

Testimony in opposition to H7127, Section 11: Articles 3 and 8.

Barbara Walsh, 62 Frederick Street, Warwick, RI 02888

Date of Hearing: March 5, 2026

To: Chair Abney and the honorable Members of the House Finance Committee

Please oppose these budget articles. This is not the time to reverse the gains made in moving to renewable energy. This is the time to remain strong and effectuate the planning needed for future improvements in climate goals set by leaders in the House. Those who supported reduction in greenhouse gasses were wise, and realized the impacts of additional costs, health impacts, and increasing natural disasters if continuing to use the same old approach to supporting fossil fuel usage. Reducing weatherization programs simply reduces the cost savings to consumers. Why would we do that if we say we are concerned about costs? Increasing fossil fuel use increases the costs resulting from natural disasters, so why would we do that? Increasing fossil fuels results in serious health consequences, increasing medical costs, so why would we do that? These budget items sound like policies now advanced by the Federal Government and only advantage fossil fuel companies, not citizens. So why would Rhode Island legislators allow that?