

Gale E. Ridge
139 Lebanon Road
Bethany, CT 06524
gdabrit@gmail.com
(203) 500-7882

March 12, 2018

To the honorable Co-chairs and members of the Environment Committee

Regarding: Testimony in support of H. B. No. 5363, **“An Act Establishing a carbon price for Fossil Fuels Sold In Connecticut”**

I applaud the writing of this bill, but I have a couple of questions and a concern.

Question 1.

Section b1 indicates that the levying of fees against fossil fuel products will begin on January 2020. Unless I am mistaken, this contradicts line 1 in the section which states in italics, *“Effective from passage.”* I ask why wait two years to start carbon pricing? The economy nationally and regionally is setting up for great volatility and I worry we may be facing a very different financial and political world in two years. This is two years of lost monies that could be used to kick start the programs the bill wants to see have done. We do not have much time.

Question 2.

Section f1 indicates that Massachusetts and Rhode Island will have a rate of \$10/ton, why are we choosing \$5? It would be wise to move as a three state block on this matter and bring our fee in line with our neighbors. Additionally, could you clarify what “ton” you are working with. A metric ton is 2,204.6lbs, a US ton is 2,000lbs, and an imperial ton is 2,240lbs. **You must be specific!**

Concern.

In Section1: b2 I am concerned with language regarding sequestering of green house gas emissions as relief against fees levied. The language needs to be specific here addressing exactly how gases will be sequestered and where. CO₂ for example, can be used in the fossil fuel industries to extract more oil and gas, and so this language may allow for a “feed back subterfuge,” which these businesses would quickly take advantage of. They will be able to lower the fees against them, pretend to be environmentally friendly while continuing to use CO₂ as part of their industrial activities. This could undermine what is being attempted here, to curb major polluters activities. Additionally, who will be reporting on the sequestration. Self reporting by these corporation need in the least to be reviewed by an “independent body” populated by scientists, and academics etc. to insure for accuracy.

A report by written by the international, Society of Petroleum Engineers titled “Carbon Capture and Sequestration” admits the industry generates approx. 30 billion tons (what type of tons....they don't say?) of CO₂/year. Natural emissions of CO₂ including volcanoes is 1% of this. They dismiss ocean sequestration and list geological CO₂ sequestration options as follows:-

1. enhancing coal bed methane recovery,
2. deep unmineable coal seams,
3. depleted oil and gas reservoirs,
4. use in enhanced oil recovery,

5. deep unused saline water-saturated reservoir rocks, and
6. in basalts, oil shales, and cavities (what cavities?).

In their continued discussion, they suggest the use of cement and steel in the sequestration process. These two products upstream are major environmental sources of pollution and environmental degradation during their manufacture.

You are facing international entities with a great deal of power, that like mercury will find any fault line and enter. If this bill receives elevated activity from these entities such as increased lobbying, then you know you are get "warm," and a little too close to what they hold most dear. Be prepared for a fight, but it will be worth it.

Sincerely yours,
Dr. Gale E. Ridge
350 CT legislative chair