



What They Are Saying:

OPPOSITION MOUNTS AGAINST H.R. 1346

Following the House's advancement of H.R. 1346, a broad array of voices have raised serious concerns about what many see as a backdoor expansion of the ethanol mandate.

Policymakers, trade associations, labor unions, environmental groups, industry leaders, and think tanks have warned the proposal would disrupt the energy supply chain, place added pressure on America's small and independent refiners, and ultimately increase costs for consumers at the pump. As H.R. 1346 heads to the Senate for consideration, opposition continues to grow among those who agree the bill threatens both American consumers and refiners. Read their reactions below.

POLICYMAKERS

[Rep. Harriet Hageman \(R-WY\)](#) — “It is interesting that anyone who supports this bill has not yet mentioned the fact that it is the refiners that will be forced, mandated, to meet the E15 requirement. The refineries that are at risk of closure because of this bill across the country employ more than 5,800 workers. We could lose upward of 266,000 indirect jobs that depend on small refineries. The EPA's own Regulatory Impact Analysis of the 2026–2027 biofuel mandate says the RFS will cost American families about \$20 billion a year.”

[Rep. Jamie Raskin \(D-MD\)](#) — “E15 will make our air and water quality dramatically worse. Scientists warn that it will increase smog, particularly during the summer months, and threaten water supplies through the runoff from millions of acres of new corn fields.... As for the reputed financial benefit to consumers, E15 yields lower gas mileage than the gasoline most widely available now, meaning that Americans will need to fill their tanks more often.”

[Rep. Scott Perry \(R-PA\)](#) — “Twenty-two States already have the option to sell E15 year-round. Less than 14 percent of fueling stations in Iowa, where they grow a heck of a lot of corn, sell E15 because the consumer doesn't want it. You get less miles per gallon. First of all, you pay more, subsidize it, and then get less miles per gallon when you put it in your tank.”

[Rep. Chip Roy \(R-TX\)](#) — “It is an expansion of the mandate. That is what the practical effects of it will be. Truthfully, I have no problem if you want to pull back on the Clean Air Act in terms of what it does with respect to the E15 requirement in the summer, but then let's modify the Renewable Fuel Standard. We have created this botched system. We are making it massively difficult for refining capacity to grow in the United States.”

[Rep. Gabe Evans \(R-CO\)](#) — “My district is home to the last two oil refineries in Colorado. Both of them are small refineries. Under this bill, their definition would change. They would no longer be small refineries, which means they would no longer be able to obtain relief from the RFS compliance costs. My two refineries alone would face an impact of over \$100 million a year.”

TRADE ASSOCIATIONS

[Tom Brooks, Chair, Sustainable Advanced Biofuel Refiners Coalition](#) — “SABR is a biofuel advocate, so we support E15, but this current package is not the answer... Rather than an E15 compromise with a side of SREs, it is more of a SRE compromise with a side of E15. We would like to engage constructively with all stakeholders to find a more measured policy that is not so disproportionately harmful to soybean farmers and biodiesel producers who do not even receive any offsetting benefits from the package.”

[Small Refineries of America](#) — “Stricter rules on exemptions would also take away important relief that Congress included in the program to help small refineries deal with the compliance costs of blending biofuels into the nation’s fuel supply.”

LABOR UNIONS

[International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers, and Helpers](#) — “The International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers, and Helpers, AFL-CIO urges you to oppose H.R. 1346, The Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Act. Our members perform the difficult and often dangerous construction, maintenance, turnaround, and repair work that keeps our nation’s refineries operating safely and efficiently. The good-paying jobs they depend on to put food on the table and take care of their families are directly tied to the long-term viability of these facilities.”

ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS

[Friends of the Earth, Center for Biological Diversity, and more](#) — “On the behalf of our millions of supporters and members, we recommend that you vote no on H.R. 1346 that would expand year-round use of 15% ethanol (“E15”) mixes in gasoline, including during summer months when E15 exacerbates ground-level ozone formation. Not only would this worsen smog and harm the air quality of millions of Americans around the nation, the further expansion of higher-blend ethanol would result in massive increases in pesticide use, worsen water and groundwater contamination, and result in further losses of native grassland habitats being converted into commodity-crop production.”

[Sierra Club, Waterkeeper Alliance, and more](#) — “The EPA has estimated that even a more modest increase in biofuel use would impose approximately \$41 billion in additional fuel and food costs over a three-year period—outweighing estimated energy security benefits 80-fold. These costs include an estimated \$24 billion in higher fuel costs, and \$17 billion in higher food prices, translating to roughly \$50 annually in increased household food costs per year.”

EDITORIAL BOARDS

[The Editorial Board, Wall Street Journal](#) — “Most gasoline contains 10% ethanol as an octane booster. But the Renewable Fuel Standard requires ethanol and other so-called advanced biofuels to be blended in increasing quantities into the nation’s fuel supply. The Trump Environmental Protection Agency recently raised these quotas, which it estimated would entail \$20 billion a year in compliance costs. These costs are passed along to drivers at the pump.”

THINK TANKS

[American Energy Institute](#) — “The undersigned organizations write to express our opposition to H.R. 1346, the Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act of 2025, and any effort to permanently authorize nationwide year-round E15 gasoline sales without substantial reform to, or repeal of, the federal Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS)... the legislation would further entrench a federally managed fuel mandate regime that has distorted energy markets, burdened consumers, harmed independent refiners, and expanded corporate welfare for politically connected ethanol interests.”

[Americans for Tax Reform](#) — “This legislation would lead to higher costs for consumers, increase government spending, and expand government regulation of the private sector. The bill would expand the renewable fuel standard (RFS) to further impose government mandates on American refineries requiring minimum amounts of ethanol in gasoline while removing the waiver requirement for year-round sales of E15, a gasoline blend that contains up to 15 percent ethanol.”

[David Widawsky, U.S. Program Director, World Resources Institute](#) — “EPA analysis has estimated that even increases in biofuel mandates smaller than E15 could impose tens of billions of dollars in additional fuel and food costs over just a few years. Those costs ripple through the economy because corn used for fuel is corn not available for food, animal feed or exports. The result is higher grocery bills at a time Americans can least afford them.”

[CATO Institute](#) — “The E15 campaigns in Congress and at the EPA hijack an otherwise deregulatory agenda—and legitimate concerns over clean air and high gasoline prices—to expand the cronyism established by the RFS.”