

SB 543 is an admirable environmental goal. It is not a good health policy without existing options statewide. We have done several such type bills that urban knows better than rural people. Neutrality does resolve cost and supply chain issues. Supply issues that are driving citizens out of their homes. The 2025 date does nothing to change the economic impacts let alone the short-term health impacts. If the date was 2027 or 2029, maybe the private sector could respond with new environmentally friendly options, but it would have to be nationwide at a minimum to be economical. It is interesting some cities have determined they want to do it, thus, the rest of the state including small cities and counties should be forced into it now. Adding this at this time, simply means the large corporations get to survive over locally owned business. And poorer citizens get to pay the largest price.