

Submitter: Stuart Reitz

On Behalf Of:

Committee: House Committee On Climate, Energy, and Environment

Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB2960

The Honorable John Lively, Chair
House Committee on Climate, Energy and Environment

House Bill 2960 - Plastic Conversion and Depolymerization Facilities Ban: OPPOSE

Dear Chair Lively and Committee Members,

HB 2960 has good intentions, but it takes an overly simplistic view of the range and quality of waste plastics and the complete scope of the environmental and economic costs of different recycling processes. For example, irrigation drip tape is not suitable for mechanical recycling because of soil contamination. Simply trying to clean these plastics to make them suitable for mechanical recycling would require tremendous amounts of water and energy. It would also require large amounts of diesel to transport these plastics to distant cleaning and recycling facilities.

In contrast, chemical recycling facilities could be scaled to the needs of local communities. Diesel fuel produced through chemical recycling would supplement the diesel that farmers are already using, and it could be produced at a lower environmental and economic cost than attempting to mechanically recycle agricultural plastics. And chemical recycling certainly is a much better option than placing more plastics in landfills.

I appreciate concerns about minimizing pollution from chemical recycling. However, technology that is now available can be deployed to minimize potential pollution from chemical recycling.

Please consider the broader picture of the costs and benefits of recycling processes. A ban on chemical recycling would not be in the best interests of the people of Oregon.