

Individual Testimony on
Sub HB6 - Clean Air Program *
Alan R. Rosenfield, ScD FASM
alanpeg@alum.mit.edu
House Energy and Natural Resources Committee
May 15, 2019

My testimony is based on the stated objectives of Sub HB6. While these objectives are excellent, Sub HB6 fails to fulfill them.

Attaining the lowest possible carbon footprint

Motor vehicle operation is now the largest source of CO₂ emissions in the United States. Electrical generation is slightly behind at about one-third of the total. In other words, Sub HB6 ignores two-thirds of Ohio's carbon footprint.

Greenhouse gasses from electricity generation have been decreasing in Ohio, mostly because of coal plant retirements. While nuclear plants limit the formation of these gasses, shutting down these plants would lead to only a few percent increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Future planned/announced coal-plant closings will have a much larger effect.

Another factor has been lower electricity usage. Ohioans are lowering the state's carbon footprint by using energy efficiency and thus preventing about as much greenhouse gas emissions as do nuclear plants. Despite this success, Sub HB6 effectively abolishes Ohio's energy efficiency program.

Ensuring lower consumer costs

Energy efficiency is the most cost-effective method available to reduce greenhouse gasses. While there are start-up costs, these are easily recouped by their lower operating costs. Sub HB6 should be revised by adding a robust energy efficiency program, which should include all contributions to the carbon footprint, not just electricity generation.

Closing the two nuclear plants will have little effect on electric rates. Despite claims to the opposite, electric rates will not rise steeply and persist for a number of years. Seven nuclear plants in six states have closed since 2010. The largest rate rise has been five percent, while rates have decreased in two of the states.

Making the state more energy self-sufficient.

Renewable energy actually satisfies all three objectives. Nationally, renewable energy is rapidly approaching nuclear as a provider of greenhouse-gas free electricity. The situation in Ohio is very different because state law has severely limited installation of renewable energy by strict restrictions on setbacks, causing Ohio to rank 48th among the states. Sub HB6 should be revised to augment the renewable-energy goals of 127-SB221 and return the setback requirements to their earlier values.

Concluding Remarks

If Sub HB6 had been introduced twenty, or even fifteen, years ago, it would have been considered forward thinking. Sadly, the legislation does not reflect the changes since then. Particularly, energy-saving technology has advanced rapidly to where it should be a major part of any clean air legislation. And fossil fuels should not.

- Testimony written before May 15 Sub Bill

Electric Rate Changes After Reactor Closing

Reactor	State	Shut Down	Electric Rate @shutdown	Jan 2019	% Change
Crystal River	FL	02/05/13	10.27	10.74	4.6%
Ft. Calhoun	NE	10/24/16	8.46	8.65	2.2%
Kewaunee	WI	05/07/13	10.34	10.86	5.0%
Oyster Creek	NJ	09/17/18	13.51	13.19	-2.4%
San Onofre	CA	06/07/13	15.84	15.66	-1.1%
VT Yankee	VT	12/20/14	14.19	14.89	4.9%
Average =				2.21%	