

Dow Opposes Proposal 3 In Michigan Due To Its Approach, Focus And Cost

(NAPSA)—The Dow Chemical Company is opposing Proposal 3, the renewable energy constitutional amendment on the Michigan ballot on November 6. A recognized, global leader in sustainable energy use, conservation and the development of advanced energy solutions, the Midland-based manufacturer is concerned the proposed amendment is misguided in approach, focus and cost.



Rich Wells

The company is opposed to Proposal 3 because it is narrowly focused on the use of renewable resources for electricity generation and will drive up utility costs. Data suggests the cost of compliance could reach more than \$10 billion, which would be passed on to electricity consumers.

“Michigan already has the highest utility rates in the Midwest, which is a barrier to attracting new manufacturing to Michigan to create jobs the state so desperately needs and to pursue the innovations that will lead to a sustainable energy future,” said Rich Wells, vice president and site director of Michigan Operations for Dow. “Proposal 3 will significantly increase the cost of electricity even further for Michigan residents and businesses large and small.”

He pointed out that as a supplier to the wind industry and a solar manufacturer, with a considerable stake in development of practical clean energy technologies, Dow is in a unique position to weigh the costs and benefits of the proposal. “Any gains these renewable markets may see from Proposal 3 would be significantly overshadowed by the higher energy costs it causes. Dow, like all residents of Michigan, would suffer financially under Proposal 3,” Wells said.

Dow has been at the forefront of advocating for a national comprehensive energy policy that supports stable energy supplies and costs, leads to innovation and sustainable solutions, strengthens economic growth and increases competitiveness. Wells said Proposal 3 falls far short of the type

of comprehensive approach needed to secure a sustainable energy future for Michigan.

“Solutions shouldn’t be restricted to a narrow definition of renewable energy, but rather encompass energy efficiency, energy storage, co-generation and energy recovery solutions,” Wells explained.

He noted that energy conservation is especially important.

“At Dow, we know firsthand the environmental and economic benefits of energy efficiency. Since 1990, Dow has reduced its energy intensity by 40 percent, saving roughly the equivalent of 11 years of energy consumption by every home in Michigan. Rather than costing us more money, these efforts have returned more than \$24 billion of value to our company,” Wells said.

Dow also opposes the prospect of Michigan’s constitution serving as a policy vehicle for select special interests.

“The state constitution is meant to address and solidify the basic rights of Michigan citizens,” Wells explained. “Energy solutions are diverse and ever evolving, requiring the flexibility of legislative policy making to stay current. Without the flexibility to respond to new technologies and practices, Michigan could find itself falling farther behind other states in taking advantage of affordable, sustainable energy, which is the key to economic growth and prosperity.”

Dow is advocating for greater collaboration and flexibility than 3 would allow. The company proposal sums up the principles for transitioning to an economically viable, sustainable energy future as COAT: Conserving energy, Optimizing existing energy resources, Accelerating the development of new energy solutions and Transitioning to a successful low carbon economy.

“What Michigan needs most is a comprehensive approach to energy policy where consumers, businesses and government embrace multiple solutions for clean, sustainable and cost-effective energy,” Wells said. “The state does not need a narrowly focused, rigid and costly state constitutional amendment. That’s why we’re asking Michigan voters to vote no on Proposal 3.”



Note to Editors: Proposal 3 is a proposed state constitutional amendment that is on the ballot in Michigan in November and has no bearing on energy regulation in other states.