

From: [Jenna Kay](#)
To: [Cnty 2025 Comp Plan](#); [Jeffrey Delapena](#)
Subject: FW: Climate, Ag, Land use, and Food
Date: Monday, June 30, 2025 10:30:05 AM

From: Don Steinke <crvancouverusa@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 28, 2025 6:14 PM
To: Climate Action of Southwest Washington <Washington-SW-Climate-Action@lists.sierraclub.org>; CASCADE-LOOWIT-COAL-FORUM@lists.sierraclub.org; Cascade Loowit Conservation Forum <CASCADE-LOOWIT-CONS-FORUM@lists.sierraclub.org>
Cc: Karissa Halstrom <Karissa.Halstrom@hotmail.com>; Ann Foster <annfoster5093@gmail.com>
Subject: Climate, Ag, Land use, and Food

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From Don Steinke – Climate Action of Southwest Washington

Re: Climate, Ag, Land use, and Food

Hello Everyone,

I listened to this 80-minute [David Roberts podcast](#) about Climate, Ag, Land use and food.

Their bottom line is that biofuels are worse than gasoline. They urge us to care about the impacts of Ag on biodiversity, and climate because it really matters.

Other takeaways.

We must electrify the economy and run it on clean electricity. And you know, we're starting to do that, but with food, we don't even know what to do.

In our land use work, it could be worth considering the hierarchy of land use. Wildlands should be valued as much or more than Ag lands. We need to value wildlife habitat and biodiversity.

The best role model is Denmark. Partly because they've done so much on the energy side, they were suddenly realizing like, "Hey, because we're reducing emissions so quickly, by 2030, agriculture is going to be half our emissions and it's only 1% of our economy."

In Denmark, they use more land for agriculture than any other nation except for Bangladesh. The agriculture guys are really powerful there. But they realized they were going to have to come to the table, and they came up with a deal where they're putting tons of money into promoting plant-based alternatives to meat, but they're also putting tons of money into the kind of things that are going to help these farmers increase their yields and reduce

their footprint. And then they are also requiring them to essentially turn about one sixth, a million acres of farmland, back to wetlands. You know, it's unbelievable.

They're going to have a carbon tax on emissions from animals. I mean, this is like, you know, they're doing all the things.

Changing a wild area to ag is always bad for nature. We need diets that are less land-intensive. We need to do more with less land. We need to increase yields without converting more wild land to ag land.

Urban sprawl is bad. Ag sprawl is worse.

Our challenge is to get more out of less land with less ghg emissions.

Indoor farming -- is too energy intensive.

Restoring wetlands is one of the best bangs for the buck.

Eliminate beef, lamb and dairy.

We are deforesting the Amazon to produce corn for biofuel.

Agriculture is the leading cause of deforestation.

Agriculture is the leading cause of wetland destruction and water pollution.

Agriculture was the leading cause of harm to the Klamath River salmon runs and is currently the leading cause of harm to biodiversity in the Sacramento River Delta.

Therefore, the more efficient we can make food production, the less land we'll need for food production.

Manure bio-digestors are not cost effective and waste land.

The cultured cells of chicken, The Upside Chicken brand, tastes better than natural chicken because the commercial chicken is not as good as the heritage chicken from which the cultivated cells are grown.

"Whatever other benefits regenerative agriculture may have, it produces less yield per acre. Thus more wild lands will be converted to ag land.

Fyi

Don Steinke