



Stephen Hoffman

From: ecomment@pa.gov
Sent: Monday, December 7, 2020 1:32 PM
To: Environment-Committee@pasenate.com; IRRC; environmentalcommittee@pahouse.net; regcomments@pa.gov; ntroutman@pasen.gov; timothy.collins@pasenate.com; gking@pahousegop.com
Cc: c-jflanaga@pa.gov
Subject: Comment received - Proposed Rulemaking: CO2 Budget Trading Program (#7-559)

CAUTION: **EXTERNAL SENDER** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.



Re: eComment System

The Department of Environmental Protection has received the following comments on Proposed Rulemaking: CO2 Budget Trading Program (#7-559).

Commenter Information:

Collin Gray
 (cgray@diamondtechnicalservices.com)
 444 Story Road
 Export, PA 15632 US

Comments entered:

Dear Sir or Madam,

I moved to Pennsylvania in January of 2012. I have found a new home. As a gainfully employed Pennsylvanian, I have found a very common thread that ties together all working persons that I have met. We are energy producers. If any Pennsylvanians livelihood is studied, the common denominator and likely the biggest source of income, can be traced back to the production of energy. The need for energy is universal. Our quality of life is absolutely dependent on a consistent and predictable energy market (as consistent/predictable as any market can be). The loss of any income derived from energy production has a negative effect that impacts many, many other people. The uniting position of informed workers in the energy industry of Pennsylvania can be summed by simply stating; Allow us to keep providing energy in a stable and responsible manner.

As an avid outdoorsman I spend a lot of time watching the land around me. I have a keen interest in man made products that negatively impact the environment. I am also a firm believer in the laws of Economics and Commerce. I have come to understand that there will always be opposing forces where proponents of commerce and the environment come to debate an issue. The normal and irrefutable conclusion is always reached before a compromise can be made. We all need Energy and we all need a clean environment. I think the majority of people are easily

turned away from following these debates. As the opposing forces make ever more outlandish claims, cite obscure scientific sources of dubious provenance, and seek to incite an outburst of frustration from one another, most average people stop following the debate. There will always be salient, fact based, cool headed arguments. Please consider the following when you weigh the option of adopting RGGI:

Pennsylvania has a tenuous hold on a good economy. This state is still feeling the impact of the collapse of the US Steel industry. A collapse of our Energy Industry would be every bit as disastrous.

We are a huge producer of Energy. We yank electrons back and forth better than all surrounding states. We are educated, trained, and experienced in the production of energy. There is no commercial incentive for this to change.

Pennsylvania is the third most populated state. Two thirds of Pennsylvanians live in rural communities. Loss of income, as derived from the production of energy, disproportionately effects Pennsylvanians that live in rural areas. Those two thirds of Pennsylvanians vote and pay their taxes. No degree of gerrymandering will alleviate changes in voting or loss of tax revenue that would come from the loss of energy jobs.

Rural Pennsylvanians are a very resilient people. Generations of workers that have had to ride the ebb and flow of an unstable economy have learned to adapt. When money gets tight, spend your money wisely. This means turning off the electric heat, and burn wood or coal. Wood and coal are cheap, plentiful, and easy to get. The convenience of electric heating is foregone for the low cost (and inconvenience) of wood/coal heating. The typical wood/coal furnace has little to no system to reduce the output of noxious fumes, nor are they very efficient. Our ability to use electricity for heat is directly dependent on the cost.

Lastly, albeit a more philosophical stance, is that we (the USA) are a capitalist nation. The artificial inflation or suppression of an industry, that provides a needed commodity, is a sure way to destroy a building block of day to day commerce. Let the laws of supply and demand work.

As a race, humans will eventually have to stop using combustion to produce energy. It is a mathematical fact that there will eventually run out of combustible natural resources. Nuclear Energy is really just "combustion lite" in that we still have to take from the earth to get the fuel, and we still have a nasty byproduct to deal with afterward. I sincerely believe that as combustible natural resource availability diminishes and the technology behind low/zero carbon emission energy improves, our country will naturally gravitate to zero combustion for energy.

There is no need to force this to happen. RGGI will not improve the day to day lives of Pennsylvanians. RGGI will be a choke placed on a populace that needs to earn consistently, and has faith that they will continue to earn a living doing what they do best. This same populace will bear the weight of your decisions.

Respectfully,

No attachments were included as part of this comment.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Jessica Shirley

Jessica Shirley
Director, Office of Policy
PA Department of Environmental Protection
Rachel Carson State Office Building
P.O. Box 2063
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063
Office: 717-783-8727
Fax: 717-783-8926
ecomment@pa.gov