4407 E Lake St, Minneapolis, MN 55406

Testimony presented the House Committee on Energy Finance and Policy in Opposition to HF 9.

Chair Swadinsky, Vice Chair Murphy, Members of the Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today. My name is Noelle Cirisan and I am the Political Manager at MN350 Action. I am here to talk to you in opposition to HF 9. The changes proposed in this bill will completely undercut the 100% Bill and leave many of the most vulnerable Minnesotans holding the bag for poor policy positions that will put Minnesota behind in the inevitable move towards real clean energy

Carbon Capture:

CCS technology is often framed as a way to reduce emissions from fossil fuel plants, but in reality, it has major downsides:

- **Burden on Environmental Justice Communities**: Carbon capture projects often require extensive infrastructure, including pipelines to transport captured CO_2 to underground storage sites. These pipelines disproportionately run through low-income and Indigenous communities, increasing health and safety risks from potential leaks or ruptures.
- **Inefficiency and Corporate Greenwashing**: The technology has failed at scale, with many projects either shutting down early or underperforming. Fossil fuel companies promote CCS to justify continued extraction and combustion, rather than transitioning to cleaner energy.
- **Increased Energy Demand and Pollution**: Capturing and storing carbon requires additional energy, meaning power plants must burn even more fossil fuels to support CCS operations. This means more air pollution, which leads to higher rates of asthma, respiratory diseases, and other health issues, particularly for frontline communities near these facilities.

Preventing Demolition of Fossil Fuel Plants

By preventing the demolition of fossil-fuel power plants unless certain conditions are met, HF 9 could keep polluting facilities running longer, leading to:

- **Continued Public Health Crises**: Fossil fuel plants release particulate matter, nitrogen oxides, and sulfur dioxide, all of which contribute to respiratory illnesses, heart disease, and premature death, disproportionately affecting low-income and minority communities.
- **Job Losses and Economic Inequality**: Stalling the transition to renewable energy means fewer investments in clean energy jobs. Instead of creating stable, high-paying green jobs, this policy protects industries that are in long-term decline.

Allowing the demolition of retired plants allows for the proper cleanup and utilization of the space for different economic avenues including true clean energy solutions. Long term pollution from retired plants can cause harm. Proper demolition and clean up can mitigate the risks to public and environmental health. The space made by demolition may allow for clean energy projects and other next generation jobs that can propel Greater Minnesota communities forward rather than leaving abandoned spaces in order to hold on to antiquated energy sources that are cycling out of use.

Conclusion: Who Pays the Price?

The policies in HF 9 largely benefit corporations and utilities that want to delay a true energy transition, while passing the environmental and social costs onto frontline communities. Rather than investing in expensive and harmful technologies like carbon capture, antiquated plants, and other false solutions, Minnesota should prioritize:

- **Decentralized, community-owned renewable energy (solar, wind, battery storage)**
- **Grid upgrades and energy efficiency programs that reduce costs for consumers**
- **Phasing out fossil fuels in a way that prioritizes worker and community-led just transitions**

By focusing on genuinely clean energy solutions, Minnesota can avoid repeating the mistakes of the past—where the most vulnerable communities bear the costs of a broken energy system.

I thank you again for your time and consideration.