

From: Randall Henderson
To: [HTP Exhibits](#)
Subject: Comments on HB 2109
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 10:39:14 AM

DATE: February 17, 2017
TO: House Committee on Transportation Policy
RE: HB 2109 (hearing date February 22, 2017)

Honored Chair and Committee Members,

I am writing to express my opposition to HB 2109, which would ban the use, sale or storage of leaded aviation fuel as after January 1, 2022.

I am an active pilot and aircraft owner. I am also a tree hugger, and not ashamed to say it. I do a lot of conservation work in my spare time, some of which involves survey and photographic documentation flights related to land conservation. I donate my time, fuel and other expenses when doing that work.

So I speak as someone who is deeply invested in the environment, not just a guy who likes to fly his plane regardless of the environmental impacts. My opposition to HB 2109 may seem like a contradiction, but lets look at the facts.

Many aircraft engines designed to burn 100LL avgas can not be easily or cheaply converted to run on currently available unleaded fuels, and with some models (and many owners) it is simply not be practical to do so. For obvious reasons, certification of a new aviation fuel is a long and expensive process, which is why we've been stuck with leaded avgas for so long. And while lead emissions from avgas have never reached the federal air quality standard, FAA and the aviation industry as a whole are just as interested as I am to get the stuff out of our avgas, which is why they teamed up several years ago to develop an unleaded replacement for 100LL. Now that process is close to producing an alternative, but once that occurs, full adoption is likely to take some time. And well it should, because safety of flight is what's at stake here, and as every pilot knows, rushing things in aviation inevitably leads to smoking holes in the ground.

Once an unleaded replacement becomes available, market forces, environmental pressures and possibly future federal action will undoubtedly be sufficient to cause an effective phase-out of 100LL, at a pace that doesn't compromise safety or create an undue burden on an industry that represents over \$3 billion dollars of economic impact and more than 16,000 jobs in Oregon¹.

As a native Oregonian, I am proud of our state's heritage of being at the forefront of environmental protection. But in the case of HB 2109, Oregon is just playing catch-up, and tripping on its toes in the process. Let the processes already in motion run their course, there is no need for this well-intentioned but unnecessary and potentially damaging legislation.

Respectfully,

Randall Henderson
Clatsop County, Oregon

1. PriceWaterhouse, *Contribution of General Aviation to the US Economy in 2013*