

HB 1110

Representative Joe Fitzgibbon (D-Seattle) is the sole sponsor of the bill.

Bill Digest:

Supports the deployment of clean transportation fuel technologies through a carefully designed program that reduces the carbon intensity of fuel used in the state, in order to: (1) Reduce levels of conventional air pollutants from diesel and gasoline that are harmful to public health; (2) Reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with transportation fuels, which are the state's largest source of greenhouse gas emissions; and (3) Create jobs and spur economic development based on innovative clean fuel technologies. Requires the joint legislative audit and review committee to: (1) Analyze, by December 1, 2027, the impacts of the initial five years of clean fuels program implementation; and (2) Submit a report to the legislature that summarizes the analysis.

Talking Points:

1. Summarization
 - a. House Bill 1110 would establish a clean fuel standard for vehicles similar to Oregon, California, and British Columbia.
2. Cost of HB 1110
 - a. The cost analysis only details administrative costs of \$750k to \$1m a year.
 - b. The bill does call for a cost-benefit analysis — in 2027, long after it's in place.
 - i. At a minimum, legislators should know what these policies might cost state government.
 - c. The policy is likely to raise fuel prices.
 - i. It is best to look at states who have enacted similar policies for the potential costs associated with this bill.
 - ii. California's nonpartisan legislative research office recently assessed their costs.
 1. The office estimated the clean fuel standard increased gasoline prices 13 cents per gallon last year and will add 46 cents by 2030.
 - a. That effect is comparable to Initiative 1631, which was recently rejected by WA State voters.
 2. They also found that it is not a cost-effective way to reduce emissions.
3. Social Costs of HB 1110
 - a. People in cities are less affected by fuel costs than those in rural areas.
 - b. Energy cost burdens are greater for lower-income households.
 - c. Much of Tuesday night's debate revolved around how the bill might impact Washington's rural areas. Republican lawmakers argued the proposal would cost jobs.
 - i. "This policy is so detrimental to my district, to my constituents," said Rep. Rep. Luanne Van Werven, R-Lynden, whose Whatcom County district is home to oil refineries.