

## WRITTEN TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO SENATE BILL 170

Submitted by Nan Brunskill

Liberty Twp, Ohio

Position: Opponent

Chairman, Vice Chair, Ranking Member, and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony in opposition to Senate Bill 170.

I strongly oppose SB 170 because it poses serious risks to property rights, environmental safety, democratic governance, and the responsible use of public funds.

First, the bill enables the use of “statutory consolidation” for carbon capture and storage (CCS) projects, meaning if just 70% of property owners agree, the remaining 30% can be compelled to participate. This infringes upon the fundamental property rights of Ohioans and sets a troubling precedent.

Second, SB 170 removes the authority of local governments to approve or block CCS projects. Communities that would bear the long-term risks of carbon injection—such as groundwater contamination or induced seismicity—deserve a meaningful voice in these decisions. Local self-governance should not be overridden to fast-track industrial projects.

Third, CCS is not without danger. The 2020 CO<sub>2</sub> pipeline rupture in Satartia, Mississippi caused hospitalizations and evacuations, underscoring the safety hazards associated with transporting and storing compressed CO<sub>2</sub> underground.

Fourth, this policy shifts significant economic burden onto taxpayers. The CCS industry depends heavily on the 45Q federal tax credit—currently \$85 per ton of sequestered CO<sub>2</sub>. For a single large coal plant, this could result in over \$1 billion in taxpayer subsidies annually. That money could be better directed toward clean energy investments that offer both environmental and economic returns.

Lastly, CCS does not address the root causes of climate change. It risks prolonging fossil fuel dependence rather than accelerating the transition to renewables. As such, it serves as a costly distraction, not a long-term solution.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to reject SB 170.

Sincerely,

Nan Brunskill