Oregon Global Warming Commission – Public Comment -1/6/2022 Meeting.

Sent via form submission from *Keep Oregon Cool*

Name: Gail Sabbadini

Email Address: ggsabba@gmail.com

Subject: Energy conservation

Message: I agree with the ideas listed in today's Bend Bulletin for addressing climate change. I would also add to encourage and educate people as to how they can reduce their individual daily energy use and thereby reduce their energy costs as we see the transition to all electric homes and vehicles. Thank you for all you are doing to reduce GHGs. It is a most urgent issue.

Sent via form submission from *Keep Oregon Cool*

Name: Daniel Olson

Email Address: dnolsonny@msn.com

Subject: Recommendation to Eliminate Gasoline Powered Leaf Blowers

Message: Oregon Global Warming Commission:

The December 31, 2021, Bend Bulletin listed possible recommendations for your commission to consider regarding Oregon's climate action plan.

Please consider the elimination of gasoline-powered leaf blowers in the battle to reduce carbon emissions.

Backpack leaf blowers operate with 2-cycle engines and, as such, emit CO2 as well as VOCs during use. (See Microsoft Word - IEI 2015 Paper_Final_041015 (epa.gov), which concludes that equipment of this sort is "an important source of toxic and carcinogenic exhaust and fine particulate matter").

Why can't we restrict the use of gasoline-powered leaf blowers within the state of Oregon, at least in urban areas? There are already many communities that place restrictions on leaf blowers. Some examples: White Plains, NY prohibits the use of leaf blowers that produce more than 70 dBA. Naples, Florida prohibits the use of gasoline-powered leaf blowers within the city. Los Angeles, CA prohibits the use of gasoline-powered leaf blowers within 500 feet of a residence. Pasadena, CA outlaws the use of leaf blowers that produce more than 65 dBa when measured from a distance of 50 feet. There are many other examples that make it clear that my suggestion is not unreasonable.

During the summer, lawn services operate leaf blowers day in and day out. The main purpose for their use is to blow grass clippings and leaves off sidewalks and around yards. The benefit is that yards look

nice, but it is done by releasing CO2 while also exceeding noise limits set by most cities.

I urge your commission to recommend eliminating the use of "industrial grade" leaf blowers. Critics of possible recommendations say that they will have wrenching impacts on businesses and consumers. Elimination of gasoline-powered leaf blowers, which I consider to be “low hanging fruit” in the push to reduce carbon emissions, would not have such liabilities.

Thank you for your consideration.

Daniel R Olson, PhD

Sent via form submission from *Keep Oregon Cool*

Name: Cory Little

Email Address: evolvingmonkeys@gmail.com

Subject: Making wise investments for green energy transportation

Message: I first feel it is necessary to point out that the attempt to convert our transportation infrastructure to run on chemical batteries is both financially futile and environmentally catastrophe. There are much better options:
The energy contained in liquid nitrogen is nearly the same energy density as lithium batteries, and compressed air is an even cheaper alternative to power our vehicles, although the range of compressed air is more limited. The mechanics of using these energy sources is nearly identical to steam, except; instead of using combustibles to expend the liquid into a gas, it only takes heat exchangers to allow the ambient heat in the surrounding air to expand the fluid. Since liquid nitrogen must remain at less than -250° F to remain a liquid, it will begin to quickly expand the moment it leaves thermal containment. This pressure can be used to move pistons and create motion. These vehicles would cost a fraction of the cost of an EV or ICEV, be more reliable, last longer, and easier to maintain. This is without a doubt the fuel of the future, but how much destruction and money must be wasted building short lived very expensive chemical batteries before society realizes it's a dead end? this is the question?
The role of government in this transition is to make compressed air and liquid nitrogen available at a low cost or free. Since it's just a conversion of energy; that fuel can be provided indefinitely by a one time investment in solar or wind powered compressors and cryocoolers. The inefficiencies can be easily compensated by a one time investment in additional energy creation at a far lower cost than battery storage. This makes the cost of operating compressed air and liquid nitrogen vehicles lower at every stage, from initial construction, fueling, maintenance, and disposal. The recharge time is much faster than a battery, making it realistic for use in long haul trucks. Since every part of a liquid nitrogen or compressed air vehicle can be made from recycled materials, and our supply if nitrogen is nearly limitlessness, it's the most environmentally responsible. Since it's also the least expensive, and most dependable, it is the obvious choice for powering our infrastructure.

Thank you for your time

The creation of the first public compressed air filling station could be built on publicly owned property for less than $50,000 and would allow for the start of a transition to fully sustainable transportation. A liquid nitrogen station would cost a bit more, but would allow for long range vehicles to be utilized. The government must step up and take measures to make this happen, to do the research, find out the materials are not actually available for a battery powered infrastructure, and point our society in the right direction.