without solid research to justify the claim that these racing events are hazardous to public health, the bill to ban leaded gas at venues appears more like an overreaction or even a politically motivated maneuver. The lack of scientific studies and the lack of transparency surrounding the decision-making process suggest that the real reasons for these closures may be something other than environmental or public health concerns.

Given the absence of supporting studies, one must consider the possibility of ulterior motives behind this bill. Racing events can attract large crowds, generate significant revenue for local economies, and bring exposure to communities that would otherwise remain relatively unknown. With such economic value at stake, closing down a track could have a devastating impact on the local businesses and the people who rely on the income generated by these events. Is it possible that behind the push to cripple race tracks is an effort to redirect resources or investments to areas with more lucrative or politically favorable projects? If there is no scientific basis for these closures, it begs the question of whether something more sinister is at play.

Motorsports have long been a target for those who oppose racing culture or view it as a symbol of excess. The push for closure could be framed as a moral or environmental victory, but in reality, it could simply be a battle against a cultural institution that has a long and storied history.

Beyond the environmental argument, this bill could lead to the closure of a race track and this could have far-reaching consequences for the local community. Race tracks often provide jobs, from track staff to hospitality workers and vendors. The loss of a race track means the loss of a gathering place that is important not just for fans but also for the local economy. The social fabric that binds the community together

through these events would be severely damaged. Furthermore, a closure could lead to unintended consequences, such as the displacement of events to less-regulated venues where safety protocols may not be as stringent, and the ecological impact may be even greater. It is essential to take these factors into account before rushing to judgment based on unsubstantiated claims about air quality and environmental harm.

Proponents of such a bill often point to the use of leaded gasoline as a reason to shut down racing events, but without any scientific studies to support these claims, such proposals are rooted in speculation rather than fact. The lack of evidence raises serious concerns about the true motivations behind these efforts. The potential economic and social harm to communities must also be weighed in the balance. Until solid research can demonstrate that motorsport events are harming public health or the environment in a measurable way, it seems that closing down race tracks is not only an unnecessary decision but one that could be driven by factors other than the welfare of nearby residents.