Testimony of Justin Haaheim, Connecticut Regional Coordinator for 350.org
Energy and Technology Committee March 19, 2013

In **Opposition** to Proposed Substitute Bill 1138
AAC Connecticut's Clean Energy Goals

Senator Duff, Representative Reed and members of the committee, my name is Justin Haaheim. I am the Connecticut Regional Coordinator for 350.org and a resident of New Haven, and I am speaking in strong opposition to Proposed Substitute Bill 1138.

I am here today with gratitude for this committee's work in this year and years past, but with deep concerns about the process and policies surrounding 1138. I support and echo the concerns raised by partner groups Clean Water Action, CT Fund for the Environment, RENEW, Sierra Club, Working Families, Environment Connecticut, Environment Northeast and others. As dedicated legislators who have strong records of supporting clean energy in our state, I was surprised to see this bill language appear in the way it did, as substitute language submitted at the last minute, and before the Governor's Renewable Portfolio Standard study has actually been completed or released to the public.

The substitute language proposes sweeping and backward-looking changes to Connecticut's Renewable Portfolio Standard, effectively scaling back our commitments to clean energy in favor of a sweetheart deal for Hydro Quebec and Northeast Utilities, the company who will enjoy the profits of the energy-wasting transmission lines to bring out-of-the-region power to our region. This cannot possibly be considered a step forward for our state, and it puzzles me that this committee would propose such language.

This committee knows well the challenges we face right now in our state: a sluggish economy, volatile energy prices, 8.2% unemployment, and all the while increasingly extreme weather beating down our door -- the product of a climate that is rapidly changing. 350.org represents over 13,000 people across Connecticut who experience these challenges every day and who are counting on their legislators to do the right thing and build a real, honest to God clean energy future -- one that stimulates the economy, supports local businesses that create high-quality jobs, insulates us from the roller-coaster of fossil fuel prices, and does our part to stop the looming climate crisis. I know the members of this committee value those things, so I'm curious: what warrants rollbacks of this scale, at such a last minute and with such an opaque process?

The one piece of this legislation that represents a step forward is Section 5 (h) which lays out the foundation for long-term regional procurement of clean energy. I support the committee taking action on that, and giving due process and due deliberation to the rest of the measures after the Renewable Portfolio Standard study has been released and subject to public comment. 1138 as it is written currently is not good energy policy, and I oppose it.