



February 11, 2026

**TO: Senate Transportation and Energy Committee** Chair Lisa Cutter, Vice Chair Matt Ball, Marc Catlin, Mark Baisley, Tony Exum, Kyle Mullica, Byron Pelton, and Tom Sullivan

**TO: Bill Sponsor:** Rod Pelton

**RE: CRES Opposes SB26-028** |Concerning Removal of Wind Generation as a Clean Energy Source Related to the State's Clean Energy Goals

CRES strongly opposes this highly unusual bill and urges all Senate Transportation and Energy Committee members to vote no on the bill.

---

CRES is a nonpartisan, science-based nonprofit with a reach of thousands of Coloradans annually. The CRES Policy Committee brings together a broad range of energy policy and technology experts who review energy bills before the Colorado state legislature to provide our perspective.

CRES unreservedly opposes SB26-028, "Concerning Removal of Wind Generation as a Clean Energy Source Related to the State's Clean Energy Goals." This bill would completely and erroneously change the meaning of the word "renewable." As the bill states, "The bill removes wind energy as an eligible renewable energy resource under Colorado's renewable energy standard and removes wind energy generation from consideration for the state's clean energy targets." In particular in Colorado Revised Statutes, 40-2-124, (1)(a)(VII) is amended to strike out wind energy as a renewable resource as follows:

(VII) "Renewable energy resources" means solar, ~~wind~~, geothermal, biomass that is greenhouse gas neutral, new hydroelectricity with a nameplate rating of ten megawatts or less, and hydroelectricity in existence on January 1, 2005, with a nameplate rating of thirty megawatts or less and that does not require the construction of any new dams or reservoirs.

This bill would thus deny the very meaning of the word "renewable." The Merriam-Webster dictionary (<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/renewable>) defines "renewable" as follows:

1. capable of being renewed
2. capable of being replaced by natural ecological cycles or sound management practices

Furthermore, it provides the following specific examples and includes wind:

Forests are *renewable* natural resources, but they must be treated with care.  
Wind and water are *renewable* fuel sources.

When wind energy is harnessed to produce electricity, it is replaced by nature. Furthermore, the wind energy that is converted to electricity by wind turbines would otherwise have been dissipated in the environment as heat (as is the electricity after it is used to provide a useful function). Whereas the fossil fuels such as coal, oil, and natural gas come out of the ground from finite reserves, there are no “reserves” of wind energy, as they are forever renewed by natural processes.

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration  
(<https://www.eia.gov/states/co/analysis>),

In 2024, renewable sources of energy accounted for 43% of Colorado's total in-state electricity net generation, a record high. **Wind power accounted for the largest share of Colorado's renewable electricity generation at 67%**, followed by the combined 27% for utility-scale (1-megawatt or larger) photovoltaic and small-scale (less than 1 megawatt), customer-sited solar. Hydroelectric power accounted for 6% and biomass was less than 1%. [boldface added]

Clearly this bill would erroneously change the widely accepted definition of an energy resource that is clearly defined in the dictionary, is used by the U.S. government, and has been used for decades to meet Renewable Portfolio Standards that were required by Colorado State Legislatures. CRES urges the Senate Transportation and Energy Committee to quickly vote no on this misguided bill.

Thank you for considering our strong recommendation.

Sincerely,

Vincent Calvano  
Chair, CRES Policy Committee

**Senate Transportation & Energy**

**02/18/2026 01:30 PM**

**SB26-028 Removal of Wind Energy from State Energy Goals**

**Typed Text of Testimony Submitted**

<b>Name, Position, Representing</b>	<b>Typed Text of Testimony</b>
Nic Korte Against Grand Valley Audubon Society	We oppose this bill for several reasons:  First: Many of our group have traveled in Europe (eg Spain) and Central America (eg Costa Rica) and have seen wind energy as an effective and important part of the energy portfolio. Other countries continue to make strides in its use--including improvements in battery storage. It is short-sighted to do anything to limit this energy source's advancement.  Second: Climate change is real. We have documented it locally for the past couple of decades because of changes in composition and timing of bird species. We must transition from fossil fuels. Wind Energy is a useful component of that transition. Please oppose this bill.
Ingrid Moore Against themselves	I strongly oppose this bill! Why would we remove a proven and rapidly improving technology from the portfolio when energy needs are increasing?  Removing wind energy from the state's renewable energy portfolio eliminates a proven and cost-effective renewable energy source, and could increase energy costs while reducing the state's competitiveness in the clean energy economy.  Not to mention that this would significantly limit Colorado's ability to meet its clean energy and carbon reduction goals.  PLEASE VOTE NO!