

Dear Members of the Senate Environment and Natural Resources Policy and Legacy Finance Committee:

As a long-time corn and soybean farmer and lifelong resident of Minnesota, I have followed the recent implications and concerns surrounding our state's adoption of the Minnesota Zero Emissions Vehicle (ZEV) mandate since it was first introduced. Working as a corn and soybean farmer, these issues affect me personally, and I will continue to express the urgency that surrounds the need to oppose the adoption of these rules in our state. I applaud the Senate Committee on Environment and Natural Resources Finance for holding your hearing on October 3 addressing the California Clean Car Standards. I wish to submit the following letter for the record, and along of my recent writings on this topic, for this committee hearing.

In August, California's governor announced his state will now ban the sale of any internal combustion engines starting in 2035. That means no gas-powered cars or pickups. With the current ZEV mandate in Minnesota, our state adopted California's Low Emission Vehicle and Zero Emission Vehicle standards and will direct the amount of light-and medium-duty vehicles available for sale in Minnesota car lots. Considering the new mandate in Minnesota relied on California regulations, farmers like me are extremely worried that Minnesota officials will take this more aggressive step in banning all gas-powered vehicles and mandating the sale of 100 percent electric vehicles in our state.

The adoption of the ZEV mandate carries many negative impacts that will harm our state's vital corn and soybean farmers like me. Corn and soybean farming remains at the forefront of Minnesota's agricultural sector and provides for and creates biodiesel - a renewable, clean-burning diesel replacement - and ethanol blended fuels. Soybean farming provides the necessary oil to create biodiesel fuel and they start the base of our food chain. To add to its value, biodiesel, created from soybeans, works seamlessly with our state's existing infrastructure and vehicles. Today, more than 78% of diesel vehicles coming off production lines are approved for up to B20 use.

Mandating the sale of EVs will distort the marketplace and discriminate against any and all opportunities to achieve GHG emission reductions through the use of ethanol blended fuels and biodiesel, eliminating the need for the fuels in their entirety. Mandating more electric vehicles than are expected to sell will increase costs and mean consumers will be severely limited in the choices of vehicles they have to purchase.

However, this mandate doesn't just affect farmers; it also places a target on the auto dealers of our state. With this new MN ZEV mandate, in 2025, Minnesota dealers could be required to stock ~26% electric vehicles on their lots, or more than 65,000 vehicles – which is three times as many electric vehicles as have been registered in the state since 2011. This drastic change could ultimately nullify the sale all liquid fuels vehicles including internal combustion vehicles, thereby harming the auto industry in its entirety.

State Senator Andrew Matthews' Minnesota Consumer Choice of Fuel Act does an admirable job of emphasizing the idea that this mandate is not made for our home state of Minnesota. Simply put, Minnesota and California have vastly different economic landscapes and, in turn, vastly different needs when it comes to this topic. The Act emphasizes the need to ensure that consumers have the right to choose what vehicle they prefer, after all, everyone has different personal, familial or business needs.

Our state of Minnesota vastly depends on corn and soybean farming. We also enjoy the opportunity to have a choice when it comes to providing for the needs of ourselves and our families. A mandate of this

magnitude – especially if Minnesota officials adopt California’s new more aggressive regulations – would be exponentially detrimental to our state and would also jeopardize our electric grid infrastructure. Lawmakers in Minnesota should prioritize getting this mandate repealed and withdrawn.

Minnesota is not California and it never will be.

Sincerely,

Wanda Patsche  
Corn and Soybean Farmer  
Editor of MNFarmLiving.com  
Welcome, Minnesota

**Enclosures:**

<https://www.mnfarmliving.com/2022/08/electric-vehicle-mandates-have-we-had-enough-yet.html>

## *Electric Vehicle Mandates. Have We Had Enough Yet?*

August 28, 2022 By **WANDA PATSCHE**

I am going to be very upfront. I have been pushed to the edge with the force our government is taking in controlling our lives. The unapologetic push for electric vehicle mandates is at the top of the list of unnecessary government controls. Let’s look at what’s going on.

### **CALIFORNIA AND MINNESOTA’S ELECTRIC VEHICLE MANDATES**

In 2021, the state of Minnesota requires carmakers to deliver for sale in Minnesota a gradually increasing number of vehicles with low or zero tailpipe emissions each year, which includes electric vehicles. So what/who determines how fast and to what level the state of Minnesota decides the requirements for future clean car standards? Minnesota had a choice.

The state could either follow California’s clean car standards or follow the federal fuel emission standards. The MPCA, through a rule-making process, followed California. California has much higher standards and requirements than the federal standards.

Minnesota is the largest and only Midwest state to sign on with California's fuel emission standards. There was zero legislative involvement in the decision-making process. Therein lies the problem.

### **Minnesota is NOT California.**

Following the California Clean Car act means higher prices for everyone. There will be fewer vehicles that people will want to buy on dealership lots. There are reports that estimate the prices of a car on a dealer lot will increase up to \$2,500. The average Minnesotan cannot afford that.

Now let's fast forward to 2022. California's governor is now banning the sale of any internal combustion engines starting in 2035. That means no gas-powered cars or pickups. This is not a joke. No question, the governor is out of touch with America.

### **WILL MINNESOTA BE REQUIRED TO FOLLOW THE NEWEST CALIFORNIA CLEAN CAR MANDATES?**

No, not as of right now. Unless the state chooses to move with them.

### **WHAT IS THE PROBLEM WITH MANDATING ELECTRIC CARS?**

There isn't a problem with electric cars. I support people's choice in purchasing electric cars. The problem is the mandates. They are trying to increase the use of electric cars through mandates.

There is no question the government wants to increase supply. And, unfortunately, that is backward. They should be working on demand, not supply. If you increase demand, supply will follow.

Also, these types of decisions should be made using the legislative process. Do we need to be reminded who the government is? **It is we, the people.** Our representatives should be making these decisions, not state-regulating entities such as the MPCA.

### **IS THERE ANOTHER CLEAN AIR OPTION FOR ELECTRIC CARS?**

Yes. Biofuels.

## **WHAT ARE BIOFUELS**

Biofuels are renewable energy sources created by biomass, which is then converted to liquid fuel. Biodiesel and ethanol are the two most common types of biofuels.

## **BIODIESEL**

**Biodiesel** is a clean-burning, liquid fuel produced from renewable sources such as vegetable oil and animal fats. It's clean burning and also reduces the use of petroleum diesel. Biodiesel is good for the economy, good for the environment, and we grow it locally. Win, win, and win.

Biodiesel produced from soybeans only uses the oil portion of the soybean, leaving all the proteins available to nourish livestock and humans. Using the oils from soybeans is a very efficient use of the plant.

Biodiesel also reduces life cycle greenhouse gas emissions by more than 50 percent and leaves the smallest carbon footprint compared to all other liquid fuels.

## **ETHANOL**

Ethanol is a grain alcohol that is blended with gasoline and used in motor vehicles. Many gasoline stations provide a blended fuel, which typically is 10 percent ethanol and 90 percent gasoline.

Historically, there has been an abundant supply of corn so most of the ethanol made in the United States is from corn. Along with a consistent supply of corn, the Midwest also has access to water resources and livestock production nearby. It makes good sense to produce ethanol in the Midwest.

And like biodiesel, ethanol is clean burning fuel and is good for the environment and good for Minnesota's economy.

## **WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF BIOFUELS?**

In a nutshell, biofuels help reduce the carbon footprint of transportation and other industries by making the most of our planet's carbon cycle. Every gallon of biofuel that replaces a gallon of fossil fuel helps *reduce* greenhouse-gas emissions.

What will happen to the state's biofuel industry if we continue down this path?

### **WHAT IS THE SOLUTION?**

It's really about not using mandates and letting consumers choose what is best for them. Using incentives and promotions to increase electric vehicle demand is the way to proceed. But let people choose. This should not be coming from government entities.

Also, an issue that is not discussed is the electrical grid infrastructure. We need to boost our electrical grid *significantly* before we can support additional electric cars.

I am concerned about the projected increase in vehicle costs, to the point many people will not be able to afford vehicles. Then what? Do we go down the road of Oprah's, "You get a car, you get a car, you get a car?" Of course, compliments of our government.

I certainly hope not.

It really is time we take back our government. We need to refocus on what the government's purpose is. And, yes, it's that simple.

<https://www.nujournal.com/opinion/letters/2022/08/03/consumer-choice-should-determine-future-vehicle-market/>

## **Consumer choice should determine future vehicle market**

LETTERS

AUG 3, 2022

To the editor:

Farmers like me understand the importance of protecting our beautiful environment by combating climate change, but we also know tying our state's vehicle standards to California's regulations makes little sense. We have little in common with California, which is why aligning Minnesota's vehicle standards with the Golden State in hopes of reducing greenhouse gases in transportation by 30% by 2025 is not the right approach.

New rules requiring about a quarter of vehicles on Minnesota auto lots in 2025 to be electric vehicles limits customer options. This would mean more than 65,000 zero emissions vehicles would be forced onto car lots, about triple the number that have been sold in Minnesota since 2011. Other products using combustion engines, including snowmobiles, watercraft, and even leaf blowers and lawnmowers, are also subject to the rule.

More than two in three Minnesotans said that goals for reducing transportation-related emissions, decreasing vehicle miles traveled, and increasing the number of electric cars and light trucks on Minnesota roads all go too far. Those results come from a survey conducted by the administration's own Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. Then there's the obvious costs. The government's own analysis shows Minnesotans would pay more than \$1,100 more per vehicle under the new rule.

Those strong feelings are part of the reason why the "*Minnesota Consumer Choice For Fuel Act*," has been so well received. The legislation, if adopted, would repeal the new mandate and ensure that Minnesota lawmakers, not those elected in California, are the ones setting vehicle policy. This means Minnesotans would be free to choose the kind of vehicle that best fits their lifestyle. This is especially true for farmers and those living in rural areas, where electric vehicles might make little sense or even be incapable of getting the job done. After all, our state's rate of pick-up trucks and SUVs already stands at 82% compared to California's 55%, strong evidence that our vehicle market and preferences are vastly different. The state's sizable snowmobile sector, one that stands 220,000 strong today, would be in the crosshairs as well, impacting a beloved activity that creates an impact of around \$1 billion dollars annually in Minnesota.

The Minnesota Consumer Choice For Fuel Act remedies this potential threat by ensuring that customers have the right to choose whatever vehicle type they prefer, allowing consumer choice to set the market instead of rule makers in California. Tying Minnesota's vehicle future to California makes little sense, a message being sent loud and clear by the public. There are much better ways for Minnesota to do its part on climate change.

**Wanda Patsche**  
**Welcome, MN**