

Dear Chair Solomon and Honorable members of the House Corporations Committee,

I'm Peter Trafton of Providence, Rhode Island writing with my strongest opposition to house Resolution 6418, which calls for a special legislative commission to study and recommend increasing the use and building the infrastructure for alternative fuels.

With regard to studies called for by the Rhode Island state government, I must refer you to Frank Carini's ecoRI editorial of June 12, 2025. He provides an eloquent description of how our leaders repeatedly confirm the very limited value of "studies". (<https://ecori.org/rhode-island-drowns-in-rising-sea-of-disregarded-climate-studies> )

With regard to the study called for by H 6418, it looks at issues well covered in an astonishing number of similar studies by climate, economics, and energy experts, and clearly described in the literature.

H6418 calls for a study of "alternative fuels" without really defining them, or what our needs are with regard to the fossil fuels that they are presumably alternatives to.

The truth is that global warming is occurring because greenhouse gases have polluted the Earth's atmosphere resulting in retention of heat energy produced by the sun. An essential part of our response is to stop greenhouse gas pollution. That means **stop** not just "reduce". So, a fuel's "potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions" (P1, line 6) is insufficient and largely irrelevant

Furthermore, we still need to obtain enough power to meet our economy's increasing needs - needs which can be met with energy efficiency, wind, solar, and geothermal development, continued use of existing nuclear facilities and perhaps their supplementation.

Clearly it's necessary to consider cost and benefit of any proposed alternative, and clearly time is of the essence. Unproductive delays must no longer be accepted.

Now with the climate of the world and our state hanging in the balance, H 6418 calls for a "commission" made up of business folks associated with the various mentioned alternatives. (Well, not all the alternatives – The Legislative Council's "explanation" excluded "solar" and "wind".) Since "photovoltaic" was included in the bills list of alternatives perhaps there's some confusion about whether or not solar should be excluded! It seems clear that at least the legislative counsel intends that wind energy is not to be considered. I submit that considering any alternatives without comparing them

directly with our 2 best sources of renewable energy is truly absurd. Furthermore we must recognize that the mentioned alternatives should play only a minor role in our efforts to end greenhouse gas pollution.

The bill's list of alternatives includes a couple others beyond photovoltaics which, in my opinion, certainly deserve to be considered. **Geothermal energy** offers greenhouse gas free energy. A bill for its implementation in Rhode Island has been ignored by the house for the last 2 years (This year it's H5576 by Rep Cortvriend – it would create jobs for gas utility workers. Why isn't it brought up for a committee vote?) We should not ignore nuclear energy, I believe. However, its runaway costs, years in development, and dangers of accidents, weaponization, and spent fuel disposal problems must be addressed. Perhaps someday we will have nuclear fusion as an option – but not yet.

But the other alternatives – ethanol, biodiesel, wood pellets, propane, and hydrogen – vigorously promoted by their relative industries, who have obtained government support, false or deceptive labeling as “climate friendly” and more adoption than they deserve, these deserve neither study by a commission in Rhode Island nor further promotion.

For the above reasons and more, I urge you to reject any further consideration of 6418.

Thanks very much for considering my evidence and opinions,

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "PG Trafton". The letters are cursive and somewhat stylized, with the "P" and "G" being particularly prominent.

Peter Trafton