

Dear Members of the Environment and Transportation Committee,

I am writing to request a favorable report on HB0021 Prohibition on the Chemical Conversion of Plastic.

- **Industry misuses the terms “chemical recycling” or “advanced recycling,” when in fact, most facilities are not operational, and the few that are are primarily Plastic-to-Fuel (PTF).** Plastic-derived fuels are fossil fuels that spend a very small portion of their lifecycle as plastic. This is not recycling, it is an expensive and complicated way to burn fossil fuels.
- **“Chemical Recycling” is an industry greenwashing tactic, undermining real solutions to the plastics crisis.** The fossil fuel industry is investing over \$164 billion in expanding plastic production in the U.S., 35 times the amount that they claimed to invest in “chemical recycling.”
- **“Chemical Recycling” is a bad investment.** “Chemical recycling”(aka plastic-to-fuel) is competing against, *and losing to*, virgin plastic production. High likelihood of technical failure has also squandered investment. As of 2017, similar technologies have wasted at least \$2 billion of investments with canceled or failed projects across the globe.
- **“Chemical recycling” has a large carbon footprint,** and poses a climate risk. Over half of the plastic that is processed in these facilities is released as climate pollution (CO2). That’s on top of the emissions from burning the resulting fuel.
- **“Chemical Recycling” is an environmental health risk, particularly to already overburdened communities.** Every step of the process produces toxicants, from the sites themselves, where the product is burned, and at the facilities where the waste from the process goes, oftentimes in environmental justice communities. The chemical recycling industry is looking to expand into the same neighborhoods suffering from fossil fuel industry pollution.

Thank you for your consideration.

Thanks Always,
Natasha Shangold
8937 Skyrock Ct
Columbia, MD 21046